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Abstract

Using a holistic perspective on athlete talent development, this study examines the impact of role strain on the life satisfaction in various life domains of junior elite Australian Rules Football players. One hundred and twelve talent-identified male Australian Rules Football players ($M_{age} = 16.8; SD = .71$) completed measures of role strain and multidimensional life satisfaction. The results indicated that role strain explained twelve to twenty-four percent of the variance in life satisfaction in the players’ life domains. Experiences of role strain related to the players’ dual careers were associated with decreased life satisfaction in sport, friendships, family, yourself, and global life satisfaction domains. Situations in which the players perceived that their abilities were underutilized were also negatively associated with life satisfaction across various life domains. This study thus evidences the importance of a domain specific, holistic approach to investigate the life satisfaction in junior athletes’ dual careers.
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A holistic perspective on talent development in sport is important to facilitate a developmentally appropriate approach to cultivating sporting expertise (Henriksen, 2010a, b; Miller & Kerr, 2002 Wylleman & Lavallee, 2004). Understanding the personal, environmental, and organizational factors associated with the multiple life domains of junior elite athletes is central to this holistic approach (Henriksen 2010a, b; Wylleman & Lavallee, 2004). Research adopting a holistic approach to talent development has unveiled an extensive list of stressors that are associated with the dual careers of junior elite athletes (Christensen & Sørensen, 2009; Godber, 2012; Miller & Kerr, 2002). Examples of the stressors experienced by junior elite athletes are difficulties with time management (little time to study because of training hours), time pressure (meeting deadlines for homework and assignments), the impact of sporting events and training on schoolwork and homework, extended absences from school to attend overseas events, restricted subject choice due to conflicts between assessments and sporting competitions, mental stress due to expectations imposed by self and others, sport related injuries, lack of recognition of sporting commitments, dealing with disappointment and failure, and fatigue due to daily routines of early morning, afternoon or evening practices (Christensen & Sørensen, 2009; Godber, 2012; Miller & Kerr, 2002).

A plethora of qualitative studies has provided detailed insight into the aforementioned stressors, and colourfully described the ‘existential stress-test’ that junior elite athletes endure (Brettschneider, 1999, p.122). Additionally, results from qualitative research have suggested that junior athletes who struggle to balance the demands from their dual careers may experience mental breakdown, higher levels of stress, increased incidence of school dropout, and lower school exam results (Christensen & Sørensen, 2009). However, few studies have adopted a quantitative approach to investigate the relationships between these stressors and junior athletes’ psychological wellbeing (Burgess & Naughton, 2010; Ivarsson et al., 2015). Yet this
information is crucial to understand how the psychological wellbeing of junior elite athletes in dual careers can be facilitated (Strachan, Côte, & Deakin, 2011).

**Wellbeing and Life Satisfaction in Junior Athletes’ dual careers**

Subjective wellbeing is composed of two separate, albeit related, components: affect and life satisfaction (Diener, 1994). Affect refers to short-lived emotional components of wellbeing, while life satisfaction refers to an individual’s longer lasting cognitive appraisal of his/her overall quality of life (Veenhoven, 1996). It has been suggested that life satisfaction consists of both state-like and trait-like components (Diener, 1996; Veenhoven, 1996). A person’s life satisfaction can thus be modified by changes in a person’s life circumstances (state-like component), but generally aspects of a person’s life are stable over time (trait-like component). The stressors associated with the dual careers of junior elite athletes can equally be chronic (e.g., ongoing pressure to perform) or acute (e.g., deciding between attending a birthday party or to take rest).

Adolescents experience differentiated levels of life satisfaction across life domains (Chen, Morin, Parker, & March, 2015; Weber & Huebner, 2015). Consequently, it is possible that adolescent athletes are satisfied with one aspect of their life (e.g., sport), but dissatisfied with another (e.g., school). Yet, the limited research on the wellbeing of junior elite athletes often neglects to adopt a domain specific, holistic approach relevant to the development of junior athletes (Ivarsson et al., 2015). Instead, global life satisfaction, or life satisfaction in only the sport domain is investigated. The effect of stressors associated with dual careers on the life satisfaction in the various life domains of junior athletes – such as school, sport, and friendships – thus remain unknown. Since life satisfaction is positively associated with the physical, mental, social, and emotional functioning of adolescents (Huebner, Suldo, Smith, & McKnight, 2004), a domain specific-holistic approach is central to investigate concerns whether the
stressors associated with dual careers of junior elite athletes come at the cost of their wellbeing (Chen, et al., 2015; Miller & Kerr, 2002).

**Experiences of Role Strain by Junior Athletes**

In order to quantify the various stressors experienced by junior elite athletes a role strain framework has been adopted. The role strain framework is widely used in educational and organisational psychology to study the difficulties experienced when fulfilling role demands (Goode, 1960). Recent research has confirmed the utility of the role strain framework to investigate stressors associated with the dual careers of junior athletes (Van Rens et al., 2016). Role strain encapsulates the difficulties people experience in four interrelated stressors. These stressors are overload, underload, ambiguity, and conflict (Fenzel, 1989a; Goode, 1960; Holt, 1982).

The overload component of role strain refers to situations in which demands exceed personal resources (Fenzel, 1989a). An example of a common experience of overload in the dual careers of junior elite athletes is the struggle to have enough time to complete schoolwork on top of attending all training sessions (Van Rens et al., 2016). Less common, but equally possible, are experiences of overload in solely school (e.g., too much homework), or sport (e.g., too exhausting). Overload solely in school has been negatively associated with life satisfaction, school performance, global self-worth, self-esteem, and perceived competence in high school students (De Bruyn, 2005; Fenzel, 1989a, 1989b, 1992, 2000). In sport, physical overload, or a lack of recovery has been identified as a risk factor that may lead to a junior athlete’s burnout (Brenner, 2007; Kjormo & Halvari, 2002). As such, experiences of overload (due to school or sport) negatively affect the life satisfaction of junior elite athletes.

The conflict component of role strain refers to a discrepancy between the athlete’s wishes and demands imposed by others (Van Rens et al., 2016). An example of conflict is a
situation in which the athlete would like to skip a training session to spend time with friends, but cannot do so because the coach demands that the athlete is present at every training session. The internal discrepancy caused by experiences of conflict is known to affect athletes’ sport performance and wellbeing, as evidenced by negative associations with self-efficacy and burnout (Beauchamp & Bray, 2001; Kjormo & Halvari, 2002).

The underload component of role strain reflects a perceived under-utilization of one’s abilities (Fenzel, 1989a). In educational psychology, underload is well researched, and it is believed that progressively more difficult and challenging levels of skill are critical in achieving expert performance (Rogers, 2007). Van Rens et al. (2016) have indicated that experiences of underload might be uncommon amongst junior elite athletes. However, experiences of underload in the school domain have been associated with a rise in psychological distress (existential depression), boredom, decreased passion, and increased stress in academically and athletically gifted children (Csikszentmihalyi, Rathude, & Whalen, 1993; Fredricks, Alfeld, & Eccles, 2010). Experiences of underload in the school domain is thus negatively associated with the life satisfaction of adolescents. However it is unclear how experiences of underload in other life domains (such as sport) are associated with adolescent’ wellbeing.

The final component of role strain, ambiguity, refers to a lack of clarity of one’s responsibilities (Holt, 1982; Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, & Rosenthal, 1964). In the team sport context, four sources of role ambiguity have been identified: (a) a lack of knowledge about one’s responsibilities; (b) lack of information on expected behaviour; (c) lack of knowledge on how one’s performance is evaluated; and (d) the consequences of not meeting certain role demands are unclear (Beauchamp, Bray, Eys, & Carron, 2002). Further, ambiguity experienced by adolescent team sport players was associated with lower athlete satisfaction in how their abilities are utilized (Eys, Carron, Bray, & Beauchamp, 2003), increased cognitive anxiety,
competitive anxiety poorer sport performance (Beauchamp et al., 2002), and, to some extent, somatic anxiety (Beauchamp, Bray, Eys, & Carron, 2003). These findings seem to allude to a negative association between athletes’ experiences of ambiguity and their life satisfaction.

Research Aim

The aim of this study was to investigate possible relationships between the role strain junior elite athletes experience in their dual careers, and their domain specific life satisfaction. Given the lack of previous literature, it was difficult to predict the relationships between the components of role strain and domain specific life satisfaction. However, it was hypothesized that all components of role strain were associated with decreased total life satisfaction. A model building approach will be taken to investigate potential negative associations between components of role strain and domain specific life satisfaction.

Method

Participants

Participants were 112 male junior elite Australian Rules Football (ARF) players who were, on average, 16.8 years of age (SD = .71). All participants were enrolled in either year 10 (N = 13), year 11 (N = 57) or year 12 (N = 42) of various secondary schools across Australia. The participants were part of state (TAC Cup, N = 69) or national (N = 43) Australian Football League (AFL) teams.

Measures

The Brief Multidimensional Student Athlete Life Satisfaction Scale (BMSALSS). The BMSALSS is an adapted version of the Peabody Treatment Progress Battery version of the Brief Multidimensional Student Life Satisfaction Scale (BMSLSS-PTPB; Bickman et al., 2010), which is used to assess life satisfaction of adolescents. The BMSLSS-PTPB in turn, is a modification of the BMSLSS (Seligson, Huebner, & Valois, 2003) in which the response
format of the questionnaire was modified from a 7-point Likert-type scale to a five point scale based on Item Response Theory analysis (Bickman et al., 2010). Example items of the BMSLSS-PTPB include: ‘How satisfied are you with your family life’, ‘How satisfied are you with your school experience’, and ‘How satisfied are you with your life overall’. Responses ranged from 1= very dissatisfied to 5= very satisfied.

The BMSLSS-PTPB can be used as a single scale (CFI = 0.93, GFI = 0.97, SRMR = 0.05; Bickman et al., 2010), however scores on the unadjusted version of the BMSLSS correlate strongly with the longer Multidimensional Student Life Satisfaction Scale (r = 0.66 and 0.8; Bickman et al., 2010), indicating that each item could be used as a single item scale.

The BMSLSS-PTPB has been extensively tested in children aged 8 to 18 years (Bickman et al., 2010; Huebner, Seligson, Valois, & Suldo, 2006).

Since the BMSLSS-PTPB does not assess life satisfaction in the ‘sport’ domain, a seventh item was added to the questionnaire, which reads: ‘How satisfied are you with your sport experience’. Responses were measured on the same 5-point Likert type scale as the BMSLSS-PTPB. In order to assess the validity of the adaption of the BMSALSS a Confirmatory Factor Analysis was conducted using IBM SPSS Amos 20 (Arbuckle, 2011).

The results supported the factorial structure of the BMSALSS and indicated a good model fit ($\chi^2 = 10.46, p = 0.66$, CFI = 1.0, GFI = 0.98, SRMR = 0.04). Further, the model fit of the BMSALSS was slightly improved compared to the BMSLSS-PTPB without the ‘sport’ item in the current sample ($\chi^2 = 6.95, p = 0.54$, CFI = 1.0, GFI = 0.98, SRMR = 0.04).

The Role Strain Questionnaire for Junior Athletes (RSQ-JA). The RSQ-JA is a 22-item scale that is designed to measure role strain in the sport, school, family, and friend roles of junior athletes (Van Rens et al., 2016). The RSQ-JA measures the four components of role strain (Fenzel, 1989a) using five subscales: dual career overload (i.e., overload in sport and between roles), school overload, conflict, underload, and ambiguity. Example items are: ‘I
can’t spend enough time with my friends because I am too busy’, ‘My schoolwork is too
difficult’, and ‘My roles aren’t challenging enough’. Responses are indicated on a 5-point
Likert type scale which records how true each of the statements is for the participants ranging
from 1 = not at all true, to 5 = very true. The scale was has an acceptable model fit ($\chi^2 (193) =
267.06$, $p = 0.32$, RMSEA = 0.06, CFI = 0.91, SRMR = 0.08; Van Rens et al., 2016).

Procedure

Ethical approval was granted by the university Human Research Ethics Committee. Further, the AFL, Victorian Football League (VFL) and five participating TAC Cup clubs
(pinnacle U18 Australian rules football competition) supported the research. Data was
collected at the training grounds of the TAC Cup teams, and at the national training camp of
the AFL talent academy. Of the five participating TAC Cup teams, one was located in rural
Victoria, two were located in regional Victoria, and two were located in Melbourne. Written
consent was provided by all participants. Additionally, written consent was provided by parents
or guardians of participants who were under 18 years of age at the time of measurement.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Mean scores of all life satisfaction domains on the 5-point scale ranged from 3.8 to 4.5.
The average score for the life satisfaction scale was 4.3, with scores ranging from 3.0-5.0 (see
Table 1), evidencing differential levels of life satisfaction across life domains.

Significant low to moderate negative correlations were found between all components
of role strain, and the total life satisfaction of the ARF players ($p < 0.05$, see Table 2). Furthermore, the correlation analysis revealed distinctive associations between some of the
components of role strain and domains of life satisfaction. Life satisfaction in the ‘family’
domain was negatively associated with dual career overload, overload in school, and conflict.
Life satisfaction in the ‘friendships’ domain was negatively associated with dual career overload and overload in school. Life satisfaction in the ‘school’ domain was negatively associated with dual career overload, school overload, ambiguity, and underload. Life satisfaction in ‘sport’ was negatively associated with dual career overload, conflict, and underload. For an overview of all correlations between components of role strain, and domains of life satisfaction, please refer to Table 2.

Out of interest, correlational analyses were conducted between the amount of teams the players’ played for, and the components of role strain. No significant associations between the amount of teams played for and dual career overload (r = .05, p = .62), school overload (r = .11, p = .27), ambiguity (r = .14, p = .13), conflict (r = .06, p = .55), and underload (r = .10, p = .30) were found.

**Relationships between Components of Role Strain and Domains of Life Satisfaction**

As there was no theoretical basis for predicting the strength of the relationship between the components of role strain and life satisfaction, a model building approach of stepwise regressions was undertaken (Tabachnick & Fidell, 1996). Linear regression analyses between each of the components of role strain and total life satisfaction yielded significant results. Dual career overload was the factor explaining most (14%) of the variance of total life satisfaction (F(1,110) = 19.18, p < 0.01). Underload (F(1,110) = 10.63, p < 0.01) and ambiguity (F(1,110) = 9.49, p < 0.01) each explained 9% of the variance in total life satisfaction. Overload in school (F(1,110) = 9.49, p < 0.01) and conflict (F(1,110) = 5.52, p = 0.02) contributed 7% and 4% of the variance in total life satisfaction respectively.

Multiple linear regression analyses were conducted to examine the relationships between the five subscales of role strain and the multiple domains of life satisfaction. The collinearity tolerance statistics of the multiple regression analyses ranged from .63 to .92, with
VIF scores ranging from 1.1 to 1.6. As such, collinearity was not a concern within the data analysis (Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1998). Together, the five components of role strain explained 24% of the variance of total life satisfaction \((F(5,111) = 6.51, p < 0.01)\). The variables that significantly contributed to this model \((p < 0.05)\) were underload and dual career overload (see Table 3).

Multiple regression analyses on each of the individual domains of life satisfaction yielded significant models \((p < 0.05)\) which explained 10% to 20% of the variance in life satisfaction. Again, underload and dual career overload were the factors that most often significantly contributed to the models. Dual career overload had a significant negative effect on life satisfaction in the family, friends, sport, yourself, and global life satisfaction domains, whilst underload significantly affected life satisfaction in the sport, yourself, where you live, and global life satisfaction domains (see Table 3).

**Discussion**

In general, the results of this research indicate that junior elite ARF players were satisfied with their lives. However, some reported to be (extremely) dissatisfied with some of their life domains. Consistent with the hypothesis, results from correlational and regression analyses indicated that all components of role strain were negatively associated with the total life satisfaction of junior elite athletes. Dual career overload and underload were revealed as the factors that contributed most to the variance in life satisfaction of the junior elite ARF players. The relationship between underload and life satisfaction was deemed surprising, as the concept of underload has received little attention in sport psychology literature. However, this finding is consistent with research in academically gifted children, which suggests challenges are essential to foster passion and development of gifted children (Fredricks, Alfeld, & Eccles,
2010; Rodgers, 2007). As such, the concept of underload deserves further examination in the dual careers of junior athletes.

Consistent with Chen et al. (2015), this research revealed differentiated levels of domain specific life satisfaction. These differences were evident in the average score on life satisfaction across life domains, as well as the distinctive associations between some components of role strain and specific life satisfaction domains. Importantly, the findings suggest that dual career overload does not only have a negative effect on life satisfaction in the sport domain, but also on life satisfaction in the family, friends, yourself, and global life satisfaction domains. Underload also had a negative effect on life satisfaction in the sport domain, as well as in the yourself, where you live, and global life satisfaction domains. These findings further evidence the importance of a domain specific, holistic approach to investigating the dual careers of junior elite athletes (e.g., Chen et al., 2015; Debois, Ledon, & Wylleman, 2014; Wylleman & Lavallee, 2004).

From a practical perspective, the findings of this study can aid in developing interventions aimed at improving the life satisfaction of junior elite ARF players. Until now, the common approach of sport schools is to assist struggling junior athletes by providing them with facilities to decrease experiences of school overload, such as reduced classroom times, adapted school curricula, and extensions on assignments and exams (Radtke & Coalter, 2007; Van Rens, Elling, & Reijgersberg, 2015). However, the results of this study suggest that interventions tailored at reducing the dual career overload of athletes (such as reducing the load of sporting commitments) may more effectively affect the life satisfaction of junior elite ARF players across their life domains. Practitioners and professionals may want to consider tailoring their support to the specific types or role strain each individual junior athlete experiences, while taking the athletes’ individual zones of optimal functioning into consideration (Woodman, Albinson, & Hardy, 1997). For example, clients who struggle with dual career overload may...
be helped by either reducing sport related loads, or by learning to use effective coping skills and time management strategies. Future research is recommended to investigate the effectiveness of such a person-centred approach is more efficient in supporting junior elite athletes’ dual careers.

Since the ARF players slightly more often reported dual career overload than any other components of role strain, there appears to be a need to ease demands in the sport role. Although the ARF players in the sample simultaneously played for up to five football teams, the amount of teams they played for was not associated with their experiences of overload and underload. However, these results should be interpreted with caution, as the demands of playing for a certain amount of teams will vary based upon the type of team (e.g., school, local, TAC, AFL Academy) and the level of each team (e.g., a high ranking local club, or lower ranking local club). Based on individual circumstances, the amount of teams the players compete for could be thus cause overload, and be a potential threat to their life satisfaction. Ceasing to play for the lower ranked teams may be a solution for some. Further, as underload was conceptualised as roles not being ‘challenging enough’ (Van Rens et al., 2016) ceasing participation in lower ranked teams may reduce underload if player perceive a discrepancy between their abilities and the demands of lower ranked teams. As such, ceasing participation in lower ranked teams might increase players’ wellbeing in two ways, namely by reducing overload and underload. Therefore, we encourage future research to investigate the effectiveness and viability of this suggestion. Further, we recommend that schools and sport organisations collaborate when establishing their role demands, and that they tailor these role demands to the individual player to ensure that adequate challenges are set.

Although this study provides us with novel insight into the domain life satisfaction of junior elite ARF players, some limitations of the research need to be addressed. First, this study used a homogenous sample of male, junior elite ARF players. It is therefore inadvisable to
blindly generalize the findings of this study to a wider range of elite junior athletes. The AFL operates under the assumption that a balanced sport and off-field life will facilitate the players’ on-field performance (Pink, Saunders, & Stynes, 2015). During data collection, it was apparent to the authors that the AFL makes an effort to support the dual careers of its players. Junior players are for instance encouraged to regularly meet with ‘talent development managers’ who are appointed by the AFL to assist players with their pursuits outside of sport. As such, generalizing the findings of this study to junior athletes in a wider range of sports could potentially cause an underestimation of the amount of role strain experienced by junior elite athletes. Future research is therefore recommended to replicate this study with junior elite athletes in different talent development programs, and is encouraged to include female athletes.

A second limitation of this study is that role strain was only measured at one moment in time; between mid-August and mid-September (in the middle of the Australian school year). Previous research conducted amongst Swedish adolescent athletes has shown that demands increase as the school year progresses (Stambulova et al., 2015). Therefore, it is expected that the levels of role strain that junior elite athletes experience fluctuate throughout the year, with peaks expected around examination periods in school and academy selections in football. We encourage research to monitor the role strain and life satisfaction experienced by junior elite athletes, so that relevant school and sport specific periods of high and low strain can be identified.

To conclude, this research confirms concerns that experiences of role strain in the dual careers of junior elite athletes could come at the cost of the adolescent’s life satisfaction component of wellbeing (Miller & Kerr, 2002). Increased experiences of role strain related to junior elite ARF players’ dual careers were associated with decreased life satisfaction in sport, friendships, family, yourself, and global life satisfaction domains. Situations in which ARF players think that their abilities are underutilized were also negatively associated with their life
satisfaction across various life domains. Life satisfaction is positively associated with the physical, mental, social, and emotional functioning of adolescents (Huebner, Suldo, Smith, & McKnight, 2004). Understanding the life satisfaction of junior elite ARF players is thus not only important to develop evidence-based strategies to improve junior athletes’ wellbeing, but could also affect their sporting and academic performance. Further, it can be speculated that experiences of high levels of role strain could increase dropout (from school or sport), which in turn could contribute to symptoms of depression, anxiety, or eating disorders (Wylleman, Alfermann, & Lavallee, 2004). To ensure athletes’ wellbeing, we would like to encourage researchers, practitioners, and professionals in sport to adopt a holistic, domain specific approach when considering the discriminants of life satisfaction in the dual careers of junior elite athletes.
References


Table 1: Descriptive statistics life satisfaction and role strain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction with Family</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction with Friendships</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction with School</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction with Sport</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction with Yourself</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Satisfaction with Where you live</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score on BMSALSS</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Career Overload</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overload in School</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underload</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average score on RSQ-JA</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Domain Specific Life Satisfaction in the Dual Careers of Junior Elite Football Players: The Impact of Role Strain”
by van Rens FECA, Borkoles E, Farrow D, Polman RCJ
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Table 2: Intercorrelations between the components of role strain and domains of life satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Strain</th>
<th>DCO</th>
<th>OS</th>
<th>Ambiguity</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Underload</th>
<th>RSQ-JA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DCO</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.64**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| RSQ-JA      | 1   | .37** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Life Satisfaction</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Friends</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Yourself</th>
<th>Where you live</th>
<th>Overall life</th>
<th>BMSALSS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friendships</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.28**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>.66**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yourself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.59**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where you live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.79**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMSALSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. DCO = Dual Career overload. OS = Overload in Sport. RSQ-JA = Role Strain Questionnaire for Junior Athletes. BMSALSS = Brief Multidimensional Student Athlete Life Satisfaction Scale.

* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)
Table 3: Regression analysis predicting the effect of the components of role strain on life satisfaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Life Satisfaction</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>Friends</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>Sport</td>
<td>Yourself</td>
<td>Where you live</td>
<td>Overall life</td>
<td>BMSALSS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Career Overload</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.40*</td>
<td>-2.57</td>
<td>-.31*</td>
<td>-2.40</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td>-.28*</td>
<td>-2.18</td>
<td>-.30*</td>
<td>-2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overload in School</td>
<td></td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.64</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.52</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underload</td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.82</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>-.41*</td>
<td>-2.04</td>
<td>-.54*</td>
<td>-3.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td></td>
<td>14% *</td>
<td>13% *</td>
<td>12% *</td>
<td>13% *</td>
<td>19% *</td>
<td>10% *</td>
<td>20% *</td>
<td>24% *</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes. BMSALSS = Brief Multidimensional Student Athlete Life Satisfaction Scale. R² = Combined explained variance of role strain components on life satisfaction
* Significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).