Promoting and protecting coach psychological well-being and performance.

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

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

Introduction

Since Daniel Gould and colleagues' (2002) seminal statement that coaches are performers in their own right, research using a psychological lens with coaches has developed exponentially. Indeed, Gould et al.'s work is often cited as a primary reason why research with coaches is important, but the rationale for conducting such work extends beyond a focus on performance. Coaches are performers but, to highlight just a few of the varied roles that many coaches fulfil, they are also decision makers, educators, employees, and mentors. Coaches are, therefore, influential individuals whose well-being should be a priority. The purpose of this chapter is to define key concepts that relate to the promotion and protection of coach well-being and performance; to review literature relating to environmental, individual, and interpersonal influences on well-being; and to offer directions for future research and practice. In doing so, we emphasise the case for well-being as central to coach performance, clarify and distinguish key terms that are relevant to research on coach well-being, and highlight some limitations of extant literature that need to be addressed before forging new lines of enquiry.

Key concepts

The difficulty of defining well-being has been documented extensively by general (e.g., Dodge, Daily, Huyton, & Sanders, 2012), organisational (e.g., Danna & Griffin, 1999), and sport psychology researchers (e.g., Norris, Didymus, & Kaiseler, 2017). There is, however, consensus that well-being is a multi-dimensional construct that is linked to happiness (Diener, 2009) and is important for health, productivity, and performance (Wright & Cropanzano, 2000). Various conceptualisations of well-being are evident in the literature, including some that adopt a hedonic tradition (e.g., Kahneman, Diener, & Schwarz, 1999), some that focus on eudaimonia (e.g., Ryff, 1989), and some that incorporate both hedonic and eudaimonic elements (e.g., Robertson & Flint-Taylor, 2010). The hedonic tradition

accentuates happiness, subjective well-being, affect (i.e., positive emotions), and satisfaction with life as central to well-being, while the eudaimonic tradition focuses on human development (i.e., personal growth, environmental mastery), autonomy, self-acceptance, positive relationships, and purpose in life. While these different approaches to well-being mean that there is no universally accepted definition of it, what is clear is that well-being is central to human functioning and relates closely to how happy individuals are with themselves, their lives, and their work. For the purpose of this book chapter, we adopt a positive psychology (Seligman & Czikszentmihalyi, 2000) approach, which has as its general sentiment the notion that well-being is more than the absence of illness and includes elements of both hedonia and eudaimonia. Limited literature exists that explores coaches' well-being but a lot can be learnt from the occupational and general psychology domains about the environmental, individual, and interpersonal factors that influence well-being and performance. The focus of this chapter now turns to a review of these factors and, in doing so, uses literature from various psychological domains to extend understanding of well-being among sports coaches.

Review of the literature

Environmental factors that influence coach well-being and performance

It is no secret that the nature and scope of coaching varies according to an individual's role, and between coaches of different sex, qualifications, experience, quantity and standard of athletes coached, and the sport(s) that they are involved with. As such, sports coaching comprises many idiosyncratic socio-cultural interactions that occur within context-specific environments (Groom, Cushion, & Nelson, 2012). Although a coach's well-being may be optimised or hindered by different environmental features that are specific to their personal coaching context, a series of recent studies have shed light on some of the common environmental factors that are believed to be paramount for coaches' well-being. These

factors include stressors that are experienced in the work environment and coaches' perceptions of the organisational environment in which they operate. This part of the chapter explains these factors and their links to coach well-being and performance in more detail.

Stressors are environmental events, situations, or demands that may be encountered by coaches (Fletcher & Scott, 2010). In the past decade, research has sought to indirectly understand the well-being of coaches by exploring the stressors that can be encountered in this role (Didymus, 2017; Thelwell, Weston, Greenlees, & Hutchings, 2008). In a recent systematic review, Norris et al. (2017) evaluated twenty-four studies that identified a vast range of stressors that were related to coaches' performance. Performance stressors that are typically encountered by coaches relate to their coaching job tasks, how their athletes behave and perform, and how they manage performance expectations of others (e.g., media, athletes' parents). Particular features of coaches' job tasks that are believed to be linked to acute stress include making incorrect decisions (Kubayi, Toriola, & Didymus, 2017), managing high standards of coaching, and meeting training session outcomes (Thelwell et al., 2008). A number of athlete-related performance demands that coaches can find stressful include athletes training through injuries, not displaying good coachability, demonstrating unprofessional behaviour, having a poor attitude, or lacking commitment to their training. While no sport psychology literature has specifically linked these stressors to coach well-being, occupational psychology researchers have highlighted that work-related stressors can impede individuals' well-being and job performance (Daniels, 2011).

From the findings of the review by Norris and colleagues (2017), it can be concluded that coaches of different sports, experience, and sex not only encounter environmental demands related to performance, but they also encounter as many stressors relating to the organisation in which they coach (e.g., the national governing body [NGB] for their sport or the sport club to which they are employed). In line with job stress literature (e.g., Dewe,

O'Driscoll, & Cooper, 2010), workload (e.g., extended working hours, performing multiple roles), administration (e.g., meetings with management, attending to emails), relationships (e.g., poor communication from higher management, relationships with athletes and teams coached), and career concerns (e.g., compensation, job security) are among some of the organisational-related factors that can influence coaches' well-being. In this regard, sport organisations have the potential to inhibit coach well-being by neglecting to appropriately manage some of the aforementioned factors. Equally, by optimising coaches' workloads and available support resources, organisations can play a fundamental role in promoting well-being (e.g., happiness, a sense of belonging, job satisfaction) and performance development (Bakker & Daniels, 2013).

A series of recent studies have demonstrated how demands relating to work environments contribute to coach ill-being and subsequent performance, particularly when transitioning to new coaching roles. For example, in a series of interviews with Australian football league senior coaches, participants discussed how job accountability and responsibilities, not knowing who to trust at work, and challenges achieving a work-life balance resulted in many coaches feeling physically ill (Knights & Ruddock-Hudson, 2016). Further, coaches in this study described how this experience of ill-being was typically projected onto their partners, family, children, and friends. Coach well-being may also be compromised through experiencing emotional exhaustion (i.e., lack of energy) from competing work and life demands. Identifying early symptoms of burnout, such as emotional exhaustion, is important in the long-term due to its potential for influencing a person's passion for, satisfaction with, and commitment to their job role (cf. Sonnentag, Kuttler, & Fritz, 2010); all of which are characteristics indicative of well-being. Indeed, researchers have demonstrated how coaches' perceptions of their workload and the degree to which work conflicts with their home-lives can predict emotional exhaustion over a sport season

(Bentzen, Lemyre, & Kenttä, 2016a). For the 299 Norwegian and Swedish high-performance coaches who participated in Bentzen et al.'s (2016a) study, those who reported experiencing a higher workload and work-home imbalance also reported higher levels of emotional exhaustion at the beginning and end of their season. These findings highlight the importance of proactively planning and overcoming work obstacles that may impair coaches' home-lives. When coaches are unable to balance family and coaching commitments and have limited work resources to develop (both tangible and supportive), the likelihood is that they will experience poor job satisfaction or transition out of their coaching role before environmental conditions become deleterious for well-being and career development (Knight, Rodgers, Reade, Mrak, & Hall, 2015).

Coaches' perceptions of the organisational climate are also important in predicting burnout symptoms and intentions to remain in one's coaching role (Kilo & Hassmén, 2016). Understanding how coaches' perceptions of environmental factors may predict burnout symptoms is essential since a number of affective (e.g., depressed mood), cognitive (e.g., cynicism), physical (e.g., illness), behavioural (e.g., impaired performance) and motivational (e.g., disillusionment) aspects of ill-being have been credited to burnout in the workplace (Schaufeli & Buunk, 2003). Research with Australian coaches has indicated that those who perceived that their organisation cared about their welfare and could provide support resources were less likely to experience burnout symptoms, such as a reduced sense of personal accomplishment and sport devaluation (i.e., negative feelings towards the sport). These burnout symptoms were also important for predicting coaches' intentions to remain in their current jobs (Kilo & Hassmén, 2016). These findings suggest that sport organisations have an important role in shaping cultures and environments that allow trusting and supportive relationships to thrive, which can facilitate coach well-being and performance. Without such commitment from stakeholders of sport organisations, coaches' may develop

cynicism regarding the organisational climate in which they are working (Rumbold, Fletcher, & Daniels, 2018).

In light of the environmental demands that have been outlined in this section, it is worth noting that the degree to which these factors could lead to ill-being and poor performance may depend on how coaches perceive the situational properties (e.g., novelty, duration, event uncertainty) of these environmental demands (Didymus, 2017). According to Lazarus' (1999) Cognitive-Motivational-Relational Theory (CMRT) of stress and emotion, understanding situational properties of stressors is important because a person's perceptions of them determine how he or she evaluates stressors in relation to their personal goals and well-being. In a study of fifteen coaches who each had experience of coaching Olympic or international-level sport performers, Didymus (2017) identified seven situational properties that underpinned coaches' stressful experiences. These related to the ambiguity (e.g., absence of clear information), duration (e.g., lack of time to prepare for the stressor), uncertainty (e.g., unpredictable nature of the stressor), imminence (e.g., too much or too little time before the event), novelty (e.g., limited experience of the stressor), temporal uncertainty (e.g., not knowing when the stressor will occur), and timing (e.g., stressor coinciding with work commitments) of the stressors that the coaches encountered in relation to their work and life commitments. The findings of this study highlight specific situational properties of environmental demands that coaches considered important in underpinning their experiences of stress. In particular, the frequency and duration of demands was considered stressful, while the ambiguity of stressors was often linked to coaches appraising stressors as a threat (i.e., appraisals of potential damage to well-being), which are typically key determinants of diminished well-being (Dewe et al., 2010).

To summarise this subsection on environmental factors that influence coach well-being and performance, it is clear that coaches must proactively contend with a variety of

work, performance, and life demands in combination if the coaching role is to be an enjoyable, fulfilling, and inspiring experience. Our review of contemporary literature suggests that coaches need to carefully monitor their ability to manage competing demands and recognise symptoms (e.g., emotional exhaustion, reduced personal accomplishment, sport devaluation) that may lead to reduced well-being and performance. Organisations must also accept some responsibility for protecting and promoting coaches' well-being because they have a duty of care to their employees (Dewe et al., 2010). In this regard, organisations must ensure that the performance climate created by leaders provides coaches with the resources and entrustability (i.e., trusting coaches to perform their role with minimal supervision or micromanagement) to thrive under pressure, which in turn can support performance and make the coaching role a rewarding and enjoyable one. The focus of this chapter now turns to a review of individual factors that help to illuminate the multitude of factors that influence coach well-being and performance.

Individual factors that influence coach well-being and performance

In addition to environmental factors (e.g., stressors, perceptions of the organisational climate) that influence coach well-being and performance, individual factors, including genetic make-up, personality, locus of control, pursuit of hobbies, and basic psychological needs are also influential. This part of the chapter explains these factors in more detail and offers insight to the links between them and coach well-being and performance. With reference to genetic make-up and personality, it is generally agreed that personality is largely inherited (i.e., genetic) and refers at a basic level to what makes one individual different to another. It is also widely agreed that personality encompasses stable traits that predispose individuals to think, feel, and behave in particular ways. These traits are often referred to as 'the big five,' which make up the widely used five factor model of personality (Fiske, 1949), and consist of agreeableness (e.g., sensitive to the needs of others), conscientiousness (e.g.,

dependable and prudent), extraversion (e.g., gaining energy from interacting with others), openness (e.g., a willingness to try new things), and neuroticism (e.g., emotionally unstable). Genetic make-up and the big five are linked to well-being in that individuals who are predisposed to be high in extraversion and agreeableness and low in neuroticism are more likely to have higher well-being (Sun, Kaufman, & Smillie, in press). With the knowledge that well-being incorporates positive emotions and satisfaction with life (i.e., hedonic elements), it seems that there may be a 'happy personality' that could predispose coaches to be psychologically well.

Turning to individuals' locus of control, personal control over one's life seems to play an important part in well-being. Personal control has both objective and subjective components, while perceived control is a function of objective control and generalised perceived control (see Parkes, 1989) and has been shown to be directly related to well-being (Bakker & Daniels, 2013). Locus of control is one of the most widely studied aspects of personal control and researchers generally agree on a divided structure that consists of internal and external loci. Coaches with an internal locus of control believe that their own behaviours are the primary determinants of what happens to them whereas coaches with an external locus of control believe that external factors (e.g., luck) are more important determinants of what happens in their lives. Thus, locus of control refers broadly to individuals' beliefs about control, which is thought to be more influential for well-being than objective control (Newton & Keenan, 1990). If coaches perceive that they have control over their coaching and job tasks, they are more likely to feel empowered, satisfied, and motivated in their role. The findings of general and occupational psychology literature that focus on control and well-being collectively point to the importance of control for health (Greenaway et al., 2015), well-being (Bakker & Daniels, 2013), and performance (Courtright, McCormick, Mistry, & Wang, 2017).

In addition to the relatively stable personality and locus of control traits that we are born with, more dynamic individual factors, including pursuits of non-work interests, also influence well-being. This means that, while we cannot choose our blueprints that determine personality and locus of control and, therefore, our genetic tendency to have higher or lower well-being, there is much that *is* under our control and can be done to enhance well-being. Pursuing interests (e.g., exercise, creative and social activities) and building positive relationships with individuals outside of work are some examples of things that coaches might do to promote and protect their well-being. Not only do such pursuits provide opportunities for rest, recovery, and positive interaction but, in doing so, they have the potential to enhance happiness and satisfaction with life and, thus, well-being. Some researchers (e.g., Winwood, Bakker, & Winefield, 2007) have also shown that helpful non-work behaviours (e.g., engagement with hobbies) buffer the effects of work strain. This highlights the dual importance of non-work interests and relationships for boosting well-being and for enhancing individuals' abilities to cope with work. This is important for coaches because coaching has been highlighted by many researchers (e.g., Didymus, 2017) as an inherently stressful occupation, particularly when working at the higher levels of sport competition. The key message here then is that coaches can protect and promote their own well-being and performance by allocating time for non-work interests and by working to maintain positive relationships both within and outside of their workplace.

The majority of research with sports coaches that has focused on well-being has used self-determination theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2001) to examine the factors that meet and thwart coaches' psychological needs and, in doing so, promote or diminish well-being (see, for a review, Stebbings & Taylor, 2017). It is likely that SDT has been predominantly used to study coaches' well-being because of the similarities between the basic psychological needs that underpin SDT (i.e., autonomy, competence, and relatedness) and some of the key

elements of well-being (e.g., autonomy, environmental mastery, and positive relationships with others). Using SDT to examine well-being is helpful for a number of reasons, not least because of the aforementioned synergies between the factors that underlie motivation and well-being. However, the infancy of the literature in this area and the resultant narrow focus on SDT and coach well-being is also problematic. This is because it does not create a comprehensive picture of the individual factors that help to promote and protect coach well-being. To develop more comprehensive insight, other theoretical frameworks such as the CMRT of stress and emotion (Lazarus, 1999) need to be used to shed light on the cognitive and affective elements of coaches' experiences that influence well-being and performance. This is important given findings of research in non-sport domains, which highlight that positive cognitive and affective psychological capacities (e.g., hope, belief in one's ability, optimism) can be a source of positive emotions, and that positive emotions mediate the relationship between positive psychological capacities and well-being (Avey, Wernsing, & Mhatre, 2011). This points to the potential importance of positive psychological capacities, including what some have termed 'the light quartet' (hope, optimism, perseverance, and resilience), in promoting and protecting coaches' well-being.

To summarise briefly the published literature that has focused on sports coaches' well-being, satisfaction of competence, autonomy, and relatedness (i.e., basic psychological needs) appears to promote well-being while frustration of these needs seems to diminish well-being (McLean, Mallett, & Newcombe, 2012; Stebbings & Taylor, 2017). Indeed, satisfaction of coaches' needs for competence and autonomy has been shown to be positively associated with well-being (Stebbings, Taylor, Spray, & Ntoumanis, 2012) while self-determination to coach may foster higher well-being, lower perceptions of stress, and lower levels of burnout (McLean et al., 2012). In the most recent study of coaches' well-being, Bentzen, Lemyre, and Kenttä (2016b) reported that well-being decreased over the course of a

competitive season while symptoms of burnout increased during the same period of time. They also highlighted that changes in the perceived environment led to changes in psychological need satisfaction, which, in turn, led to increases in autonomous motivation and well-being, and decreases in burnout symptoms. Taken together, the findings of the research in this area point to the importance of basic psychological need satisfaction in the promotion and protection of coaches' well-being.

The previous subsection of this literature review focused on the environmental factors that influence coaches' well-being. Given the focus in the current subsection on influential individual factors, a question relating to the relative contribution of environmental and individual factors in determining well-being is raised. The answer to this question is that neither environmental nor individual factors are more important than the other but that the interaction between the two is vital. In essence, there must be a good fit between the individual and the environment that he or she works in for well-being to be maintained or enhanced. Take the example of a coach who is not open to new ideas (i.e., low in openness), has an external locus of control (i.e., attributes success and failure to others), and is working in an NGB that has recently recruited a new performance director who is implementing a series of new policies (e.g., provision of support staff, salary structures) that will directly impact the coach. The working environment created by the performance director will likely have a negative influence on the coach's well-being and performance. This is because a coach who is less open to new ideas with an external locus of control is more likely to experience uncertainty and perceive such organisational changes as a threat to their goals and well-being. Put simply, there is not a good fit between the coach and the environment that she is working in. Thus, it can be seen that both the environment and the individual are important for well-being, as are the more specific interactions between two or more people. To explore these interactions in more detail this chapter now turns to an examination of interpersonal

factors that influence coach well-being and performance.

Interpersonal factors that influence coach well-being and performance

Coping, emotions, and coach-athlete relationships can influence coach well-being and performance and are each interpersonal in nature. With reference to coping, one widely used model of interpersonal coping is the systemic transactional model (STM; Bodenmann, 1995), which focuses on dyadic transactions between two people during coping episodes. Findings of general psychology research that has used the STM (see, for a review, Staff, Didymus, & Backhouse, 2017a) reveal that individuals in close personal relationships use dyadic coping to overcome the stressors that they encounter. Dyadic coping refers to the combined coping efforts of two partners when they experience a shared stressor (cf. Bodenmann, 1995). The use of dyadic coping extends individuals' coping resources and, in doing so, provides additional coping options to those that are available when an individual copes with stressors on his or her own. When considered alongside the knowledge that effective coping can promote well-being (Dewe et al., 2010), light is shed on the potential importance of dyadic coping as an interpersonal factor that can promote coaches' well-being.

In sport, the majority of coping research (e.g., Didymus & Fletcher, 2014) has focused on how athletes or coaches cope with stressors individually. Indeed, only two studies to date (Nicholls & Perry, 2016; Staff, Didymus, & Backhouse, 2017b) have explicitly focused on the interpersonal nature of coping among coaches. The findings of these studies suggest that a positive coach-athlete relationship mediates the association between dyadic coping and coaches' appraisals of stressors (Nicholls & Perry, 2016). In addition, they highlight that fit between an athlete and coach, friendship and trust, and communication of a stressor can facilitate dyadic coping, and that dyadic coping protects and supports the coach-athlete relationship (Staff et al., 2017b). These findings suggest that both coaches and athletes have roles to play in protecting, supporting, and developing each other and their relationship. This

suggestion is somewhat at odds with a body of literature that points to the coach as the responsible individual for providing environments that facilitate athletes' well-being (e.g., Stenling & Tafvelin, 2014). Instead, it seems plausible to suggest that athletes and coaches have joint responsibility for coping with stressors, developing their relationship, and promoting their own and each other's well-being.

Given that dyadic coping occurs between two people who are in some way connected with each other, relationships emerge as an important consideration when discussing the interpersonal factors that influence well-being. In the context of coaches and athletes, a relationship can be conceptualised as mutual and causal interdependence between the coach's and athlete's feelings, thoughts, and behaviours (Lafrenière, Jowett, Vallerand, & Carbonneau, 2011). Coaches have identified that positive relationships with athletes, family, friends, athletes' parents, peers, and supervisors can help them to cope with stressors and strain (Hayward, Knight, & Mellalieu, 2017). Further, researchers have illuminated elements of the coach-athlete relationship that can influence coach well-being, including relatedness (Allen & Shaw, 2009) and relationship quality (Lafrenière et al., 2011).

When considering the role of emotion in promoting and protecting coaches' well-being, interpersonal emotion regulation is a particularly relevant concept. Over the past few decades, a substantial body of evidence has shown that emotions not only influence thoughts and behaviours but that they also influence the emotions of others with whom we interact (e.g., Barsade, 2002). This notion of emotion contagion and, importantly, the regulation of emotions between two or more people can prevent burnout in leaders, contribute to enhanced job satisfaction, and positively influence well-being (e.g., Skakon, Nielsen, Borg, & Guzman, 2010). In sport, it has been highlighted that emotions are an important aspect of coach-athlete interactions (Davis & Davis, 2016). Indeed, researchers have suggested that interpersonal emotion regulation can develop athletes' and coaches' cognition (e.g., when managing

emotions) and behaviour (e.g., self-control), which in turn can promote resilience, stronger relationships, and more optimal psychological functioning (Wagstaff, Fletcher, & Hanton, 2012). Other researchers have suggested that interpersonal emotion regulation between athletes and coaches can improve athletes' own emotion regulation (Davis & Davis, 2016), which can also improve coaches' experiences in sport (Tamminen, Gaudreau, McEwan, & Crocker, 2016). Research has also explored how sociocultural norms, leadership styles, relationship quality, and job roles can shape coaches' personal and interpersonal emotion regulation (e.g., Hings, Wagstaff, Anderson, Gilmore, & Thelwell, 2018). These findings point to the importance of athletes' and coaches' emotion regulation for fostering coaches' well-being.

Despite these aforementioned positive implications of interpersonal emotion regulation, the potentially negative outcomes of emotion contagion and interpersonal emotion regulation should also be considered. This is because a coach's emotions can be transferred to athletes and can influence how athletes behave (Tamminen et al., 2016). Naturally, if the emotions that are transferred from coach to athlete are negatively toned, there is potential for this transference to be unhelpful for athletes' performance due to the links between negatively toned emotions and reduced performance (Fletcher & Scott, 2010). While some evidence for coach to athlete emotion contagion does exist, that which supports the transfer of emotions from athlete to coach is weak (Stebbings, Taylor, & Spray, 2016). This tentatively suggests a unidirectional emotion contagion relationship from coach to athlete and highlights the important role of the coach and his or her psychological state in athletes' development and, potentially, their well-being and performance.

Given the importance of a coach's interpersonal relationships for coping and interpersonal emotion regulation, it is relevant to consider social exchange models that help to explain the impact of relationships on well-being (e.g., Leader-Member Exchange Theory

[LMX]; Graen & Uhlbein, 1995). The basic premise of LMX is that leaders (e.g., coaches) develop different forms of exchange relationships with their subordinates (e.g., athletes) that can influence well-being and performance. Indeed, exchange relationships between coaches, athletes, and performance directors have been shown to influence coaches' job satisfaction, confidence, and performance (e.g., Van Breukelen, Van der Leeden, Wesselius, & Hoes, 2012). In a work context, employees who have helpful exchange relationships report benefits (e.g., open communication) that employees in unhelpful exchange relationships do not (Graen & Uhlbien, 1995). In sport, helpful exchange relationships between coaches and athletes can result in athletes performing better in an attempt to please and support their coach (Chen, 2010). Conversely, poor exchange relationships can increase athletes' perceptions of unfairness and preferential treatment of others (Van Breukelen et al., 2012). This highlights a need for coaches to identify ways that they can prevent differential treatment between athletes and promote a supportive team atmosphere that fosters athlete and coach well-being.

In addition to coach-athlete relationships, coach-management relationships are also important considerations because of their potential to influence coach well-being and performance. For example, managers who empower coaches to make decisions based on their expert judgment and to act without seeking permission can have a positive influence on coaches' autonomy (Kavussanu & Stanger, 2017). Furthermore, the attitudes of managers and the methods that they use with coaches can influence coaches' job satisfaction (Jordan, Turner, Fink, & Pastore, 2007). This highlights the importance of coaches striving to develop high-quality relationships with their leaders (e.g., managers, performance directors) and subordinates (e.g., athletes) to reap the benefits of helpful exchange relationships for their own and others' well-being. Taken together, these findings support theoretical frameworks (e.g., Bodenmann, 1995; Graen & Uhlbien, 1995) that bring to the fore the notion that a coach's well-being is shaped by the interpersonal world in which they live.

Implications for future research

The preceding literature review has highlighted a number of under explored areas that offer fertile ground for future research. For example, while literature on coaches' experiences of stress does exist, there is currently no published work that attempts to explore the impact of these experiences on coaches' well-being and performance. Researchers would do well to make progress in this area using, for example, the CMRT of stress and emotion (Lazarus, 1999) to better understand the environmental (i.e., stressors), individual (i.e., coping strategies), and interpersonal (e.g., emotion regulation) factors that promote and protect coaches' well-being. It would be particularly useful to explore how these factors influence coach well-being and performance over time by using longitudinal research methods. Perceptions of organisational climate were highlighted in the literature review as important for coaches' well-being and, therefore, increased attention should be directed toward *how* such perceptions influence well-being and performance.

Personality, locus of control, pursuits of hobbies, and basic psychological need satisfaction were the individual factors that this literature review focused on as important influencers of well-being. With the exception of basic psychological need satisfaction where a series of studies have quantitatively explored links between motivation and well-being, little to no literature exists that examines with coaches the other individual factors that we have highlighted as important for well-being. This means that there are numerous opportunities for future research that could, for example, focus on the five factor model of personality in relation to well-being among coaches, or on positive psychological capacities (e.g., the light quartet) that may promote and protect well-being.

Implications for applied practice

In addition to forging new lines of research enquiry, the well-being of coaches must be brought to centre stage of NGB strategic plans and coach education programmes if we are

to work towards a more engaged, committed, and high performing coaching workforce. To achieve a closer focus on coaches' well-being, NGBs should develop and implement plans to enhance accountability, trust, and work-life balance among coaches. In addition, coaches need to be supported during their development activities to understand how work-life balance can be achieved, particularly when they are required to work long hours and spend long periods of time away from friends and loved ones. Mentors are likely to play an important role in supporting coaches, and NGBs can assist by formalising coach mentoring for coaches who are working at all levels of competition. Sport organisations should also assess the cultures and environments that they create with a view to understanding whether these are conducive to the promotion and protection of trusting and supportive relationships and, thus, coach well-being and performance. This will require critical interrogation of current organisational practices but we encourage organisations and NGBs to embrace this challenge and foster open, supportive, and continuous learning environments that will benefit the well-being and performance development of coaches and, in turn, athletes.

Given that some influencers of well-being are genetic (e.g., personality), it may be that some coaches are predisposed to have higher well-being than others. With the knowledge that beliefs about control are important for well-being, there may be opportunities for practitioners to work with coaches to enhance perceptions of control and, in doing so, contribute to coach well-being. Coaches themselves should ensure that they allocate time for non-work interests (e.g., hobbies) and for maintaining positive relationships, both of which are essential for detaching psychologically from work (albeit temporarily) and for building and maintaining well-being. Coaches should also aim to treat all athletes equally, as should organisations treat all coaches equally, and, in doing so, promote supportive atmospheres that foster both athlete and coach well-being. Being aware of their own emotions and the potential

for these to be transferred to athletes will also be essential for coaches to optimise their own well-being and that of the athletes with whom they work.

References

Allen, J. B., & Shaw, S. (2009). Women coaches' perceptions of their sport organizations' social environment: Supporting coaches' psychological needs? *The Sport Psychologist, 23*, 346–366. doi:10.1123/tsp.23.3.346

Avey, J. B., Wernsing, T. S., & Mhatre, K. H. (2011). A longitudinal analysis of positive psychological constructs and emotions on stress, anxiety, and well-being. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 18*, 216–228. doi:10.1177/1548051810397368

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

Barsade, S. G. (2002). The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 47*, 644–675. doi:10.2307/3094912

Bentzen, M., Lemyre, P., & Kenttä, G. (2016a). Development of exhaustion for high performance coaches in association with workload and motivation: A person-centered approach. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *22*, 10–19. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.06.004

Bentzen, M., Lemyre, P., & Kenttä, G. (2016b). Changes in motivation and burnout indices in high-performance coaches over the course of a competitive season. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 28*, 28–48. doi:10.1080/10413200.2015.1053160.

Bodenmann, G. (1995). A systemic-transactional conceptualization of stress and coping in couples. *Swiss Journal of Psychology, 54*, 34–49. Retrieved from www.hogrefe.ch/index.php/swiss-journal-of-psychology.html/

Chen, C. (2010). Leadership and teamwork paradigms: Two models for baseball coaches. *Social Behavior and Personality, 38*, 1367–1376. doi:10.2224/sbp.2010.38.10.1367

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

coaching behaviors. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *12*, 144–152. doi:10.1123/jsep.30.5.541

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

Newton, T. J., & Keenan, A. (1990). The moderating effect of the type A behaviour pattern and locus of control upon the relationship between change in job demands and change in psychological strain. *Human Relations, 43*, 1229–1255. doi:10.1177/001872679004301204

Nicholls, A. R., & Perry, J. L. (2016). Perceptions of coach-athlete relationship are more important to coaches than athletes in predicting dyadic coping and stress appraisals: An actor-partner independence mediation model. *Frontiers in Psychology, 29*, 447. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00447

Norris, L., Didymus, F. F., & Kaiseler, M. H. (2017). Stressors, coping, and well-being among sports coaches: A systematic review. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 33*, 93–112. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.08.005

Parkes, K. R. (1989). Personal control in an occupational context. In A. Steptoe & A. Appels (Eds.), *Stress, personal control and health* (pp. 21–47). Chichester, United Kingdom: Wiley.

Robertson, I. T., & Flint-Taylor, J. (2010). Well-being in health care organizations: Key issues. *British Journal of Healthcare Management, 16,* 19–23. doi:10.12968/bjhc.2010.16.1.45895

Rumbold, J. L., Fletcher, D., & Daniels, K. (2018). Using a mixed method audit to inform organizational stress management interventions in sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *35*, 27–38. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.10.010

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

Thelwell, R. C., Weston, N. J. V., Greenlees, I. A., & Hutchings, N. V. (2008). Stressors in elite sport: A coach perspective. *Journal of Sport Sciences, 26*, 905–918. doi:10.1080/02640470807885933

Van Breukelen, W., Van Der Leeden, R., Wesselius, W., & Hoes, M. (2012). Differential treatment within sports teams, leader-member (coach-player) exchange quality, team atmosphere, and team performance. *Journal of Organisational Behaviour, 33*, 43–63. doi:10.1002/job.735

Wagstaff, C. R. D., Fletcher, D., & Hanton, S. (2012). Exploring emotion abilities and regulation strategies in sport organisations. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology, 1*, 268–282. doi:10.1037/a0028814

Winwood, P. C., Bakker, A. B., & Winefield, A. H. (2007). An investigation of the role of non-work-time behavior in buffering the effects of work strain. *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine, 49*, 862–871. doi:10.1097/JOM.0b013e318124a8dc

Wright, T. A., & Cropanzano, R. (2000). Psychological well-being and job satisfaction as predictors of job performance. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 5*, 94–94. doi:10.1037//1076-8998.5.1.84