Sheffield Hallam University

Promoting and protecting coach psychological well-being and performance.

DIDYMUS, Faye, RUMBOLD, James <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1914-1036> and STAFF, Helen

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

http://shura.shu.ac.uk/26381/

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

DIDYMUS, Faye, RUMBOLD, James and STAFF, Helen (2018). Promoting and protecting coach psychological well-being and performance. In: THELWELL, Richard and DICKS, Matt, (eds.) Professional Advances in Sports Coaching Research and Practice. Routledge.

Copyright and re-use policy

Promoting and Protecting Coach Well-Being and Performance

Faye F. Didymus[1], James L. Rumbold[2], and Helen R. Staff[1]

[1] Leeds Beckett University, United Kingdom

[2] Sheffield Hallam University, United Kingdom

Submitted: Friday 15th December 2017

1   Introduction

2   Since Daniel Gould and colleagues' (2002) seminal statement that coaches are

3 performers in their own right, research using a psychological lens with coaches has developed

4 exponentially. Indeed, Gould et al.'s work is often cited as a primary reason why research

5 with coaches is important, but the rationale for conducting such work extends beyond a focus

6 on performance. Coaches are performers but, to highlight just a few of the varied roles that

7 many coaches fulfil, they are also decision makers, educators, employees, and mentors.

8 Coaches are, therefore, influential individuals whose well-being should be a priority. The

9 purpose of this chapter is to define key concepts that relate to the promotion and protection of

10 coach well-being and performance; to review literature relating to environmental, individual,

11 and interpersonal influences on well-being; and to offer directions for future research and

12 practice. In doing so, we emphasise the case for well-being as central to coach performance,

13 clarify and distinguish key terms that are relevant to research on coach well-being, and

14 highlight some limitations of extant literature that need to be addressed before forging new

15 lines of enquiry.

16   Key concepts

17   The difficulty of defining well-being has been documented extensively by general

18 (e.g., Dodge, Daily, Huyton, & Sanders, 2012), organisational (e.g., Danna & Griffin, 1999),

19 and sport psychology researchers (e.g., Norris, Didymus, & Kaiseler, 2017). There is,

20 however, consensus that well-being is a multi-dimensional construct that is linked to

21 happiness (Diener, 2009) and is important for health, productivity, and performance (Wright

22 & Cropanzano, 2000). Various conceptualisations of well-being are evident in the literature,

23 including some that adopt a hedonic tradition (e.g., Kahneman, Diener, & Schwarz, 1999),

24 some that focus on eudaimonia (e.g., Ryff, 1989), and some that incorporate both hedonic

25 and eudaimonic elements (e.g., Robertson & Flint-Taylor, 2010). The hedonic tradition

1   accentuates happiness, subjective well-being, affect (i.e., positive emotions), and satisfaction

2   with life as central to well-being, while the eudaimonic tradition focuses on human

3   development (i.e., personal growth, environmental mastery), autonomy, self-acceptance,

4   positive relationships, and purpose in life. While these different approaches to well-being

5   mean that there is no universally accepted definition of it, what is clear is that well-being is

6   central to human functioning and relates closely to how happy individuals are with

7   themselves, their lives, and their work. For the purpose of this book chapter, we adopt a

8   positive psychology (Seligman & Czikszentmihalyi, 2000) approach, which has as its general

9   sentiment the notion that well-being is more than the absence of illness and includes elements

10   of both hedonia and eudaimonia. Limited literature exists that explores coaches' well-being

11   but a lot can be learnt from the occupational and general psychology domains about the

12   environmental, individual, and interpersonal factors that influence well-being and

13   performance. The focus of this chapter now turns to a review of these factors and, in doing

14   so, uses literature from various psychological domains to extend understanding of well-being

15   among sports coaches.

16   Review of the literature

17   Environmental factors that influence coach well-being and performance

18   It is no secret that the nature and scope of coaching varies according to an individual's

19   role, and between coaches of different sex, qualifications, experience, quantity and standard

20   of athletes coached, and the sport(s) that they are involved with. As such, sports coaching

21   comprises many idiosyncratic socio-cultural interactions that occur within context-specific

22   environments (Groom, Cushion, & Nelson, 2012). Although a coach's well-being may be

23   optimised or hindered by different environmental features that are specific to their personal

24   coaching context, a series of recent studies have shed light on some of the common

25   environmental factors that are believed to be paramount for coaches' well-being. These

1   factors include stressors that are experienced in the work environment and coaches'

2   perceptions of the organisational environment in which they operate. This part of the chapter

3   explains these factors and their links to coach well-being and performance in more detail.

4   Stressors are environmental events, situations, or demands that may be encountered

5   by coaches (Fletcher & Scott, 2010). In the past decade, research has sought to indirectly

6   understand the well-being of coaches by exploring the stressors that can be encountered in

7   this role (Didymus, 2017; Thelwell, Weston, Greenlees, & Hutchings, 2008). In a recent

8   systematic review, Norris et al. (2017) evaluated twenty-four studies that identified a vast

9   range of stressors that were related to coaches' performance. Performance stressors that are

10   typically encountered by coaches relate to their coaching job tasks, how their athletes behave

11   and perform, and how they manage performance expectations of others (e.g., media, athletes'

12   parents). Particular features of coaches' job tasks that are believed to be linked to acute stress

13   include making incorrect decisions (Kubayi, Toriola, & Didymus, 2017), managing high

14   standards of coaching, and meeting training session outcomes (Thelwell et al., 2008). A

15   number of athlete-related performance demands that coaches can find stressful include

16   athletes training through injuries, not displaying good coachability, demonstrating

17   unprofessional behaviour, having a poor attitude, or lacking commitment to their training.

18   While no sport psychology literature has specifically linked these stressors to coach well-

19   being, occupational psychology researchers have highlighted that work-related stressors can

20   impede individuals' well-being and job performance (Daniels, 2011).

21   From the findings of the review by Norris and colleagues (2017), it can be concluded

22   that coaches of different sports, experience, and sex not only encounter environmental

23   demands related to performance, but they also encounter as many stressors relating to the

24   organisation in which they coach (e.g., the national governing body [NGB] for their sport or

25   the sport club to which they are employed). In line with job stress literature (e.g., Dewe,

1   O'Driscoll, & Cooper, 2010), workload (e.g., extended working hours, performing multiple

2   roles), administration (e.g., meetings with management, attending to emails), relationships

3   (e.g., poor communication from higher management, relationships with athletes and teams

4   coached), and career concerns (e.g., compensation, job security) are among some of the

5   organisational-related factors that can influence coaches' well-being. In this regard, sport

6   organisations have the potential to inhibit coach well-being by neglecting to appropriately

7   manage some of the aforementioned factors. Equally, by optimising coaches' workloads and

8   available support resources, organisations can play a fundamental role in promoting well-

9   being (e.g., happiness, a sense of belonging, job satisfaction) and performance development

10   (Bakker & Daniels, 2013).

11   A series of recent studies have demonstrated how demands relating to work

12   environments contribute to coach ill-being and subsequent performance, particularly when

13   transitioning to new coaching roles. For example, in a series of interviews with Australian

14   football league senior coaches, participants discussed how job accountability and

15   responsibilities, not knowing who to trust at work, and challenges achieving a work-life

16   balance resulted in many coaches feeling physically ill (Knights & Ruddock-Hudson, 2016).

17   Further, coaches in this study described how this experience of ill-being was typically

18   projected onto their partners, family, children, and friends. Coach well-being may also be

19   compromised through experiencing emotional exhaustion (i.e., lack of energy) from

20   competing work and life demands. Identifying early symptoms of burnout, such as emotional

21   exhaustion, is important in the long-term due to its potential for influencing a person's

22   passion for, satisfaction with, and commitment to their job role (cf. Sonnentag, Kuttler, &

23   Fritz, 2010); all of which are characteristics indicative of well-being. Indeed, researchers

24   have demonstrated how coaches' perceptions of their workload and the degree to which work

25   conflicts with their home-lives can predict emotional exhaustion over a sport season

1   (Bentzen, Lemyre, & Kenttä, 2016a). For the 299 Norwegian and Swedish high-performance

2   coaches who participated in Bentzen et al.'s (2016a) study, those who reported experiencing

3   a higher workload and work-home imbalance also reported higher levels of emotional

4   exhaustion at the beginning and end of their season. These findings highlight the importance

5   of proactively planning and overcoming work obstacles that may impair coaches' home-lives.

6   When coaches are unable to balance family and coaching commitments and have limited

7   work resources to develop (both tangible and supportive), the likelihood is that they will

8   experience poor job satisfaction or transition out of their coaching role before environmental

9   conditions become deleterious for well-being and career development (Knight, Rodgers,

10 Reade, Mrak, & Hall, 2015).

11   Coaches' perceptions of the organisational climate are also important in predicting

12 burnout symptoms and intentions to remain in one's coaching role (Kilo & Hassmén, 2016).

13 Understanding how coaches' perceptions of environmental factors may predict burnout

14 symptoms is essential since a number of affective (e.g., depressed mood), cognitive (e.g.,

15 cynicism), physical (e.g., illness), behavioural (e.g., impaired performance) and motivational

16 (e.g., disillusionment) aspects of ill-being have been credited to burnout in the workplace

17 (Schaufeli & Buunk, 2003). Research with Australian coaches has indicated that those who

18 perceived that their organisation cared about their welfare and could provide support

19 resources were less likely to experience burnout symptoms, such as a reduced sense of

20 personal accomplishment and sport devaluation (i.e., negative feelings towards the sport).

21 These burnout symptoms were also important for predicting coaches' intentions to remain in

22 their current jobs (Kilo & Hassmén, 2016). These findings suggest that sport organisations

23 have an important role in shaping cultures and environments that allow trusting and

24 supportive relationships to thrive, which can facilitate coach well-being and performance.

25 Without such commitment from stakeholders of sport organisations, coaches' may develop

1   cynicism regarding the organisational climate in which they are working (Rumbold, Fletcher,

2   & Daniels, 2018).

3   In light of the environmental demands that have been outlined in this section, it is

4   worth noting that the degree to which these factors could lead to ill-being and poor

5   performance may depend on how coaches perceive the situational properties (e.g., novelty,

6   duration, event uncertainty) of these environmental demands (Didymus, 2017). According to

7   Lazarus' (1999) Cognitive-Motivational-Relational Theory (CMRT) of stress and emotion,

8   understanding situational properties of stressors is important because a person's perceptions

9   of them determine how he or she evaluates stressors in relation to their personal goals and

10   well-being. In a study of fifteen coaches who each had experience of coaching Olympic or

11   international-level sport performers, Didymus (2017) identified seven situational properties

12   that underpinned coaches' stressful experiences. These related to the ambiguity (e.g., absence

13   of clear information), duration (e.g., lack of time to prepare for the stressor), uncertainty (e.g.,

14   unpredictable nature of the stressor), imminence (e.g., too much or too little time before the

15   event), novelty (e.g., limited experience of the stressor), temporal uncertainty (e.g., not

16   knowing when the stressor will occur), and timing (e.g., stressor coinciding with work

17   commitments) of the stressors that the coaches encountered in relation to their work and life

18   commitments. The findings of this study highlight specific situational properties of

19   environmental demands that coaches considered important in underpinning their experiences

20   of stress. In particular, the frequency and duration of demands was considered stressful, while

21   the ambiguity of stressors was often linked to coaches appraising stressors as a threat (i.e.,

22   appraisals of potential damage to well-being), which are typically key determinants of

23   diminished well-being (Dewe et al., 2010).

24   To summarise this subsection on environmental factors that influence coach well-

25   being and performance, it is clear that coaches must proactively contend with a variety of

1   work, performance, and life demands in combination if the coaching role is to be an

2   enjoyable, fulfilling, and inspiring experience. Our review of contemporary literature

3   suggests that coaches need to carefully monitor their ability to manage competing demands

4   and recognise symptoms (e.g., emotional exhaustion, reduced personal accomplishment, sport

5   devaluation) that may lead to reduced well-being and performance. Organisations must also

6   accept some responsibility for protecting and promoting coaches' well-being because they

7   have a duty of care to their employees (Dewe et al., 2010). In this regard, organisations must

8   ensure that the performance climate created by leaders provides coaches with the resources

9   and entrustability (i.e., trusting coaches to perform their role with minimal supervision or

10   micromanagement) to thrive under pressure, which in turn can support performance and

11   make the coaching role a rewarding and enjoyable one. The focus of this chapter now turns to

12   a review of individual factors that help to illuminate the multitude of factors that influence

13   coach well-being and performance.

14   Individual factors that influence coach well-being and performance

15   In addition to environmental factors (e.g., stressors, perceptions of the organisational

16   climate) that influence coach well-being and performance, individual factors, including

17   genetic make-up, personality, locus of control, pursuit of hobbies, and basic psychological

18   needs are also influential. This part of the chapter explains these factors in more detail and

19   offers insight to the links between them and coach well-being and performance. With

20   reference to genetic make-up and personality, it is generally agreed that personality is largely

21   inherited (i.e., genetic) and refers at a basic level to what makes one individual different to

22   another. It is also widely agreed that personality encompasses stable traits that predispose

23   individuals to think, feel, and behave in particular ways. These traits are often referred to as

24   'the big five,' which make up the widely used five factor model of personality (Fiske, 1949),

25   and consist of agreeableness (e.g., sensitive to the needs of others), conscientiousness (e.g.,

1   dependable and prudent), extraversion (e.g., gaining energy from interacting with others),

2   openness (e.g., a willingness to try new things), and neuroticism (e.g., emotionally unstable).

3   Genetic make-up and the big five are linked to well-being in that individuals who are

4   predisposed to be high in extraversion and agreeableness and low in neuroticism are more

5   likely to have higher well-being (Sun, Kaufman, & Smillie, in press). With the knowledge

6   that well-being incorporates positive emotions and satisfaction with life (i.e., hedonic

7   elements), it seems that there may be a 'happy personality' that could predispose coaches to

8   be psychologically well.

9   Turning to individuals' locus of control, personal control over one's life seems to play

10   an important part in well-being. Personal control has both objective and subjective

11   components, while perceived control is a function of objective control and generalised

12   perceived control (see Parkes, 1989) and has been shown to be directly related to well-being

13   (Bakker & Daniels, 2013). Locus of control is one of the most widely studied aspects of

14   personal control and researchers generally agree on a divided structure that consists of

15   internal and external loci. Coaches with an internal locus of control believe that their own

16   behaviours are the primary determinants of what happens to them whereas coaches with an

17   external locus of control believe that external factors (e.g., luck) are more important

18   determinants of what happens in their lives. Thus, locus of control refers broadly to

19   individuals' beliefs about control, which is thought to be more influential for well-being than

20   objective control (Newton & Keenan, 1990). If coaches perceive that they have control over

21   their coaching and job tasks, they are more likely to feel empowered, satisfied, and motivated

22   in their role. The findings of general and occupational psychology literature that focus on

23   control and well-being collectively point to the importance of control for health (Greenaway

24   et al., 2015), well-being (Bakker & Daniels, 2013), and performance (Courtright,

25   McCormick, Mistry, & Wang, 2017).

1   In addition to the relatively stable personality and locus of control traits that we are

2   born with, more dynamic individual factors, including pursuits of non-work interests, also

3   influence well-being. This means that, while we cannot choose our blueprints that determine

4   personality and locus of control and, therefore, our genetic tendency to have higher or lower

5   well-being, there is much that *is* under our control and can be done to enhance well-being.

6   Pursuing interests (e.g., exercise, creative and social activities) and building positive

7   relationships with individuals outside of work are some examples of things that coaches

8   might do to promote and protect their well-being. Not only do such pursuits provide

9   opportunities for rest, recovery, and positive interaction but, in doing so, they have the

10   potential to enhance happiness and satisfaction with life and, thus, well-being. Some

11   researchers (e.g., Winwood, Bakker, & Winefield, 2007) have also shown that helpful non-

12   work behaviours (e.g., engagement with hobbies) buffer the effects of work strain. This

13   highlights the dual importance of non-work interests and relationships for boosting well-

14   being and for enhancing individuals' abilities to cope with work. This is important for

15   coaches because coaching has been highlighted by many researchers (e.g., Didymus, 2017) as

16   an inherently stressful occupation, particularly when working at the higher levels of sport

17   competition. The key message here then is that coaches can protect and promote their own

18   well-being and performance by allocating time for non-work interests and by working to

19   maintain positive relationships both within and outside of their workplace.

20   The majority of research with sports coaches that has focused on well-being has used

21   self-determination theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2001) to examine the factors that meet and

22   thwart coaches' psychological needs and, in doing so, promote or diminish well-being (see,

23   for a review, Stebbings & Taylor, 2017). It is likely that SDT has been predominantly used to

24   study coaches' well-being because of the similarities between the basic psychological needs

25   that underpin SDT (i.e., autonomy, competence, and relatedness) and some of the key

1   elements of well-being (e.g., autonomy, environmental mastery, and positive relationships

2   with others). Using SDT to examine well-being is helpful for a number of reasons, not least

3   because of the aforementioned synergies between the factors that underlie motivation and

4   well-being. However, the infancy of the literature in this area and the resultant narrow focus

5   on SDT and coach well-being is also problematic. This is because it does not create a

6   comprehensive picture of the individual factors that help to promote and protect coach well-

7   being. To develop more comprehensive insight, other theoretical frameworks such as the

8   CMRT of stress and emotion (Lazarus, 1999) need to be used to shed light on the cognitive

9   and affective elements of coaches' experiences that influence well-being and performance.

10   This is important given findings of research in non-sport domains, which highlight that

11   positive cognitive and affective psychological capacities (e.g., hope, belief in one's ability,

12   optimism) can be a source of positive emotions, and that positive emotions mediate the

13   relationship between positive psychological capacities and well-being (Avey, Wernsing, &

14   Mhatre, 2011). This points to the potential importance of positive psychological capacities,

15   including what some have termed 'the light quartet' (hope, optimism, perseverance, and

16   resilience), in promoting and protecting coaches' well-being.

17   To summarise briefly the published literature that has focused on sports coaches'

18   well-being, satisfaction of competence, autonomy, and relatedness (i.e., basic psychological

19   needs) appears to promote well-being while frustration of these needs seems to diminish

20   well-being (McLean, Mallett, & Newcombe, 2012; Stebbings & Taylor, 2017). Indeed,

21   satisfaction of coaches' needs for competence and autonomy has been shown to be positively

22   associated with well-being (Stebbings, Taylor, Spray, & Ntoumanis, 2012) while self-

23   determination to coach may foster higher well-being, lower perceptions of stress, and lower

24   levels of burnout (McLean et al., 2012). In the most recent study of coaches' well-being,

25   Bentzen, Lemyre, and Kenttä (2016b) reported that well-being decreased over the course of a

1   competitive season while symptoms of burnout increased during the same period of time.

2   They also highlighted that changes in the perceived environment led to changes in

3   psychological need satisfaction, which, in turn, led to increases in autonomous motivation

4   and well-being, and decreases in burnout symptoms. Taken together, the findings of the

5   research in this area point to the importance of basic psychological need satisfaction in the

6   promotion and protection of coaches' well-being.

7   The previous subsection of this literature review focused on the environmental factors

8   that influence coaches' well-being. Given the focus in the current subsection on influential

9   individual factors, a question relating to the relative contribution of environmental and

10   individual factors in determining well-being is raised. The answer to this question is that

11   neither environmental nor individual factors are more important than the other but that the

12   interaction between the two is vital. In essence, there must be a good fit between the

13   individual and the environment that he or she works in for well-being to be maintained or

14   enhanced. Take the example of a coach who is not open to new ideas (i.e., low in openness),

15   has an external locus of control (i.e., attributes success and failure to others), and is working

16   in an NGB that has recently recruited a new performance director who is implementing a

17   series of new policies (e.g., provision of support staff, salary structures) that will directly

18   impact the coach. The working environment created by the performance director will likely

19   have a negative influence on the coach's well-being and performance. This is because a

20   coach who is less open to new ideas with an external locus of control is more likely to

21   experience uncertainty and perceive such organisational changes as a threat to their goals and

22   well-being. Put simply, there is not a good fit between the coach and the environment that she

23   is working in. Thus, it can be seen that both the environment and the individual are important

24   for well-being, as are the more specific interactions between two or more people. To explore

25   these interactions in more detail this chapter now turns to an examination of interpersonal

1   factors that influence coach well-being and performance.

2   Interpersonal factors that influence coach well-being and performance

3   Coping, emotions, and coach-athlete relationships can influence coach well-being and

4   performance and are each interpersonal in nature. With reference to coping, one widely used

5   model of interpersonal coping is the systemic transactional model (STM; Bodenmann, 1995),

6   which focuses on dyadic transactions between two people during coping episodes. Findings

7   of general psychology research that has used the STM (see, for a review, Staff, Didymus, &

8   Backhouse, 2017a) reveal that individuals in close personal relationships use dyadic coping

9   to overcome the stressors that they encounter. Dyadic coping refers to the combined coping

10 efforts of two partners when they experience a shared stressor (cf. Bodenmann, 1995). The

11 use of dyadic coping extends individuals' coping resources and, in doing so, provides

12 additional coping options to those that are available when an individual copes with stressors

13 on his or her own. When considered alongside the knowledge that effective coping can

14 promote well-being (Dewe et al., 2010), light is shed on the potential importance of dyadic

15 coping as an interpersonal factor that can promote coaches' well-being.

16   In sport, the majority of coping research (e.g., Didymus & Fletcher, 2014) has focused

17 on how athletes or coaches cope with stressors individually. Indeed, only two studies to date

18 (Nicholls & Perry, 2016; Staff, Didymus, & Backhouse, 2017b) have explicitly focused on

19 the interpersonal nature of coping among coaches. The findings of these studies suggest that a

20 positive coach-athlete relationship mediates the association between dyadic coping and

21 coaches' appraisals of stressors (Nicholls & Perry, 2016). In addition, they highlight that fit

22 between an athlete and coach, friendship and trust, and communication of a stressor can

23 facilitate dyadic coping, and that dyadic coping protects and supports the coach-athlete

24 relationship (Staff et al., 2017b). These findings suggest that both coaches and athletes have

25 roles to play in protecting, supporting, and developing each other and their relationship. This

1   suggestion is somewhat at odds with a body of literature that points to the coach as the

2   responsible individual for providing environments that facilitate athletes' well-being (e.g.,

3   Stenling & Tafvelin, 2014). Instead, it seems plausible to suggest that athletes and coaches

4   have joint responsibility for coping with stressors, developing their relationship, and

5   promoting their own and each other's well-being.

6   Given that dyadic coping occurs between two people who are in some way connected

7   with each other, relationships emerge as an important consideration when discussing the

8   interpersonal factors that influence well-being. In the context of coaches and athletes, a

9   relationship can be conceptualised as mutual and causal interdependence between the coach's

10 and athlete's feelings, thoughts, and behaviours (Lafrenière, Jowett, Vallerand, &

11 Carbonneau, 2011). Coaches have identified that positive relationships with athletes, family,

12 friends, athletes' parents, peers, and supervisors can help them to cope with stressors and

13 strain (Hayward, Knight, & Mellalieu, 2017). Further, researchers have illuminated elements

14 of the coach-athlete relationship that can influence coach well-being, including relatedness

15 (Allen & Shaw, 2009) and relationship quality (Lafrenière et al., 2011).

16   When considering the role of emotion in promoting and protecting coaches' well-

17 being, interpersonal emotion regulation is a particularly relevant concept. Over the past few

18 decades, a substantial body of evidence has shown that emotions not only influence thoughts

19 and behaviours but that they also influence the emotions of others with whom we interact

20 (e.g., Barsade, 2002). This notion of emotion contagion and, importantly, the regulation of

21 emotions between two or more people can prevent burnout in leaders, contribute to enhanced

22 job satisfaction, and positively influence well-being (e.g., Skakon, Nielsen, Borg, & Guzman,

23 2010). In sport, it has been highlighted that emotions are an important aspect of coach-athlete

24 interactions (Davis & Davis, 2016). Indeed, researchers have suggested that interpersonal

25 emotion regulation can develop athletes' and coaches' cognition (e.g., when managing

1   emotions) and behaviour (e.g., self-control), which in turn can promote resilience, stronger

2   relationships, and more optimal psychological functioning (Wagstaff, Fletcher, & Hanton,

3   2012). Other researchers have suggested that interpersonal emotion regulation between

4   athletes and coaches can improve athletes' own emotion regulation (Davis & Davis, 2016),

5   which can also improve coaches' experiences in sport (Tamminen, Gaudreau, McEwan, &

6   Crocker, 2016). Research has also explored how sociocultural norms, leadership styles,

7   relationship quality, and job roles can shape coaches' personal and interpersonal emotion

8   regulation (e.g., Hings, Wagstaff, Anderson, Gilmore, & Thelwell, 2018). These findings

9   point to the importance of athletes' and coaches' emotion regulation for fostering coaches'

10   well-being.

11   Despite these aforementioned positive implications of interpersonal emotion

12   regulation, the potentially negative outcomes of emotion contagion and interpersonal emotion

13   regulation should also be considered. This is because a coach's emotions can be transferred to

14   athletes and can influence how athletes behave (Tamminen et al., 2016). Naturally, if the

15   emotions that are transferred from coach to athlete are negatively toned, there is potential for

16   this transference to be unhelpful for athletes' performance due to the links between

17   negatively toned emotions and reduced performance (Fletcher & Scott, 2010). While some

18   evidence for coach to athlete emotion contagion does exist, that which supports the transfer

19   of emotions from athlete to coach is weak (Stebbings, Taylor, & Spray, 2016). This

20   tentatively suggests a unidirectional emotion contagion relationship from coach to athlete and

21   highlights the important role of the coach and his or her psychological state in athletes'

22   development and, potentially, their well-being and performance.

23   Given the importance of a coach's interpersonal relationships for coping and

24   interpersonal emotion regulation, it is relevant to consider social exchange models that help

25   to explain the impact of relationships on well-being (e.g., Leader-Member Exchange Theory

1   [LMX]; Graen & Uhlbein, 1995). The basic premise of LMX is that leaders (e.g., coaches)

2   develop different forms of exchange relationships with their subordinates (e.g., athletes) that

3   can influence well-being and performance. Indeed, exchange relationships between coaches,

4   athletes, and performance directors have been shown to influence coaches' job satisfaction,

5   confidence, and performance (e.g., Van Breukelen, Van der Leeden, Wesselius, & Hoes,

6   2012). In a work context, employees who have helpful exchange relationships report benefits

7   (e.g., open communication) that employees in unhelpful exchange relationships do not (Graen

8   & Uhlbien, 1995). In sport, helpful exchange relationships between coaches and athletes can

9   result in athletes performing better in an attempt to please and support their coach (Chen,

10   2010). Conversely, poor exchange relationships can increase athletes' perceptions of

11   unfairness and preferential treatment of others (Van Breukelen et al., 2012). This highlights a

12   need for coaches to identify ways that they can prevent differential treatment between

13   athletes and promote a supportive team atmosphere that fosters athlete and coach well-being.

14   In addition to coach-athlete relationships, coach-management relationships are also

15   important considerations because of their potential to influence coach well-being and

16   performance. For example, managers who empower coaches to make decisions based on their

17   expert judgment and to act without seeking permission can have a positive influence on

18   coaches' autonomy (Kavussanu & Stanger, 2017). Furthermore, the attitudes of managers and

19   the methods that they use with coaches can influence coaches' job satisfaction (Jordan,

20   Turner, Fink, & Pastore, 2007). This highlights the importance of coaches striving to develop

21   high-quality relationships with their leaders (e.g., managers, performance directors) and

22   subordinates (e.g., athletes) to reap the benefits of helpful exchange relationships for their

23   own and others' well-being. Taken together, these findings support theoretical frameworks

24   (e.g., Bodenmann, 1995; Graen & Uhlbien, 1995) that bring to the fore the notion that a

25   coach's well-being is shaped by the interpersonal world in which they live.

1   Implications for future research

2   The preceding literature review has highlighted a number of under explored areas that

3   offer fertile ground for future research. For example, while literature on coaches' experiences

4   of stress does exist, there is currently no published work that attempts to explore the impact

5   of these experiences on coaches' well-being and performance. Researchers would do well to

6   make progress in this area using, for example, the CMRT of stress and emotion (Lazarus,

7   1999) to better understand the environmental (i.e., stressors), individual (i.e., coping

8   strategies), and interpersonal (e.g., emotion regulation) factors that promote and protect

9   coaches' well-being. It would be particularly useful to explore how these factors influence

10   coach well-being and performance over time by using longitudinal research methods.

11   Perceptions of organisational climate were highlighted in the literature review as important

12   for coaches' well-being and, therefore, increased attention should be directed toward *how*

13   such perceptions influence well-being and performance.

14   Personality, locus of control, pursuits of hobbies, and basic psychological need

15   satisfaction were the individual factors that this literature review focused on as important

16   influencers of well-being. With the exception of basic psychological need satisfaction where

17   a series of studies have quantitatively explored links between motivation and well-being,

18   little to no literature exists that examines with coaches the other individual factors that we

19   have highlighted as important for well-being. This means that there are numerous

20   opportunities for future research that could, for example, focus on the five factor model of

21   personality in relation to well-being among coaches, or on positive psychological capacities

22   (e.g., the light quartet) that may promote and protect well-being.

23   Implications for applied practice

24   In addition to forging new lines of research enquiry, the well-being of coaches must

25   be brought to centre stage of NGB strategic plans and coach education programmes if we are

1   to work towards a more engaged, committed, and high performing coaching workforce. To

2   achieve a closer focus on coaches' well-being, NGBs should develop and implement plans to

3   enhance accountability, trust, and work-life balance among coaches. In addition, coaches

4   need to be supported during their development activities to understand how work-life balance

5   can be achieved, particularly when they are required to work long hours and spend long

6   periods of time away from friends and loved ones. Mentors are likely to play an important

7   role in supporting coaches, and NGBs can assist by formalising coach mentoring for coaches

8   who are working at all levels of competition. Sport organisations should also assess the

9   cultures and environments that they create with a view to understanding whether these are

10   conducive to the promotion and protection of trusting and supportive relationships and, thus,

11   coach well-being and performance. This will require critical interrogation of current

12   organisational practices but we encourage organisations and NGBs to embrace this challenge

13   and foster open, supportive, and continuous learning environments that will benefit the well-

14   being and performance development of coaches and, in turn, athletes.

15   Given that some influencers of well-being are genetic (e.g., personality), it may be

16   that some coaches are predisposed to have higher well-being than others. With the knowledge

17   that beliefs about control are important for well-being, there may be opportunities for

18   practitioners to work with coaches to enhance perceptions of control and, in doing so,

19   contribute to coach well-being. Coaches themselves should ensure that they allocate time for

20   non-work interests (e.g., hobbies) and for maintaining positive relationships, both of which

21   are essential for detaching psychologically from work (albeit temporarily) and for building

22   and maintaining well-being. Coaches should also aim to treat all athletes equally, as should

23   organisations treat all coaches equally, and, in doing so, promote supportive atmospheres that

24   foster both athlete and coach well-being. Being aware of their own emotions and the potential

1   for these to be transferred to athletes will also be essential for coaches to optimise their own

2   well-being and that of the athletes with whom they work.

1   References

2   Allen, J. B., & Shaw, S. (2009). Women coaches' perceptions of their sport organizations'

3   social environment: Supporting coaches' psychological needs? *The Sport*

4   *Psychologist, 23*, 346–366. doi:10.1123/tsp.23.3.346

5   Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T. S., & Mhatre, K. H. (2011). A longitudinal analysis of positive

6   psychological constructs and emotions on stress, anxiety, and well-being. *Journal of*

7   *Leadership and Organizational Studies, 18*, 216–228.

8   doi:10.1177/1548051810397368

9   Bakker, A. B., & Daniels, K. (2013). *A day in the life of a happy worker*. Hove, United

10   Kingdom: Psychology Press.

11   Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group

12   behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 47*, 644–675. doi:10.2307/3094912

13   Bentzen, M., Lemyre, P., & Kenttä, G. (2016a). Development of exhaustion for high

14   performance coaches in association with workload and motivation: A person-centered

15   approach. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *22*, 10–19.

16   doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.06.004

17   Bentzen, M., Lemyre, P., & Kenttä, G. (2016b). Changes in motivation and burnout indices

18   in high-performance coaches over the course of a competitive season. *Journal of*

19   *Applied Sport Psychology, 28*, 28–48. doi:10.1080/10413200.2015.1053160.

20   Bodenmann, G. (1995). A systemic-transactional conceptualization of stress and coping in

21   couples. *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 54*, 34–49. Retrieved from

22   www.hogrefe.ch/index.php/swiss-journal-of-psychology.html/

23   Chen, C. (2010). Leadership and teamwork paradigms: Two models for baseball coaches.

24   *Social Behavior and Personality, 38*, 1367–1376. doi:10.2224/sbp.2010.38.10.1367

25   Courtright, S. H., McCormick, B. W., Mistry, S., & Wang, J. (2017). Quality charters or

quality members? A control theory perspective on team charters and team

performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 102*, 1462–1470.

doi:10.1037/apl0000229

Daniels, K. (2011). Stress and well-being are still issues and something still needs to be done:

Or why agency and interpretation are important for policy and practice. In G. P.

Hodgkinson & J. K. Ford (Eds.), *International review of industrial and*

organizational psychology (Vol. 25, pp. 1–45). New York City, NY: Wiley

Danna, K., & Griffin, R. W. (1999). Health and well-being in the workplace: A review and

synthesis of the literature. *Journal of Management, 25*, 357–384.

doi:10.1177/014920639902500305

Davis, P. A., & Davis, L. (2016). Emotions and emotion regulation in coaching. In P. A.

Davis (Ed.), *The psychology of effective coaching and management* (pp. 285–306).

New York City, NY: Nova Science.

Dewe, P. J., O'Driscoll, M. P., & Cooper, C. L. (2010). *Coping with work stress: A review*

and critique. Chichester, United Kingdom: Wiley-Blackwell.

Didymus, F. F. (2017). Olympic and international level sports coaches' experiences of

stressors, appraisals, and coping. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise, and*

Health, 9, 214–232. doi:10.1080/2159676x.2016.1261364

Didymus, F. F., & Fletcher, D. (2014). Swimmers' experiences of organizational stress:

Exploring the role of cognitive appraisal and coping strategies. *Journal of Clinical*

Sport Psychology, 8, 159–183. doi:10.1123/jcsp.2014-0020

Diener, E. (2009). Subjective well-being. In E. Diener (Ed.), *The science of well-being* (pp.

11-58). New York City, NY: Springer.

Dodge, R., Daly, A. P., Huyton, J., & Sanders, L. D. (2012). The challenge of defining

wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing, 2*, 222–235. doi:10.5502/ijw.v2i3.4

Fiske, D. W. (1949). Consistency of the factorial structures of personality ratings from

   different sources. *Abnormal Social Psychology, 44*, 329–44. doi:10.1037/h0057198

Fletcher, D., & Scott, M. (2010). Psychological stress in sports coaches: A review of

   concepts, research, and practice. *Journal of Sports Science, 28*, 127–137.

   doi:10.1080/02640410903406208

Gould, D., Guinan, D., Greenleaf, C., & Chung, Y. (2002). A survey of U.S. Olympic

   coaches: Variables perceived to have influenced athlete performances and coach

   effectiveness. *The Sport Psychologist, 16*, 229–250. doi:10.1123/tsp.16.3.229

Graen, G. B., & Uhlbien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership:

   Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years.

   Applying a multi-level multi-domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*, 219–247.

   doi:10.1016/1048-9843(95)90036-5

Greenaway, K. H., Haslam, S. A., Cruwys, T., Branscombe, N. R., Ysseldyk, R., & Heldreth,

   C. (2015). From "we" to "me": Group identification enhances perceived personal

   control with consequences for health and well-being. *Interpersonal Relations and

   Group Processes, 109*, 53–74. doi:10.1037/pspi0000019

Groom, R., Cushion, C. J., & Nelson, L. J. (2012). Analysing coach-athlete 'talk in

   interaction' within the delivery of video-based performance feedback in elite youth

   soccer. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *4*, 439–458.

   doi:10.1080/2159676X.2012.693525

Hayward, F. P. I., Knight, C. J., & Mellalieu, S. D. (2017). A longitudinal examination of

   stressors, appraisals, and coping in youth swimming. *Psychology of Sport and

   Exercise, 29*, 56–68. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.12.002

Hings, R. F., Wagstaff, C. R., Anderson, V., Gilmore, S., & Thelwell, R. C. (2018).

   Professional challenges in elite sports medicine and science: Composite vignettes of

practitioner emotional labor. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 35*, 66–73.

doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.11.007

Jordan, J. S., Turner, B. A., Fink, J. S., & Pastore, D. L. (2007). Organizational justice as a

predictor of job satisfaction: An examination of head basketball coaches. *Journal for

the Study of Sport and Athletes in Education, 1*, 321–344.

doi:10.1179/ssa.2007.1.3.321

Kahneman, D., Diener, E., & Schwarz, N. (Eds.) (1999). *Well-being: Foundations of hedonic

psychology*. New York City, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Kavussanu, M., & Stanger, N. (2017). Prosocial and antisocial behaviours in sport

organisations. In C. Wagstaff (Ed.), *The organizational psychology of sport: Key

issues and practical applications* (pp. 176–192). Oxon, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Kilo, R. A., & Hassmén, P. (2016). Burnout and turnover intentions in Australian coaches as

related to organizational support and perceived control. *International Journal of Sport

Science and Coaching, 11*, 151–161. doi:10.1177/1747954116636710

Knight, C. J., Rodgers, W. M., Reade, I. L., Mrak, J. M., & Hall, C. R. (2015). Coach

transitions: Influence of interpersonal and work environmental factors. *Sport,

Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, *4*, 170–187. doi:10.1037/spy0000036

Knights, S., & Ruddock-Hudson, M. (2016). Experiences of occupational stress and social

support in Australian football league senior coaches. *International Journal of Sports

Science and Coaching*, *11*, 162–171. doi:10.1177/1747954116636711

Kubayi, A., Toriola, A., & Didymus, F. F. (2017). Development and initial validation of an

instrument to assess stressors among South African sports coaches. *Journal of Sports

Sciences*, Advance online publication. doi:10.1080/02640414.2017.1385264

Lafrenière, M. A. K., Jowett, S., Vallerand, R. J., & Carbonneau, N. (2011). Passion for

coaching and the quality of the coach–athlete relationship: The mediating role of

1   coaching behaviors. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *12*, 144–152.

2   doi:10.1123/jsep.30.5.541

3   Lazarus, R. S. (1999). *Stress and emotion: A new synthesis.* New York City, NY: Springer.

4   Newton, T. J., & Keenan, A. (1990). The moderating effect of the type A behaviour pattern

5   and locus of control upon the relationship between change in job demands and

6   change in psychological strain. *Human Relations, 43*, 1229–1255.

7   doi:10.1177/001872679004301204

8   Nicholls, A. R., & Perry, J. L. (2016). Perceptions of coach-athlete relationship are more

9   important to coaches than athletes in predicting dyadic coping and stress appraisals:

10   An actor-partner independence mediation model. *Frontiers in Psychology, 29*, 447.

11   doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00447

12   Norris, L., Didymus, F. F., & Kaiseler, M. H. (2017). Stressors, coping, and well-being

13   among sports coaches: A systematic review. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 33*,

14   93–112. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.08.005

15   Parkes, K. R. (1989). Personal control in an occupational context. In A. Steptoe & A. Appels

16   (Eds.), *Stress, personal control and health* (pp. 21–47). Chichester, United Kingdom:

17   Wiley.

18   Robertson, I. T., & Flint-Taylor, J. (2010). Well-being in health care organizations: Key

19   issues. *British Journal of Healthcare Management, 16,* 19–23.

20   doi:10.12968/bjhc.2010.16.1.45895

21   Rumbold, J. L., Fletcher, D., & Daniels, K. (2018). Using a mixed method audit to inform

22   organizational stress management interventions in sport. *Psychology of Sport and*

23   *Exercise*, *35*, 27–38. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.10.010

24   Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research

25   on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52*, 141–166.

doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141

Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of

    psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 1069–

    1081. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069

Schaufeli, W. B., & Buunk, B. P. (2003). Burnout: An overview of 25 years of research and

    theorizing. In M. J. Schbracq, J. A. M. Winnubst, & C. L. Cooper (Eds.), *The*

    handbook of work and health psychology (2nd ed.) (pp. 383–425). New York City,

    NY: Wiley.

Seligman, M. E. P., & Czikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction.

    American Psychologist, 55, 5–14. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5

Skakon, J., Nielsen, K., Borg, V., & Guzman, J. (2010). Are leaders' well-being, behaviors

    and style associated with the affective well-being of their employees? A systematic

    review of three decades of research. *Work and Stress, 24,* 107–139.

    doi:10.1080/0267373.2010.495262

Sonnentag, S., Kuttler, I., & Fritz, C. (2010). Job stressors, emotional exhaustion, and need

    for recovery: A multi-source study on the benefits of psychological detachment.

    Journal of Vocational Behavior, *76*, 355–365: doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2009.06.005

Staff, H. R., Didymus, F. F., & Backhouse, S. H. (2017a). The antecedents and outcomes of

    dyadic coping in close personal relationships: A systematic review and narrative

    synthesis. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping, 30*, 498–520.

    doi:10.1080/10615806.2017.1329931

Staff, H. R., Didymus, F. F., & Backhouse, S. H. (2017b). Coping rarely takes place in a

    social vacuum: Exploring antecedents and outcomes of dyadic coping in coach-athlete

    relationships. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 30*, 91–100.

    doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.02.009

Stebbings, J., & Taylor, I. M. (2017). Definitions and correlates of coach psychological well-and ill-being. In R. Thelwell, C. Harwood, & I. Greenlees (Eds.), *The psychology of sports coaching: Research and practice* (pp. 170–185). Abingdon, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Stebbings, J., Taylor, I. M., & Spray, C. M. (2016). Interpersonal Mechanisms Explaining the Transfer of Well-and Ill-Being in Coach-Athlete Dyads. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *38*, 292–304. doi:10.1123/jsep.2015-0172

Stebbings, J., Taylor, I. M., Spray, C. M., & Ntoumanis, N. (2012). Antecedents of perceived coach interpersonal behaviors: The coaching environment and coach psychological well- and ill-being. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 34*, 481–502. doi:10.1123/jsep.33.2.255

Stenling, A., & Tafvelin, S. (2014). Transformational leadership and well-being in sports: The mediating role of need satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 26*, 182–196. doi:10.1080/10413200.2013.819392

Sun, J., Kaufman, S. B., & Smillie, L. D. (in press). Unique associations between big five personality aspects and multiple dimensions of well-being. *Journal of Personality*. Advance online publication. doi:10.1111/jopy.12301

Tamminen, K. A., Gaudreau, P., McEwan, C. E., & Crocker, P. R. E. (2016). Interpersonal emotion regulation among adolescent athletes: A bayesian multilevel model predicting sport enjoyment and commitment. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 38*, 541–555. doi:10.1123/jsep.2015-0189

Tamminen, K. A., Palmateer, T. M., Denton, M., Sabiston, C., Crocker, P. R. E., Eys, M., & Smith, B. (2016). Exploring emotions as social phenomenon among Canadian varsity athletes. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 27*, 28–38. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.07.010

1   Thelwell, R. C., Weston, N. J. V., Greenlees, I. A., & Hutchings, N. V. (2008). Stressors in

2   elite sport: A coach perspective. *Journal of Sport Sciences, 26*, 905–918.

3   doi:10.1080/02640470807885933

4   Van Breukelen, W., Van Der Leeden, R., Wesselius, W., & Hoes, M. (2012). Differential

5   treatment within sports teams, leader-member (coach-player) exchange quality, team

6   atmosphere, and team performance. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 33*, 43–63.

7   doi:10.1002/job.735

8   Wagstaff, C. R. D., Fletcher, D., & Hanton, S. (2012). Exploring emotion abilities and

9   regulation strategies in sport organisations. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance*

10   *Psychology, 1*, 268–282. doi:10.1037/a0028814

11   Winwood, P. C., Bakker, A. B., & Winefield, A. H. (2007). An investigation of the role of

12   non-work-time behavior in buffering the effects of work strain. *Journal of*

13   *Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 49*, 862–871.

14   doi:10.1097/JOM.0b013e318124a8dc

15   Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (2000). Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as

16   predictors of job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 94–

17   94. doi:10.1037//1076-8998.5.1.84