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Abstract

This programme of research examined the psychosocial factors affecting performers and personnel that operate within sport organizations. Study 1 (chapter 4) aimed to gain a better understanding of how individuals manage their emotional responses to organizational stressors and the consequences for burnout and turnover intentions. A cross-sectional questionnaire design was the chosen methodology and moderation and moderated-mediation analysis was adopted. Results from this study highlighted the importance of emotional labour (i.e., surface acting) in understanding how organizational stressors contribute to the experience of burnout and turnover intentions. The results from study 1 suggested that emotional labour might have negative consequences for actual turnover. Therefore, study 2 (chapter 5) examined emotional labour as a moderator in the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors, turnover intention, and actual turnover using a 6-month longitudinal design. In line with study 1, the results from study 2 highlight that organizational stressors and surface acting are among the factors that lead to psychological disengagement in sport (i.e., turnover intention). Specifically, surface acting moderated the relationship between organizational stressor frequency and turnover intentions, but not for actual turnover. Based on the findings from study 2, study 3 (chapter 6) aimed to determine whether an individual’s commitment, identity, and engagement with their organization might influence their experience of organizational stressors and the consequences for burnout and turnover intention. A cross-sectional questionnaire design was the chosen methodology and a moderation and moderated-mediation analysis was adopted. Results from this study showed that higher self-reported levels of commitment, identity, and engagement moderated the
relationship between organizational stressors and turnover intention through burnout. These results highlight the importance of attitudes in understanding how performers and personnel respond to the organizational stressors they encounter in their sport.

Drawing together the findings from this programme of research, the thesis contains a discussion of its empirical and practical implications, its strengths and weaknesses, and avenues for future research directions. The thesis concludes with a reflective epilogue, which presents an account of the author’s experience of the Ph.D. process. The aim of the reflective epilogue was to review the lessons learned from doing quantitative, questionnaire-based research and to reflect on being a part-time researcher.
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Chapter 1:

Introduction
Stress in Sport

Phrases such as “I feel stressed” have become part of our everyday language and are usually used to describe the negative emotional state that individuals experience in response to demanding life or work situations. Indeed, stress is a widespread issue that is recognised as one of the biggest health concerns, contributing to impaired mental health and physical well-being for individuals. For organizations, job and workplace stress is a major issue contributing to a variety of factors that are critical to organizational functioning and success; for example, absenteeism, low morale, turnover of employees, and reduced job performance (Colligan & Higgins, 2005). Putting this into perspective, a labour force survey by the United Kingdom (UK) Government’s Health and Safety Executive (HSE) found 526,000 workers reported suffering from work-related stress, depression, or anxiety in 2016/2017, and as a result 12.5 million working days were lost (Health and Safety Executive [HSE], 2017).

The precarious and results-driven world of sport is not different. Indeed, the area of stress and well-being has received more research attention than any other dimension within organizational psychology in sport. It is widely acknowledged within this literature that sport performers must manage a wide range of demands (i.e., stressors) that are not only associated with competitive performance, but also the highly complex social and organizational environment (Fletcher & Hanton, 2003; Fletcher, Hanton, & Mellalieu, 2006; Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009; Hanton, Fletcher, & Coughlan, 2005a). Regarding the latter of these, the evolution of sport organizations over the past decade or so has seen a substantial increase in research examining the organizational stressors encountered by sport performers. The value of such work can be explained by the undesirable impact that organizational stressors
can have on performers and personnel in sport; for example, burnout (Raedeke & Smith, 2004; Tabei, Fletcher, & Goodger, 2012), negative emotions (Fletcher, Hanton, & Wagstaff, 2012), dissatisfaction (Noblet, Rodwell, & Mcwilliams, 2003), and impaired performance (Daniel Gould, Guinan, Greenleaf, Mudbery, & Peterson, 1999). The body of literature within this area has provided valuable insights into the salience of organizational stressors. It is surprising, however, that despite this recognition, the extant research in this area has yet to systematically explore the factors that may either exacerbate or negate the undesirable consequences of organizational stressors in sport.

**Purpose of this Thesis**

This thesis reflects a programme of research that involved an examination of the psychosocial experiences of performers and personnel that operate within sport organizations. The overarching aim of this Ph.D. was to gain an in-depth understanding of the emotional and attitudinal phenomena, stress and well-being, and organizational environments that might help or hinder individuals in sport. More specifically, the aims of this thesis were to: (a) investigate emotional labour in the context of organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intention in sport (Study 1); (b) examine the impact of organizational stressors and emotional labour on behavioural outcomes over time using a longitudinal design (Study 2); and (c) explore sport-related attitudes that influence the stressor-burnout-turnover intention relationship (Study 3). Due to the nature of this programme of research, quantitative methods of data collection (i.e., questionnaires) and analysis (i.e., moderation and mediation statistics) were employed to achieve these aims.
Overview of this Thesis

This thesis is presented in a continental style, whereby chapters are presented as research manuscripts suitable for publication in peer-reviewed journals. Indeed, three of the four content-driven chapters from this thesis have been published in peer-reviewed outlets. In total, there are 8 chapters, of which three contain original studies. Following this introduction, Chapter 2 provides a critical review of the extant literature relating to organizational psychology in sport. Throughout this chapter, potential areas for future research are discussed that are organized into four core dimensions; emotions and attitudes in sport organizations, stress and well-being in sport organizations, behaviours in sport organizations, and environments in sport organizations.

Chapter 3 considers the key stress-related definitions, conceptions, and models that have influenced the sport psychology literature within the area, as well as this programme of work. Specifically, this review offers critical insight into the main components of the stress process and the relevant supporting literature that underpins this thesis.

Following the literature review in chapter 1 and review of organizational stress in sport in chapter 3, Chapter 4 (Study 1) reports an examination of emotional labour in the context of stress and well-being outcomes in sport. Previous research in stress in sport has examined the types of organizational stressors encountered by individuals and their allied responses; however, little is known about how such individuals manage their emotional responses to these stressors or the consequences of such behaviours. Therefore, the findings presented in this chapter provide valuable insight into the role of emotional labour in managing responses to organizational
stressors, and how such strategies might influence well-being and behavioural outcomes in sport.

Chapter 5 (Study 2) presents the findings of a longitudinal examination of the relationships between organizational stressors, emotional labour, and behavioural outcomes in sport. Specifically, the purpose of Study 2 was to build on the knowledge gained from Study 1 by investigating whether emotional labour influences the relationship between organizational stressors and actual turnover. The findings reiterated the importance of emotional labour in understanding how organizational stressors can lead to psychological disengagement in sport (i.e., turnover intention) but not for actual turnover. This chapter suggested that sport-related attitudes such as commitment, identity, and engagement could potentially explain why some individuals remain in their organization despite stating their intention to leave.

Chapter 6 (Study 3) reports the results of an analysis of sport-related attitudes as moderators in the relationship between several components of the organizational stress process in sport. Specifically, the purpose of Study 3 was to determine whether an individual’s commitment, identity, and engagement with their organization might influence their experience of organizational stressors and the consequences for burnout and turnover intention. The findings presented in this chapter serve to highlight the importance of attitudes in understanding how performers and personnel respond to the organizational stressors they encounter in sport.

Chapter 7 draws together the research findings from the studies presented in this programme of research and discusses the empirical and practical implications
emanating from this body of work. The chapter also considers the strengths and weaknesses of the research and suggests areas for future research.

Chapter 8 closes the thesis with a reflective epilogue, which presents an account of the author’s experience of the Ph.D. process. The reflections reported within this chapter relate to: the nature of quantitative, questionnaire-based research, reflections on being a part-time researcher, and the lessons learned from undertaking a Ph.D.
Chapter 2:

Organizational psychology in sport: Recent developments and a research agenda
Abstract

This chapter provides a review of the recent developments in the literature relating to organizational psychology in sport. In doing so, this review delimits and demystifies organizational psychology from similar concentrations of industrial and organizational psychology. Moreover, this chapter provides an organizing structure to align extant and potential future lines of inquiry into four core dimensions of research and application; emotions and attitudes in sport organizations, stress and well-being in sport organizations, behaviours in sport organizations, and environments in sport organizations.
Introduction

In the latter part of the 20\textsuperscript{th} Century, elite sport was host to substantial commercialization and globalization (see Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009). Thus far, during the 21\textsuperscript{st} Century there has been little indication that these complex, turbulent, and volatile changes will slow or desist. Indeed, an implication of these changes has been a growing demand for the establishment of organizational systems that instantly and consistently deliver success. In response to such requirements, there has been an increasing technologicalisation, medicalisation and scientisation of elite sport performance environments as organizations seek a competitive edge (Wagstaff, Gilmore, & Thelwell, 2015). Such actions echo the observations of sport management scholars who have described the current state of unrest as a “global sporting arms race” (see De Bosscher, Bingham, Shibli, Van Bottenburg, & De Knop, 2008) exemplified by the creation of isomorphic institutions with hierarchically-structured bodies, coordinated policies and processes, democratised authority and shared collective goals. Given this changing landscape of elite sport, psychologists have increasingly emphasised the importance of exploring the organizational contexts in which performers operate (see, for reviews, Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009; Wagstaff, Fletcher, & Hanton, 2012). Indeed, given the pivotal role of human performance for optimising the functioning of sport organizations (see Wagstaff, Fletcher, & Hanton, 2012a), the domain of organizational psychology has much to contribute to the changing face of elite sport (see Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009).

Defining, delimiting, and demystifying organizational psychology in sport

The foundations of organizational psychology lie with the confluence of industrial and organizational (I/O) psychology and the changing landscape of elite
sport environments. I/O psychology has been defined as “a general practice specialty of professional psychology with a focus on scientifically-based solutions to human problems in work and other organizational settings. In these contexts, I/O psychologists assess and enhance the effectiveness of individuals, groups, and organizations” (American Psychological Association, 2011). Hence, I/O psychologists recognize the interdependence of individuals, organizations and society and consider problems such as employee turnover, absenteeism and productivity; succession planning and development of managers and executives; organizational restructuring; workplace stress and well-being; and employee motivation and performance (Wagstaff et al., 2012c).

Scholars have typically distinguished between three concentrations of I/O psychology (e.g., Landy & Conte, 2009): personnel psychology, organizational psychology, and human engineering. Personnel psychology is often integrated within human resources in many workplaces and addresses issues such as recruitment, selection, training, performance appraisal, promotion, transfer, and termination. This work typically relates to the methods and principles used to select and evaluate potential employees and would have overlap with talent identification and team composition procedures in sport organizations. However, traditionally such roles have been performed by individuals responsible for the performance department (i.e., manager, performance director, director of sport), with input from scouts and performance analysts. The value of psychological input regarding these issues lies in the view that individuals have fluctuating work behaviours and attitudes and that information relating to these changes can help predict, maintain and increase performance and satisfaction.
Organizational psychology integrates research foundations in social psychology and organizational behaviour to address emotional and motivational aspects of organizational life. The main aim of this work is the evaluation of what motivates employees to have a successful, productive, satisfying work environment to help organizations function more effectively. Consequently, organizational psychologists commonly focus on topics such as attitudes, fairness, motivation, stress, leadership, teams, and broader aspects of organizational and work design. Given its emphasis on the reactions of people to work and their resultant action tendencies and responses, both the organization and the people within its sphere of influence are of importance. Hence, organizational psychologists might also seek to achieve a fit between people, the work demands they might face and the organization’s idiosyncratic characteristics. Indeed, the author proposes that organizational psychology principles can advance sport performance through two means: 1) the development of optimally functioning sport organizations; and 2) though the enhancement of the quality of work life for those that operate within their sphere of influence.

Human engineering refers to the study of human limitations with respect to the design of products, technology, systems, and environments that optimise performance. Whilst personnel psychology aims to find the best individual for the work, and organizational psychology aims to match the best person to relevant roles, human engineering aims to develop environments and systems that are compatible with the characteristics of the worker. According to Landy and Conte (2009) the diverse environmental aspects of this work may include tools, work spaces, information displays, shift work, work pace, machine controls, and safety. This approach integrates cognitive science, ergonomics, physiology, anatomy and
biomechanics. The role of human engineering psychologists in sport could incorporate the optimal understanding, functionality, and integration of medical, technological, and scientific advances by sport performers.

Although there is value in each of the three concentrations of I/O psychology, it is the author’s belief that the biggest potential benefit to sport is the optimisation of organizational psychology factors, much of which will fall under the rubric of positive organizational psychology in sport (POPS; Wagstaff et al., 2012a). Hence, the focus here is on the second concentration outlined above. Before providing a review and organizing structure for research in organizational psychology in sport, the salience of this area is considered.

Vacuums and the myth of individualism

Advocates of organizational psychology in sport (see, e.g., Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009) have frequently used an oft-quoted passage from Hardy, Jones, and Gould’s (1996) early sport psychology text; borrowing from Shaw’s work on social environments (1981). Hardy et al. (1996) concluded their book by noting “elite athletes do not live in a vacuum; they function within a highly complex social and organizational environment, which exerts major influences on them and their performances” (pp. 239-240). Allied with Hardy et al.’s analogy of the environments in which elite sport performers prepare and perform, there are many dangers of what one would label a ‘myth of individualism’. That is, a fallacy that sporting success or failure is wholly determined by individual effort or ability has prevailed for some time in society. The power of this myth lies in its promotion of a social fixation on talent and eliding of the salience of a wealth of interpersonal, team, and organizational level factors that impact performance. This is not to say that elite sport performers do not require talent, or that this cannot be nurtured and supplemented
with individual effort; indeed, such factors are pivotal for initial success and might be largely responsible for fugacious underdog triumphs. However, *sustained* success in high performance domains is not solely predicated on the embodied competence of individual performers, but also how effectively these individuals build and maintain working relationships with a network of stakeholders (e.g., coaches, managers, selectors, performers) and organizations (e.g., sport institutions, bodies, organizations) in addition to those who provide informational (e.g., scientific, medical, and technological expertise), financial (e.g., sponsors), and social (e.g., friends, family) supports to optimise day-to-day productivity in preparation for and performance at major competitions (see Wagstaff et al., 2012a).

In addition to the importance of dispelling the myth of individualism for sporting success, there is also a need to view sport organizations as workplaces that must ensure the well-being of their employees rather than merely systematised collectives aimed at promoting success. That is, examining the psychological states of individuals during their engagement with organizations and at home (i.e., their work-life balance) might allow for a better understanding the well-being of sport performers. Well-being considers a wide range of experiences (e.g., demands and functioning), and incorporates positive (e.g., enthusiasm) and negative (e.g., anxiety) affective states and outcomes (e.g., psychosomatic health, job satisfaction), as well as the processes (e.g., communication) that facilitate these ends. Hence, the value of organizational psychology in sport lies with its examination and facilitation of performance factors (i.e., the development of optimally functioning sport organizations and debunking of the myth of individualism) and well-being (i.e., the enhancement of the quality of work life and view sport organizations as places of
work requiring considerations for sportspeople as employees with requisite rights and needs).

In line with the growing acknowledgement of the importance of organizational issues in elite sport, two recent reviews have summarised the emergence, application and potential futures for this domain. Specifically, in 2009 an article by Fletcher and Wagstaff was published in *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* that reviewed a (then) nascent body of research concerned with the emergence of organizational psychology in elite sport. Fletcher and Wagstaff (2009) reviewed six lines of inquiry pointing to the salience of these issues: factors affecting Olympic performance (see, for a review, Gould & Maynard, 2009); organizational stress (see, for a review, Arnold & Fletcher, 2012); perceptions of roles (see, e.g., Reid, Stewart, & Thorne, 2004); organizational success factors (see, e.g., Weinberg & McDermott, 2002); performance environments in elite sport (see, e.g., Fletcher & Streeter, 2016); and organizational citizenship behaviour (see, e.g., Aoyagi, Cox, & Mcguire, 2008).

More recently, Wagstaff et al. (2012c) reviewed the literature relating to the *positive* organizational psychology research in sport. In their review, Wagstaff et al. defined and delimited relevant concepts, including organizational psychology and positive organizing, with a particular emphasis on extant research relating to organizational functioning in sport (i.e., positive environments, positive behaviours, and positive outcomes) and a call for attention to be paid to topics such as culture, climate and change, in addition to those aligned with positive organizational behaviour and scholarship (see Wagstaff et al., 2012b). The author’s intention is not to repeat the work presented in these reviews but to acknowledge recent developments and stimulate new inquiry.
A research agenda for organizational psychology in sport

In the remainder of this chapter, a structure for organizational psychology research in sport is outlined. This structure organizes many extant (see, for reviews, Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009; Wagstaff et al., 2012b) and possible future lines of inquiry into four core dimensions of research and application: 1) emotions and attitudes in sport organizations; 2) stress and well-being in sport organizations; 3) behaviours in sport organizations; and 4) environments in sport organizations.

Emotions and attitudes in sport organizations.

Due to their impact on a range of psychosocial variables associated with performance and well-being (cf. Hanin, 2007) perhaps the most promising dimension of organizational psychology in sport relates to the interrelated areas of emotional and attitudinal phenomena. While a full review of these topics is beyond the scope of this chapter, a selection is considered below.

Emotions in sport organizations. Wagstaff et al. (2012b) stated that emotions play an essential role in sport organizations by providing feedback and stimulating retrospective appraisal of actions, promoting learning, and altering guidelines for future behaviour and self-management. Indeed, due to a recent proliferation of research attention exploring emotion and affect in organizations, Barsade, Brief, and Spataro (2003) have termed the current era an “affective revolution”. Importantly, this revolution has stimulated research on affective concepts for promoting team (e.g., Friesen et al., 2013; Tamminen & Crocker, 2013) and organizational functioning (e.g., Wagstaff et al., 2012b; 2012a; Wagstaff, Hanton, & Fletcher, 2013) in sport. This growing body of research has generally indicated that emotional experience, regulation strategy use, and ability have important implications for individual, team, and organizational outcomes in sport.
Although the study of emotional experience has firmly established its place in sport psychology, almost all of this research has focused on the examination of negative emotions in competitive environments such as anxiety (see, for a review, Wagstaff, Neil, Mellalieu, & Hanton, 2011). Indeed, there is a relative dearth of research examining the daily affective experiences of sport performers within their organizations or the value of emotion-based interventions to improve psychological well-being and organizational performance. McCarthy (2011) recently argued that the benefits of positive emotions have hitherto not been wholly realized in sport, especially in their capacity to generate greater self-efficacy, motivation, attention, problem-solving, and coping with adversity. Interestingly, beyond the context of sport, happiness has been the emotion of principal interest in organizations (Totterdell, Holman, & Niven, 2013). Indeed, a wide array of happiness-related concepts have been studied in the workplace and typically focus on state-level variables (e.g., fluctuations in momentary happiness). Indeed, there is evidence that momentary happiness has positive consequences for employee well-being, creativity, proactivity, task performance, and goal attainment (see Fisher, 2000). Such findings align with Frederickson’s (2001) broaden and build theory of positive emotion which proposes that momentary emotional experiences engender success by broadening ones thought-action repertoires and building social, personal, and psychological resources to deal with or undo the deleterious effects of negative events.

In addition to the recent calls for a shift in extant emotion experience research to incorporate positive emotions, scholars have also acknowledged the importance of regulating emotions in sport organizations (e.g., Lane, Beedie, Jones, Uphill, & Devonport, 2012; Wagstaff et al., 2012b, 2012a). For example, Wagstaff et al. (2012b) conducted a 9-month ethnography in an Olympic national sport organization
(NSO), highlighting the development and maintenance of interpersonal relationships to be the critical building blocks for optimal organizational functioning. Moreover, individuals better able to monitor and manage their emotions were more likely to forge and maintain successful relationships. That is, participants used emotion-related abilities for managing conflict, communicating emotion, managing and expressing emotion to maintain the psychological contract, engaging in contagious emotion regulation, and emotion regulation to aid the building and maintenance of relationships. The use of these emotion abilities and regulation strategies increased what Wagstaff et al. termed “psychosocial capital” (i.e., enhanced levels of engagement and social relationships) and displays of prosocial behavior within the organization. Conversely, the absence of such abilities appeared to put a strain on interpersonal relationships, reduced individuals’ social standing, and gave way to power struggles. In an attempt to extend the ethnographic work of Wagstaff et al. (2012b), Wagstaff et al. (2012a) used a semi-structured interview approach to identify key emotion abilities (i.e., identifying, processing and comprehending, and managing emotions) associated with the use of specific experience and expression regulation strategies (e.g., forward-tracking, back-tracking, reappraisal, suppression, and impulse control). To elaborate, Wagstaff et al. found emotion abilities to influence regulation strategy selection through sociocultural norms present within organizations. For example, participants reported that adhering to expectations and norms relating to emotional expression to be a major contributing factor in regulation strategy selection. Based on these findings, Wagstaff et al. proposed a socio-cognitive model of emotion regulation in organizations to explain the antecedents to and consequences of emotion regulation (see Figure 2.1).
Initial support has emerged for Wagstaff et al.’s (2012b) socio-cognitive model of emotion regulation in organizations (e.g., Friesen et al., 2013; Tamminen & Crocker, 2013; Wagstaff et al., 2013). For example, using a two-phase action research intervention, Wagstaff et al. (2013) showed emotion regulation and ability workshops to improve the practice of participants, their regulation strategy use, and perceptions of relationship quality and closeness. Moreover, participants receiving an extended one-to-one coaching intervention showed improvement in emotional intelligence ability scores in addition to the benefits demonstrated via workshops. The findings indicated that short-term generic interventions to promote the use of adaptive emotion regulation strategies might be effective in sport organizations, but the purposive development of emotional intelligence might require more longitudinal and idiographic approaches. Tamminen and Crocker (2013) recently provided
additional support for Wagstaff et al.’s (2012b) model by highlighting the interpersonal emotion regulation undertaken by a team of curlers. Specifically, the authors found performers to be aware of and consider social and contextual factors (e.g., social norms and role on team) when regulating emotions in team meetings, practices, and games toward the achievement of multiple goals (e.g., positive performances, positive social relationships). Considering the fruitful body of work reviewed above, it would appear that the requirement for emotion regulation and emotional intelligence abilities have, perhaps, been underestimated in sport and reflect a pervasive necessity of organizational life.

In addition to the extant lines of emotion-related inquiry reviewed above, researchers have increasingly highlighted the potential value of examining emotional contagion (e.g., Moll, Jordet, & Pepping, 2010; O’Neill, 2008; Totterdell, 2000; Wagstaff et al., 2012b, 2012a, 2013) in sport organizations. Schoenewolf (1990) defined emotional contagion as a “process in which a person or group influences the emotions or behaviour of another person or group through the conscious or unconscious induction of emotion states and behavioural attitudes” (p. 50). In a first exploration of contagion in sport, Totterdell (2000) explained how the mood of individual players was linked to the collective mood of other players within a cricket team. Further, O’Neill (2008) proposed that emotional contagion mechanisms might be responsible for decreased performances by alpine skiers after witnessing an injury. Moll, Jordet, and Pepping (2010) also proposed emotional contagion to explain the association between goal celebrations and team performance in association football.

In addition to emotional contagion, sport psychologists have increasingly noted the importance of emotional labour in sport organizations (e.g., Wagstaff et al.,
Morris and Feldman (1996) defined emotional labour as “the effort, planning and control needed to express organizationally desired emotions during interpersonal interactions” (p. 987). It is possible that the efforts associated with engaging in emotional labour might have intrapersonal or interpersonal costs for sport performers. Indeed, two recent studies have attempted to examine the interplay between emotional experience, regulation and psychosocial and task outcomes in performance domains. Specifically, in a study with a military performance team during a two-month Antarctic mountaineering expedition, Wagstaff and Weston (2014) found maladaptive emotion regulation strategies (e.g., suppression) to be rated as effective despite their use being correlated with negative intrapersonal (e.g., mental fatigue) and interpersonal (e.g., cohesion) outcomes. The authors concluded that the demanding expedition environment influenced participants’ perceptions of emotion regulation requirements, regulation strategy selection, and effectiveness, which, in turn, were associated with greater levels of mental fatigue, instances of conflict, and decreased team performance. In a related study, Wagstaff (2014) used a laboratory-based repeated measures design to examine the relationship between emotional self-regulation and individual cycling performance. When participants suppressed their emotional reactions to an upsetting video prior to completing a 10k cycle time trial (suppression condition) they completed the task slower, generated lower mean power outputs, and reached a lower maximum heart rate and perceived greater physical exertion than when they were given no self-regulation instructions during the video (non-suppression condition) or received no video treatment (control condition). Wagstaff (2014) concluded that emotion regulation demands affected perceived exertion, pacing and sport performance; however, research is required to ascertain if such outcomes impact the team or organizational level outcomes and the
extent to which chronic demands for emotion regulation influence any such relationships.

It is apparent from the discourse above that researchers must consider the level of analysis of the emotion concepts they study in sport organizations. Indeed, informed by the work of Ashkanasy (2003) the author proposes a five-level model for situating emotion research in sport organizations. The first level of analysis is related to understanding the within-person ebb and flow of daily emotional processes. This is characterised by the idiosyncratic experience of emotions such as anxiety, anger, and happiness. Such experiences are likely to be influenced by state affect, events, discrete emotions, moods, attitudes and behaviours in sport organizations. The second level of analysis relates to individual differences in emotion-related phenomena and provides between-person level understanding. This level is characterised by trait affectivity, emotion abilities and regulation strategies and attitudes towards the environment such as satisfaction, commitment and identification burnout. At the third or dyadic, interpersonal, level of analysis, the communication of and with emotion is likely to influence relational dynamics. This is characterised by the coach-athlete relationship or performance partnerships. Such factors might relate to the exploration of emotional labour in emotional exchanges, interpersonal conflict and negotiation, interpersonal influence and power. At the fourth level of analysis, group and team level emotional dynamics are likely to impact a host of psychosocial and performance outcomes. This is characterised by the collective affective climate and environmental factors that define performance teams or sport science and medicine departments. At the fifth level of analysis, the creation of positive organizational policies, structures and cultures that minimise stress and promote well-being might be of interest. For example, the wider
organizational cultural and climatic behaviours are likely to influence affective phenomena at various other levels of analysis.

**Attitudes in sport organizations.** In a study of performers’ responses to organizational stressors, Fletcher, Hanton, and Wagstaff (2012) showed performers to respond in numerous emotional, attitudinal, and behavioural ways. Hence, and in view of the review of emotion phenomena above, attitude-related topics in sport organizations are worthy of closer examination.

**Organizational commitment.** Of the many attitudinal concepts of potential interest to sport psychologists seeking to optimise organizational functioning, one of the most promising is organizational commitment. In research conducted outside of sport, Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) proposed that organizational commitment was comprised of three components: acceptance and belief in an organization’s goals and values; a willingness to exert effort on behalf of the organization to help meet the goals or values of that organization; and, a strong desire to remain in the organization. More recently, Meyer, Allen, and Smith (1993) extended Mowday and colleagues’ work and argued that individuals can be committed to entities, objects or their profession rather than the organization per se. Subsequently, Meyer and Allen (1997) proposed that organizational commitment could be based on any one of three elements: an emotional or affective commitment to an organization (i.e., they want to stay); an element representing the perceived cost of leaving the organization or continuance commitment (i.e., they have to stay), and; an element representing an obligation to remain in the organization, or normative commitment (i.e., they feel they ought to stay). In an attempt to summarize the vast literatures on organizational commitment outside of sport, several meta-analysis have been conducted (see Mathieu & Zajac, 1990; Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002) which
have pointed to numerous antecedents (e.g., role ambiguity, role conflict, investment), correlates (e.g., job involvement, satisfaction), and consequences (e.g., turnover and withdrawal cognition, absenteeism, job performance, OCB, stress and work-family conflict) relating to affective, continuance and normative commitment to one’s organization.

Recently, in a first exploration of organizational commitment in sport, Jackson, Gucciardi, and Dimmock (2014) examined the role of this concept in explaining attrition rates in adolescent groups. In doing so, Jackson et al. drew on Meyer and Allen’s (1997) three-factor model of organizational commitment to provide validity evidence for capturing adolescent athletes’ commitment to their coach–athlete relationship or their team along with relations between commitment dimensions and relevant correlates (e.g., satisfaction, return intentions, cohesion) that were largely consistent with extant organizational theory.

The development of a sport-specific measure of organizational commitment provides an excellent opportunity to understand engagement, and intentions to or actual turnover in sport organizations in sport. One benefit of such research lies in the identification, management, or avoidance of what Ghiselli (1974) labelled the “hobo” syndrome, attributed to individuals more prone to changing organizations than others. In sport, such “hobo” or “journeyman” behaviours are increasingly apparent. For example, in a 19-year career, association footballer, Steve Claridge was involved in no less than 28 transfers between 22 different clubs. In comparison, Ryan Giggs has played almost 1000 games for Manchester United, in a career spanning 24 years. Interestingly, Giggs’ commitment was espoused with Sir Alex Ferguson’s 27-year tenure as manager at the same organization. Indeed, organizational commitment is a variable of importance for a variety of roles in sport organizations and therefore,
should not be limited to its examination to sport performers. Elsewhere, in the Indian Premier League (IPL) where pro rata salaries are second only to the NBA, commitment of both cricketers to their respective franchises and that of franchises to their players is weak. Prior to the start of each IPL season, a player auction occurs where marquee players are sold with a base price of US $320,000. Amazingly, for the 2014 IPL, franchises could retain a maximum of five players from their squad of 27 from the 2013 IPL with the buying back of additional members at auction possible via a “first refusal” clause. Moreover, the substantial financial rewards available to performers transferring between franchises further destabilises commitment foundations. Thus, it appears that there is much potential in examining the antecedents and consequences of organizational commitment in sport given that those who have been with an organization for a short period of time are likely to have weaker commitment foundations. Indeed, organizations might invest resources in socialisation processes for new members to promote the retention of desirable individuals until commitment foundations are established and stabilised.

**Organizational engagement and identification.** In addition to the value of examining commitment within sport organizations, other related affect-centred attitude variables of potential interest include organizational engagement and identification. One might consider engagement in sport to reflect the extent to which individuals cognitively, emotionally and physically express themselves during the fulfilment of their roles within their organization (cf. May, Gilson, & Harter, 2004). Britt, Dickenson, Greene-Shortridge, and McKibben (2007) have proposed a model of antecedents (e.g., clarity of job guidelines, personal control over job performance, personal relevance of job to identity and training, importance of job) and consequences (e.g., absorption, effort, persistence, health and well-being and
performance) of job engagement that might provide a point of departure for sport-specific examinations of this concept. Interestingly, a number of the proposed antecedents have overlap with roles variables highlighted as salient for group dynamics in sport such as role clarity, identification, and acceptance (see, for review, Martin, Bruner, Eys, & Spink, 2014) and therefore offer an appealing confluence of research foci.

In addition to engagement, researchers might consider the extent to which individuals identify with their sport organization. Research on identity in sport has largely focused on athletic identity (Brewer, Van Raalte, & Linder, 1993) and coping with transitions out of sport (see, for review, Wylleman, Alfermann, & Lavallee, 2004). However, researchers have recently expanded their study of identity to include a range of variables at multiple levels of analysis. Generally, this research has shown a number of antecedents (e.g., justice and coach behaviour) to predict team identification and for this to be related to various positive (e.g., athlete satisfaction, task and social cohesion) and negative (e.g., adherence to unambitious team goals) outcomes (e.g., Burns, Jasinski, Dunn, & Fletcher, 2012; De Backer et al., 2011; Täuber & Sassenberg, 2012). Such findings indicate that organizational identity presents a fruitful avenue for research in sport.

**Stress and well-being in sport organizations**

The highly complex social and organizational environment of elite sport imposes numerous demands on the performers and personnel that function within it (i.e., preparation, expectations, interpersonal relationships), with advice frequently sought from psychologists on dealing with the pressures that accompany participation (Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009; Stephen Mellalieu, Hanton, Neil, Fletcher, & Wagstaff, 2007). Indeed, the area of stress and well-being has received more
research attention than any other dimension within organizational psychology in
sport. Much of this research has focused on the organizational stressors encountered
by sport performers. Arnold and Fletcher (2012a) recently provided a synthesis of
this research and developed a taxonomic classification of stressors. The authors
concluded that a four category (viz. leadership and personnel, cultural and team,
logistical and environmental, and performance and personal issues) taxonomy
provided the most accurate, comprehensive, and parsimonious classification of
organizational stressors to date given their validity, generalisability, and applicability
to many sport performers of various ages, genders, nationalities, sports, and
standards. In considering measurement issues in this domain, Arnold and Fletcher
(2012b) argued that the most fundamental and significant hindrance to examining
organizational stress in sport has been the lack of a valid and reliable means of
assessing the phenomena. In response to this observation, and using Arnold and
Fletcher's (2012a) taxonomy of stressors, Arnold, Fletcher, and Daniels (2013)
presented a series of studies describing the development and validation of the
Organizational Stressor Indicator for Sport Performers (OSI-SP).

In addition to the stressor taxonomic and measurement development work by
Fletcher and colleagues, research has also emerged exploring performers’ responses
to general (Fletcher, Hanton, & Wagstaff, 2012; Levy, Nicholls, Marchant, &
Polman, 2009; Stephen Mellalieu, Shearer, & Shearer, 2013) and specific
organizational stressors (e.g., Knight & Harwood, 2009; Kristiansen, Roberts, &
Sisjord, 2011). For example, a series of articles by Kristiansen and colleagues have
examined the impact of negative media (e.g., Kristiansen, Hanstad, & Roberts,
2011), journalist-athlete relationships (e.g., Kristiansen & Hanstad, 2012;
Kristiansen, Roberts, et al., 2011) and use of mastery climates for dealing with media
stressors (e.g., Kristiansen, Halvari, & Roberts, 2012). In other research, Mellalieu et al. (2013) conducted a preliminary exploration of athlete, management, and support staff experiences of interpersonal conflict during a major international competition. Approximately 70% of the sample reported experiencing conflict, with most of these instances occurring at the practice and competition venue or athlete village and more than 50% being attributed to breakdowns in interaction and communication and power struggles between people. The authors highlighted that such findings were consistent with Wagstaff et al.’s (2012b) findings regarding the importance of communication in avoiding power struggles and conflict.

Despite the general themes associating organizational stressors with negative psychosocial and performance outcomes (e.g., interpersonal conflict), it is likely that these sources of strain could impact sport performance in both positive (e.g., motivation) and negative (e.g., anxiety) ways. Indeed, Fletcher et al. (2012) found athletes to respond to organizational stressors in a wide range of positive and negative emotional, behavioural, and attitudinal ways. Elsewhere, Tabei, Fletcher, and Goodger (2012) found organizational stressors to be associated with dimensions of burnout. In order to better understand why performers report different responses to similar organizational stressors, Hanton, Wagstaff, and Fletcher (2012) conducted a longitudinal daily diary study of stress appraisals with sport performers. The findings revealed individuals to appraise sources of organizational strain as predominantly threatening or harmful, with little perceived control, and few coping resources available. In a follow up study, Didymus and Fletcher (2012) found harm/loss and threat appraisals to be associated with subsequent negative emotions and behaviours but the appraisal of stressors as a challenge to be associated with more positive outcomes (e.g., increased motivation and effort). Hence, organizational stressors
appear to have the potential to harm individual’s well-being and performance, with individual differences in cognitive appraisal likely to be a pivotal factor in determining emotional, behavioural, and attitudinal responses to such demands. Hence, future research might devote greater attention to the role of appraisal in the organizational stress process. Further, individual differences that might mediate the stress process (e.g., hardiness, mental toughness, resilience), the strategies that individuals employ to manage responses to stressors (e.g., coping), and the performance and well-being outcomes following such processes (e.g., burnout, depression) warrant further research. Future explorations of organizational stress and well-being in sport might also consider the mediating role of various emotional and attitudinal phenomena reviewed in this chapter (e.g., emotional labour) as well as the efficacy of preventative (i.e., primary) and reactive (i.e., secondary, tertiary) interventions targeted at individual, team, and organizational levels (see Fletcher, Hanton, & Mellalieu, 2006).

**Behaviours in sport organizations**

The third proposed dimension of organizational psychology research inquiry encompasses the diverse topics aligned with organizational behaviour and relates to the impact of individual, group, and organization-wide behaviour on performance and well-being.

**Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB).** OCB has been defined as, “individual behaviour that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognised by the formal rewards system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization” (Organ, 1988, p.4). That is, OCB helps or benefits others to go beyond the requirements of their role and support the social environment within organizations. While OCB has received considerable research attention in
other fields of organizational psychology there has only been one study examining this concept in sport. Aoyagi et al. (2008) examined OCB, athlete satisfaction, team cohesion, and leadership behaviours among US athletes. Results showed that leadership was associated with cohesion, satisfaction, and OCB; cohesion was related to OCB; and satisfaction with cohesion. While research is needed to replicate and extend Aoyagi et al.’s findings, it would appear that increasing OCB could enhance indicators of organizational functioning in sport.

Two variables of interest that have been studied in association with OCB are prosocial and antisocial behaviours. Prosocial behaviours are carried out to produce and maintain the well-being and integrity of others and might include congratulating teammates or helping an injured opponent (Kavussanu, Stanger, & Boardley, 2013). Conversely, antisocial behaviours are carried out to harm or disadvantage another and might include cheating or trying to injure an opponent (Kavussanu et al., 2013). Thus, prosocial and antisocial behaviours have the potential to help or hinder others’ performance and physical and mental well-being. Research has highlighted numerous predictors of prosocial behaviour in sport, including: autonomy-supportive coaching styles (Hodge & Lonsdale, 2011), task orientation and mastery climate (Kavussanu, 2006), and characteristics of the sporting environment such as relational support from the coach, positive team attitude toward fair play, and exposure to high levels of socio-moral reasoning (Rutten et al., 2008). However, more research is needed to better understand the interplay between these behaviours and organizational functioning.

**Leadership in sport organizations.** Sport organizations offer an excellent context for the examination of leadership. In an investigation of performance leadership and management in Olympic performance directors, Arnold and Fletcher
(2011) highlighted four main areas of best practice: vision (e.g., vision development, influences on the vision, and sharing the vision), operations (e.g., financial management, strategic competition and training planning, athlete selection for competition, and upholding rules and regulations), people (e.g., staff management, lines of communication, and feedback mechanisms), and culture (e.g., establishing role awareness, and organizational and team atmosphere). In a follow up study, Fletcher, Arnold, and Molyneux (2012) provided recommendations, advice and suggestions for enhancing performance leadership and management in elite sport. Specifically, five themes emerged for leaders and managers (viz. establishing an approach, understanding roles within the team, developing contextual awareness, enhancing personal skills and strengthening relationships) and sport organizations (viz. employing the most appropriate individual, creating the optimal environment, implementing systems and structures, developing an inclusive culture and providing appropriate support).

In addition to performance leadership and management research, a growing body of leadership research in sport has examined transformational leadership theory, which posits that leaders should inspire their followers through emotional appeals to adopt high goals and perform above the level of their normal expectations (Bass, 1985). Callow, Smith, Hardy, Arthur, and Hardy (2009) examined peer leadership, team cohesion, and performance, finding task cohesion to be predicted by some transformational leadership behaviours (i.e., fostering acceptance of group goals, promoting teamwork, showing high performance expectations, and having consideration for individuals) and social cohesion to be predicted by other transformational behaviours (e.g., fostering acceptance of group goals and promoting teamwork). Further, the relationships between transformational leadership
behaviours and cohesion were moderated by performance level of the teams. Other research on transformational leadership in sport has shown these behaviours to be positively associated with leader effectiveness (Rowold, 2006), leader-inspired extra effort (Arthur, Woodman, Ong, Hardy, & Ntoumanis, 2011), satisfaction with leadership (Gomes, Lopes, & Mata, 2011), and task and social cohesion (Price & Weiss, 2011). Using transformational theory as a foundation, Arthur, Hardy, and Woodman (2012) proposed a sport-specific meta-cognitive model of leadership that centers on inspiring others by creating an inspirational vision of the future; providing the necessary support to achieve the vision; and challenging others to achieve the vision. Despite the promising findings, much remains to be examined within the domain of leadership within sport, including greater conceptual refinement and delineation from similar concepts (e.g., coaching and instruction behaviours) and examination of the efficacy of leadership interventions at multiple levels of sport organizations.

**Coaching in sport organizations.** Coaching is present in almost every organizational domain and generally refers to attempts to improve performance by facilitating the acquisition of new knowledge, skills and abilities. Indeed, coaching behaviours reflect a collection of transferable and interchangeable actions that include observing others by analysing performance, using effective and insightful questioning, assisting goal setting, and the provision of feedback to develop performance and enhance motivation. There is a rich history of using coaching methodologies as a vehicle for performance enhancement in sport as well as other high-performance domains such as business, performing arts, and military (e.g., Gould & Wright, 2012). However, much of the recent research on coaching in sport has focused on holistic models of the coaching setting to enhance coach effectiveness.
and efficacy, none of this work has examined the utility of applying coaching
behaviours in other areas of sport organizations. In an attempt to ascertain the
general value of such practices across a breadth of organizational domains, a recent
meta-analysis by Theeboom, Beersma, and van Vianen (2014) showed coaching
interventions to have a significant positive effect on outcomes such as coping ($g = .43$) and goal-directed self-regulation ($g = .74$). Further, Wagstaff et al. (2013)
recently found a one-to-one coaching intervention in an Olympic NSO to facilitate
improvements in measures of individual (e.g., emotional abilities), dyadic and group
(e.g., relationship quality and closeness), and organizational (e.g., organizational
functioning) level variables. Further research is required to replicate and extend these
findings and provide greater conceptual clarity regarding coaching behaviours in
performance domains; however, coaching interventions might benefit organizations
by impacting emotions (e.g., experience of positive emotion), attitudes (e.g.,
satisfaction, commitment, and identification) stress and well-being (e.g., developing
resilience, coping), and environments (e.g., coaching leaders to shape culture
change).

Environments in sport organizations

Sport organizations are characterised by multiple stakeholder groups (e.g.,
departments, teams) that must share resources in the pursuit of individual, team and
organizational goals. The environments in which such work is done are likely to
impact the effectiveness of this work. Therefore, a greater understanding of such
environment-related factors will benefit functioning at various organizational levels.

High performance environments in sport organizations. Research on high
performance environments focuses on the athletes’ surroundings and psychosocial
factors that may affect a performer’s mood, emotion, or motivation with an emphasis
on what characterises a high-performance environment and the development of these factors. Jones, Gittins, and Hardy (2009) presented a model of the psychological and social factors within a performance environment that impact organizational performance. They recognized individual-, group-, and organizational-level variables associated with high performance environments, which were conceptualized within the areas of leadership, performance enablers, people, and organizational climate to form the key components of the high-performance environment (HPE) model.

Pain, Harwood, and Mullen (2012) found that the use of performance environment survey data and the coach’s reflections of that data were beneficial in managing the performance environment in a soccer team. Further, team feedback meetings helped to improve athlete ownership and cohesiveness by encouraging athletes to share information and discuss issues with team preparation. The findings suggest that detailed attention to, and management of, the performance environment should help to improve team and organization functioning and performance (Pain et al., 2012). In related research, Mills, Butt, Maynard, and Harwood (2014) examined coaches’ perceptions of the factors underpinning optimal development environments within elite soccer. From the results, the authors developed a conceptual framework that explained how several factors interact and contribute to an optimal performance environment. The main components of this framework were: psychosocial architecture (e.g., player welfare, key stakeholder relationships), organizational functioning (e.g., adaptability, effective communication), physical environment (e.g., material provisions), and operating system (e.g., organizational core). The findings suggest that practitioners should focus on creating a strong, dynamic organizational culture to develop an optimal performance environment for elite player development.
Recently, Fletcher and Streeter (2016) used a case study approach to explore the high performance environment in an elite swimming team. Using Jones et al.’s (2009) four-factor model as a theoretical lens, the authors provided the first evidence for this HPE model in an elite sport context. Nevertheless, several modifications were suggested in terms of integrating additional relevant concepts and considering differential weighting of the model's components. The authors concluded that practitioners should adopt a holistic view of the performance environment in order to provide a more coordinated approach to developing high performance. They added that practitioners attempting to effectively intervene at an environmental level in elite sport will need to be able to coach leaders, facilitate performance enablers, engage people, and shape cultural change.

**Climate, culture, and change.** In their call for a research agenda on POPS, Wagstaff et al. (2012c) highlighted that three variables were of particular interest to those attempting to intervene at the environment-level in sport organizations. These variables were climate, culture, and change.

The examination of climate in sport has typically focused on the illumination of the motivational climates surrounding sport performers by investigating the behaviours of coaches, peers, and parents perceived to be motivationally relevant to athlete performance and the extent to which athletes perceive their psychological needs to be supported (Keegan, Spray, Harwood, & Lavallee, 2014). This literature has invariably demonstrated correlations between athletes’ perceptions of the climate (e.g., a mastery climate) and individual-level outcomes such as self-determined motivation, affect, enjoyment, and persistence. Indeed, Keegan et al. (2014) recently highlighted that there may be a “complex, interactive, and multifaceted motivational atmosphere around a sports performer, which contains within it the broad spectrum
of influences exerted by coaches, parents, peers and others across a variety of contexts and settings” (p. 98). The exploration of such atmospheres will likely be of great interest to organizational psychologists in sport.

In line with calls for research on culture (see Schroeder, 2010; Wagstaff et al., 2012c) researchers have recently considered the application of culture change management theories in elite sport performance team environments. That is, Cruickshank and Collins (2012) recently called for a focus on the knowledge surrounding the creation of high-performing cultures in on-field elite teams. The same authors suggested that culture change is context-dependent (i.e., employee agreement with change); context-shaped (i.e., the needs of high-ego performers, support staff, board members, fans, and media); and context-specific (i.e., scenarios of manager takeover). More recently, Cruickshank, Collins, and Minten (2013) reported a case study examining the key mechanisms and processes of a successful culture change programme at Leeds Carnegie. Interviews with team management, a specialist coach, players, and the CEO, showed culture change to be facilitated by subtly and covertly shaping the physical, structural, and psychosocial context in which support staff and players made performance-impacting choices, and regulating the ‘to and fro’ of power.

In addition to the emergence and value of research on climate and culture in sport organizations, Wagstaff et al., (2015) recently explored sport medicine and science practitioners’ experiences of organizational change using a two-year longitudinal design. The findings indicated that change occurred over four distinct stages (viz. anticipation and uncertainty, upheaval and realization, integration and experimentation, normalization and learning). The findings highlighted salient emotional, behavioural, and attitudinal experiences of medics and scientists, the
existence of poor employment practices, and direct (e.g., emotions, attitudes) and indirect (e.g., performance, turnover) implications for on-field performance following organizational change. Such findings have implications for preparing prospective sport medics and scientists for the realities of elite sport environments, sport organizations as employers and managers of change, and professional bodies responsible for the training and development of practitioners.

**Social environments in sport organizations.** Further to the emerging research on climate, culture and change, a body of literature exists representing social environments (see, for review, Martin et al., 2014) of relevance to organizational psychology in sport. In his seminal text on group dynamics, Shaw (1981) described the social environment as the interpersonal relationships that come to be established once members have assembled and begin to interact. Research on selected topics aligned with the social environment are reviewed below.

**Organizational socialisation.** In many ways, the experiences of transitioning within or between sport organizations are likely to be similar to those experienced by employees in other professions. Indeed, newcomers or rookies in sport organizations must quickly navigate various social, emotional, behavioural, language, and cultural boundaries as they transition from an outsider to in-group member, which might result in ambiguity and anxiety regarding how they should behave. Hence, sport organizations should make efforts to optimise the processes through which individuals come to understand the politics, power dynamics, history, responsibilities, norms, and cliques of the various in-groups within their environment.

Researchers have typically distinguished between institutionalised (e.g., collective, formal, sequential, fixed, serial, investiture) and individualised (e.g.,
individual, informal, disjunctive, variable, random, divestiture) socialisation processes (see Jones, 1986), with the former associated with a range of positive intrapersonal outcomes. Such outcomes include reductions in negative role perceptions (e.g., role ambiguity and role conflict), desirable psychosocial outcomes for the individual (e.g., social acceptance, self-efficacy, job satisfaction), and more committed group members that have greater intentions to remain (see, for meta-analyses, Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo, & Tucker, 2007; Saks, Uggerslev, & Fassina, 2007). Such findings are relevant to sport organizations in view of the importance of managing such environments to optimise functioning through communication and interpersonal relationships (see Wagstaff et al., 2012b). Indeed, many elite sport organizations use athlete liaison or welfare and education officers to assist with the transition from organization to organization (see Fitzpatrick, 2014). Much of the work done by liaison and welfare officers appears to include psychological strategies to manage emotional difficulties and the use of counselling skills (see Fitzpatrick, 2014). Hence, organizations might seek to recruit individuals with sport psychology backgrounds to such positions, or provide training and development opportunities to those employed in such roles to adequately and ethically prepare them for dealing with the psychological demands performers face during socialisation processes.

It should be noted that not all socialisation processes are functional for the individual or organization performance and well-being. While many socialisation processes within team environments such as initiations, rites of passage and group-bonding activities are innocuous, in extremis, these activities can be life threatening. That is, the phenomena of “hazing” relates to activities expected of someone joining a group that humiliates, degrades, abuses or endangers, regardless of the person’s
willingness to participate (Hoover, 1999). One account of hazing activities by Farrey (2003) relates to a high-school wrestler in Connecticut, USA being hog-tied and sodomised with the blunt end of a plastic knife. In examining the impact of such socialisation processes, Waldron and Krane (2005) have argued that athletes will often do whatever it takes, not only to enhance performance, but also to fit into the social structure of a team by zealously adhering to norms without critically considering the consequences of this for their behaviour or health. Elsewhere, Waldron, Lynn, and Krane (2011) have found associations between such deviant over conformity and leaving organizations and sport.

**Status and power in sport organizations.** Whilst an individual’s position within a team or organization might reflect their relative standing with respect to dimensions such as power, leadership and attractiveness (Shaw, 1981), status refers to the evaluation of that position. That is, status reflects the rank or prestige allocated to one’s position by members of a given social group. This perceived variable has potential implications for behaviour in sport organizations because of its importance for defining social environment and adjustment. Indeed, a body of research indicates that high status individuals select culturally-valued spatial positions within groups, conform to norms both more and less that low status team members depending on the situation, and are more likely to have a greater influence on the team’s performance than low status individuals (see Shaw, 1981). In an early study, Hollander (1958) noted that high status individuals were often afforded “idiosyncratic credit” to deviate from norms within teams according to previous contribution to the group’s goals. Moreover, status has been found to influence communication patterns and content (Kelly, 1951), perceptions, attributions and satisfaction (Smith & Bordonaro, 1975), and the reactions of group members to deviant behaviour (Wahrman, 1977).
Hence, it would appear that status associated with an individual’s position within a team is likely to have consequences for their behaviour toward others and the behaviour of others to the individual (Shaw, 1981). Unfortunately, little of this research has been conducted in sport contexts and future work must examine whether the importance of status in performance teams and organizations extends to sport.

Another environmentally-determined concept of potential interest to organizational psychologists - and one that is often used interchangeably with status - is power (Shaw, 1981). Bass (1960) defined power as control over others through the use of rewards and punishments. As power is likely to be influenced by subjective perceptions (i.e., who is powerful), the impact of this variable on behaviour will likely fluctuate across social environments (e.g., dyads and teams) within a given organization. That is, the influence of any individual’s behaviour within a sport organization is likely to be mediated by their relative power and the power structure of their social environment. Indeed, one might hypothesise similar emotional, attitudinal, and behavioural correlates to be associated with power as those with status. Further, the extent to which individuals employ power in order to enhance compliance with their desires and the implications of such dynamics are likely to be of interest to organizational scholars. Interestingly, the use of behaviours associated with the dark triad of personality traits (i.e., narcissism, machiavellianism, psychopathy; cf. Paulhus & Williams, 2002) have increasingly been highlighted within sport psychology research (Calum Alexander Arthur et al., 2011; Cruickshank & Collins, 2012; Fletcher & Arnold, 2011; Wagstaff et al., 2012b). Hence, researchers seeking to optimise the environments in which individuals operate within sport might also benefit by examining the prevalence and potential influence of sub-
clinical psychopathologies of individuals in the composition and leadership of teams and organizations.

**Roles in sport organizations.** An individual’s role represents the set of responsibilities he or she holds, which is a function of the position occupied within the group and is interdependent with other members (Carron & Eys, 2012). Scholars (e.g., Carron & Eys, 2012) have distinguished between task (e.g., captain), social (e.g., comedian), formal (e.g., elected or elected, with prescribed behaviours), and informal (e.g., more natural, without prescribed behaviours) roles within sport organizations. In another recent review of roles in sport teams, Martin et al. (2014) highlighted that research has typically focused on the responses to formal role processes such as behavioural manifestations (i.e., role performance) and cognitions (i.e., role ambiguity and efficacy). For example, role ambiguity has been shown to be related to cohesion, coaching competency, cognitive state anxiety, and athlete satisfaction (see Martin et al., 2014). However, Martin et al. (2014) also acknowledged that researchers have begun to investigate informal role processes and other role perceptions held by athletes (e.g., role acceptance). It is likely that research on roles within sport teams will continue to provide important insights into the behaviours and cognitions of those operating within them. Martin et al. (2014) called for future research on roles that extends the theoretical underpinning of such topics and seeks to develop validated measures of roles concepts, and interventions to optimize such phenomena within organizations.

**Psychological contracts in sport organizations.** Wagstaff et al. (2012b) highlighted the importance of managing behaviour in line with norms to optimise functioning in sport organizations. Expectations regarding such behaviours might be influenced by psychological contracts or implicit subjective beliefs regarding
perceived agreements or obligations regarding exchanges between employees and their organization (see Conway & Briner, 2005; Rousseau, 1989). The breach of such contracts is likely to have significant implications for individual emotions (e.g., anger, sadness, betrayal), and attitudes (e.g., satisfaction, intention to turnover, organizational commitment, and organizational citizenship behaviours (cf. Conway & Briner, 2005). Indeed, the examination of psychological contracts offers a potentially fruitful vehicle for better understanding expectations and consequences of norms in sport organizations.

**Conclusion**

The changing landscape of elite sport has stimulated a burgeoning body of research examining organizational psychology in sport. Particular strengths within this domain relate to the elucidation of an understanding of emotional and attitudinal phenomena, stress and well-being, key behaviours associated with optimal functioning, and environments which facilitate elite performance. This research also benefits by sampling individuals who directly and indirectly impact the functioning of sport organizations and quality of work life within them. Indeed, the research reviewed here has begun to provide insights into the predictors of sustained organizational performance and well-being in sport that might be controlled and influenced through empirically grounded intervention. Despite these fruitful endeavours, there remains much to be understood regarding organizational psychology in sport and this review has pointed to numerous potential future lines of inquiry. In providing a structure to support this research agenda, the intention here has not been to provide a comprehensive list of concepts of interest, to be used to prescribe or regulate what should be examined. Instead, the aim has been to better situate extant and potential lines of inquiry in the hope of stimulating more
systematic programmes of research to advance the field.

A salient point for consideration that has emerged from this review relates to the complexity of organizational dynamics, and the apparent intertwined and hierarchically-nested nature of the core dimensions and topics they encompass. For example, extant literature has highlighted many variables of interest that appear to transcend dimensions and areas of influence (e.g., leadership, roles). Such issues might be explained by multilevel theory and research designs (see House, Rousseau, & Thomas-Hunt, 1995; Klein & Kozlowski, 2000). Indeed, a distinguishing feature of organizational psychology research is its examination of variables that occur naturally at several levels (e.g., individual, dyadic, team, organizational, and sport). Only by acknowledging such features can researchers effectively address the complexities of how team and organizational environments influence individuals’ performance and well-being and are influenced in return. For example, according to the research presented here, the implementation of an intervention aimed at creating a high-performance environment within a sport organization would require concerted efforts across individual, team, organizational levels of analysis through the optimisation of leadership, performance enablers, people, and the organizational climate. Therefore, researchers must ensure consistency between conceptualisation and research design by integrating multilevel theory and research design or risk the pitfalls of developing incomplete and mis specified models and the exacerbation of a myth of individualism in the pursuit of ongoing sporting success.

In this chapter, the focus has been on research aligned with organizational psychology. However, as alluded to in the introductory sentiments, this reflects just one of three general I/O psychology concentrations. Indeed, no space has been given to a discourse on the importance of personnel psychology or human engineering
factors. Research on such concentrations might focus on employment practices within sport organizations and their implications for the performance and well-being of employees. Indeed, issues relating to poor employment practices in elite football have been highlighted by sport scholars (e.g., Waddington, Roderick, & Naik, 2001; Wagstaff et al., 2015), but have not been directly examined through an organizational psychology lens. Such applied research might benefit by using techniques commonly associated with personnel psychology, including the use of exit interviews when seeking to make improvements in organizational functioning. Human engineering research within sport organizations might prove the most problematic of the three, given the advanced development of sport biomechanics and technology and the work of practitioners to enhance the interface between individuals in organizations and these supports. However, it is possible that psychologists can optimise the understanding and integration of such supports if they are afforded such a role by organizations.

Finally, it is important to note that despite the nascent state of many areas of inquiry within this domain, much of the research reviewed here has used inductive research designs, grounded in the sport context to examine phenomena with divergent origins. Indeed, the recent use of ecologically valid designs to examine organizational psychology concepts in sport such as ethnography (e.g., Wagstaff et al., 2012b), action research (e.g., Wagstaff et al., 2013), and grounded theory (Cruickshank et al., 2013) are highly suitable for research in its infancy. Moreover, it is reassuring to observe that researchers have begun to develop sport specific measures of organizational-related variables (e.g., Arnold & Fletcher, 2012b; Jackson et al., 2014) as these lines of inquiry have blossomed. It is hoped that future research in this domain will continue these good practices of scientific study.
Chapter 3:
Organizational Stress in Sport
It was noted within chapter 2 that organizational stress research is one the most examined lines of enquiry within organizational psychology in sport. As the body of work within this area has evolved, so have the various stress-related terms and definitions. This chapter provides an overview of how stress-related definitions and conceptions have progressed and influenced the sport psychology literature, and subsequently, this programme of work.

Early stimulus and response-based conceptualizations within sport psychology involve external events or demands (i.e., stressors) that are placed upon an individual (Hardy et al., 1996). To elaborate, this perspective labels stressors as independent variables or sources of stress that exert demands on a performer. Over the past two decades or so, a number of researchers have used qualitative research techniques to examine the sources of stress in elite sport performers (for example, Campbell & Jones, 2002; Giacobbi, Foore, & Weinberg, 2004; Gould, Jackson, & Finch, 1993; Holt & Hogg, 2002; James & Collins, 1997). Within these studies, a range of organizational stressors have been identified, of which the majority were associated with competitive performance, the organizational environment, or personal events. These early stimulus-based studies were important in demonstrating the numerous demands that performers experience as part of their sport, and the nature of their responses to these demands. However, the broad spectrum of stressors noted within this body of research also included performers’ responses such as competitive anxiety; therefore, expressing stress as both a stimulus and a response (Fletcher et al., 2006). Conceptualizing stress as a stimulus or a response overlooks the dynamics of the complex relationship that exists between a performer and their environment.
Given the limitations of the stimulus and response, or interactional conceptualizations of stress, scholars moved towards a transactional conceptualization of stress focused on the psychological processes that connect a person with their environment. Indeed, the transactional perspective moves beyond focusing on the static components of an interaction by emphasising that stress should be viewed as an ongoing transaction between the environmental demands and a person’s resources (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Therefore, according to the transactional conceptualization, stress cannot be viewed as one variable alone. Indeed, the notion of relational meaning (i.e., the meaning a person construes from their relationship with their environment) and the evaluative process of appraisal is integral to transactional definitions of stress (Lazarus & Launier, 1978). To elaborate, environmental demands and personal characteristics interact and influence the evaluative process of appraisal, leading to cognitive-evaluative reactions and give meaning to an encounter (Fletcher et al., 2006).

In an attempt to aid understanding of stress-related cognitions and behaviours experienced within sport, researchers have differentiated between major categories of stress in sport performers; namely, competitive and organizational stress (e.g., Hanton et al, 2005). Rather than stemming from performers’ competitive performance experiences, organizational stress originates from the highly complex social and organizational environment that athletes operate within. Recognising the potential to impact performers’ well-being and performance (Jones, 2002), early researchers attempted to apply Lazarus’s (1966) conceptualization of organizational stress by conceiving organizational stress in sport as, “an interaction between the individual and the sport organization within which that individual is operating” (Woodman & Hardy, 2001, p. 208). Although pertinent, defining organizational
stress as an “interaction” as opposed to a “transaction” fails to recognize that a person, the environment, and psychological reactions all mutually affect one another (Fletcher et al., 2006). Therefore, considering the dynamics of transaction and relational meaning, Fletcher et al. (2006) later defined organizational stress in sport as, “an ongoing transaction between an individual and the environmental demands associated primarily and directly with the organization within which he or she is operating” (p. 359).

In an attempt to provide a theoretical model that reflects the sequence of events involved in transactions, Fletcher and Fletcher (2005) developed the meta-model of stress, emotions and performance. The model builds on the conceptual advances provided by viewing stress as a transactional, dynamic process and outlines the theoretical relationships between key processes, moderators, and consequences of the stress process. The meta-model was intended to provide potential for any person functioning within a demanding “performance” environment (Fletcher et al., 2006), and has provided the theoretical underpinning of several studies within sport (e.g., Arnold & Fletcher, 2012a; Arnold et al., 2013). While a full evaluation of the meta-model is beyond the scope of this chapter, the model provides a theoretical framework for the work presented in this thesis, and therefore, the main components of the model (i.e., stressors, appraisal, responses, coping, and outcomes) warrant discussion (see, for a review, Fletcher et al., 2006). Simply, the premise of the model is that stressors arise from the environment that an individual operates in, are mediated by the processes of perception, appraisal, and coping, and consequently, result in positive or negative responses, feelings, and outcomes. This ongoing process is moderated by various personal and situational characteristics.
In line with their definition of organizational stress, Fletcher et al. (2006) defined organizational stressors as, “the environmental demands (i.e., stimuli) associated primarily and directly with the organization within which an individual is operating”. Within their review, Fletcher and colleagues (2006) proposed a three-level hierarchical framework of organizational stressors with five general dimensions (viz. factors intrinsic to the sport, roles in the sport organization, sport relationships and interpersonal demands, athletic career and performance development issues, and organizational structure and climate of the sport). By integrating recent developments in organizational science (Cooper, Cooper, Dewe, & O’Driscoll, 2001) and sport psychology (Fletcher et al., 2006), this framework overcomes the concerns raised regarding the theoretical underpinning of previous illustrations presented in a number of early studies (see Woodman & Hardy, 2001a, 2001b). While this framework has received support from a number of studies and reports (e.g., Arnold & Fletcher, 2012b; Mellalieu, Neil, Hanton, & Fletcher, 2009; Tabei et al., 2012), it was influenced by organizational stressors from a range of non-sport occupations (Arnold & Fletcher, 2012a, 2012b).

Within sport, researchers have qualitatively explored the content and quantity of stressors experienced by elite and non-elite performers. Indeed, Hanton et al. (2005) found that elite performers experience and recall more demands associated with their sport organization than with competitive performance. In addition, the demands associated with competitive performance were reported to be less varied and more predictable than organizational stressors. More recently, Fletcher et al. (2012) found that elite performers encountered more stressors than non-elite performers, and that the type and frequency of organizational stressors experienced varied across skill levels (e.g., elite performers reported more stressors associated
with travel and accommodation arrangements, income and funding, and media attention than non-elite performers).

To advance the body of knowledge within this area, Arnold and Fletcher (2012a) developed a taxonomic classification of the organizational stressors experienced by athletes following a synthesis of the research area. As a result, four categories of organizational stressors were produced: leadership and personnel issues, cultural and team issues, logistical and environmental issues, and performance and personal issues. Support for this classification of organizational stressors has been received by several studies (Didymus & Fletcher, 2012, 2014; Sohal, Gervis, & Rhind, 2013).

Although many studies have contributed to the knowledge of organizational stressors experienced by sport performers using qualitative research designs (e.g., Fletcher & Hanton, 2003; Hanton, Fletcher, & Coughlan, 2005b; Kristiansen et al., 2012), a lack of psychometric work in this area meant that there was no method of assessing these phenomena. To address this issue, Arnold et al. (2013) developed and validated the Organizational Stressor Indicator for Sport Performers (OSI-SP), providing researchers with the opportunity to quantitatively measure the organizational stressors that performers encounter. In the most recent study within this area, Arnold et al. (2014) used the OSI-SP and reported significant demographic differences (i.e., gender, competition level, and team or individual sport type) in the organizational stressors experienced. For example, athletes performing at a higher competitive level (e.g., national or international) experienced typically experienced a higher frequency, intensity, and duration of organizational stressors compared to lower levels (e.g., regional, county, or club).
In addition to the stressors encountered by individuals, the cognitive mechanism of appraisal is another important component of the stress process. According to the meta-model (Fletcher et al., 2006) and transactional theory (Lazarus, 1966), there are two types of appraisal: primary (i.e., evaluating whether an encounter is relevant to one’s values, goals, beliefs, and situational intentions) and secondary (i.e., identifying whether one has the coping resources to deal with harm/loss, threat, and challenge). Although these types of appraisal can occur simultaneously during a transaction, secondary appraisal will only occur if meaning is attributed to an encounter. Recent research exploring cognitive appraisals of organizational stressors in sport has found that organizational stressors are largely appraised as threatening and harmful, with little perceived control, and few coping resources available (Didymus & Fletcher, 2012; Hanton et al., 2012). In addition, these appraisals can be influenced by the situational properties of the stressors encountered such as novelty and duration (Didymus & Fletcher, 2012). Overall, the cognitive process of appraisal is salient in determining how performers and personnel in sport react to the organizational stressors that they encounter.

Depending on how an individual evaluates a stressor, they may exhibit a physiological, psychological, or behavioural stress response (Cooper et al., 2001; Fletcher et al., 2006). In a study exploring performers’ responses to stressors encountered within sport organizations, Fletcher, Hanton, and Wagstaff (2012) found that performers responded in a variety of emotional (e.g., anger, anxiety, distress, happiness, resentment), attitudinal (e.g., beliefs, motivation, satisfaction), and behavioural (e.g., verbal and physical) ways. Particularly prominent within the category of psychological responses are the emotions and their associated cognitive and somatic symptoms. Indeed, in accordance with Fletcher and colleagues (2012),
Arnold et al. (2013) found organizational stressor encounters were linked to positive and negative emotional responses and feeling states in athletes (i.e., anger, anxiety, dejection, excitement, and happiness).

According to the transactional stress theory, once an individual has appraised and responded to a stressor, they are likely to report cognitions and behaviours that are designed to deal with a stressful encounter or its consequences (Dewe, Cox, & Ferguson, 1993). According to theory (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984), an individual can employ either problem-focused (i.e., attempt to deal with the environmental demands encountered) or emotion-focused (i.e., attempt to deal with the emotional response to stressors). These two categories of coping strategies are presented within the meta-model (Fletcher et al., 2006) and focus on removing or reducing the amount, frequency, and intensity of the stressors or modifying the individual’s response through personal or situational moderators to produce a favourable reappraisal of the stressors (Fletcher et al., 2006). Within sport, research has shown that performers employ a range of coping strategies in response to stressors (Didymus & Fletcher, 2014; Kristiansen, Halvari, et al., 2012; Kristiansen, Murphy, & Roberts, 2012; Kristiansen & Roberts, 2010; Wagstaff, Hanton, & Fletcher, 2007; Weston, Thelwell, Bond, & Hutchings, 2009) such as emotion-focused, problem-focused, social support, avoidance, and cognitive strategies. In addition, some of these coping strategies were employed in response to multiple stressors, whereas others were selected in response to a particular stressor.

Depending on the effectiveness of the coping strategies selected, the experience of organizational stressors can result in a wide range of well-being and performance-related outcomes. Studies investigating the psychological and performance-related outcomes for individuals operating within sport are limited;
However, in their study of soccer players, Tabei et al. (2012) found that organizational stressors were linked to burnout symptoms. In addition, organizational stress experiences have been linked to self-reported satisfaction with performance in athletes of varying competitive standards (see Arnold et al., 2013; Fletcher et al., 2012).

While reflecting on the theory and research, it is clear that although the area has advanced considerably, there are still significant gaps where work remains to be done. For example, the conceptualization of organizational stress is as an ongoing, complex transaction between individuals and their environment; however, the majority of studies to date have only focused on one component of the stress process (e.g., stressors, appraisal, responses, coping, or outcomes). Although such work has been invaluable in providing knowledge about performers’ experiences, research investigating multiple components of the stress process that link them is needed to further advance what is already known about the complexity of organizational stress in sport. Further, there have been no studies to date examining the potential influences of personal and situational characteristics that moderate or mediate the organizational stress process. Investigating potential moderators and mediators of the stress process is important and may contribute to knowledge of adaptive characteristics, climates, and strategies that help performers manage the organizational stressors they experience.

In regards to the research methods employed by researchers to date, most studies have employed various qualitative (e.g., interviews, diaries, meta-interpretation, grounded theory) methods using an interpretivist approach, providing fundamental knowledge about sport performers’ stress experiences. However, to progress the research area further, the use of quantitative (e.g., questionnaires,
mediation and moderation analysis) research methods are needed. Indeed, the recent
development and validation of the OSI-SP (Arnold et al., 2013) has provided
researchers with an excellent opportunity to quantitatively measure organizational
stressors.

To conclude, the meta-model of stress, emotions, and performance provides a
theoretical underpinning for researchers investigating performers’ experiences of
organizational stressors in sport. Indeed, the body of work on organizational stress in
sport has been labelled one of the fastest-developing and most salient in sport
psychology (see Wagstaff, 2017, 2019b, 2019a). However, little is known about how
organizational stressors affect performance and well-being in sport or the potential
moderating or mediating factors that might influence the main components of the
stress process. To address this gap in knowledge, chapters 4 to 6 within this
programme of research will systematically examine potential moderators and
mediators aligned with organizational stressors in sport using quantitative research
methods and analysis.
Chapter 1 provided an overview of the emergence of organizational psychology in sport and proposed a research agenda for this area. Within the review, emotions and attitudes were identified as one of the four core areas of research within this domain. Taking the first of these, namely, emotions, there appears to be a wealth of opportunities for the study of emotion management and regulation. Additionally, it was noted in the previous chapter (chapter 3) that organizational stress research remains the most examined line of enquiry within organizational psychology in sport research. The following chapter presents the findings of a study that examined the relationship between these variables and burnout and turnover intention.
Chapter 4:

Emotional labour, organizational stress, burnout, and turnover intentions in sport: A cross-sectional study (Study 1)
Abstract

While a growing body of research has examined the types of organizational stressors encountered by individuals and their allied responses, little is known about how such individuals manage their emotional responses to these stressors or the consequences of such behaviours. This chapter presents novel findings from a cross-sectional study examining the moderating role that emotional labour plays in the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressor experience, burnout, and turnover intentions in sport. Participants (n = 487) completed measures of organizational stressors (OSI-SP), emotional labour (ELS), burnout (ABQ), and turnover intentions. Results showed that surface acting moderated the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and burnout in sport. Further, surface acting acted as an important mechanism through which burnout mediated the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and turnover intentions. These results highlight the importance of surface acting in understanding how individuals respond to organizational stressors encountered in sport, expanding our understanding of the positive and negative responses component of the meta-model of stress, emotions and performance. These findings also highlight potentially deleterious emotion-management behaviours that practitioners might consider when aiming to support individuals encountering organizational stressors in sport.

Keywords: stress, surface acting, well-being, dropout, emotion regulation
Introduction

In line with the growing acknowledgement of the importance of organizational issues in elite sport (see Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009; Wagstaff & Larner, 2015), a healthy body of work has emerged to indicate that participation in competitive sport is typically characterized by a wide range of demands that could lead to a disruption in performance and impaired health and well-being (see also Fletcher et al., 2006). Moreover, a category of demands that are particularly prevalent and problematic for athletes are those associated with the organization within which they operate (see, for reviews, Arnold & Fletcher, 2012b; Fletcher et al., 2012; Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009). Indeed, sport organizations have become increasingly complex, comprising of various intra-group, inter-group, and organizational levels, with all members of the organization contributing to its functioning and effectiveness (Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009). The present research aims to answer Fletcher and Wagstaff’s (2009) call for research incorporating a range of stakeholders (e.g., athletes, coaches, managers, sport science and medicine staff) in psychological research in sport organizations.

With regards to the prevalence of these demands, sport performers have been found to experience and recall more organizational stressors than those associated with competitive performances (Hanton et al., 2012). Indeed, the area of organizational stress and well-being has received more research attention than any other area within organizational psychology in sport (Wagstaff & Larner, 2015). Much of this research has been conceptually aligned with the meta-model of stress and emotions (Fletcher & Fletcher, 2005), which posits stress as a process that exists between an individual and their environment. In line with this model, Fletcher et al. (2006) defined organizational stress in sport as, “an ongoing transaction between an individual and the environmental demands associated primarily and directly with the
organization within which he or she is operating” (p. 329). To elaborate, recent research indicates that individuals respond to a range of environmental demands (i.e., organizational stressors) in a variety of emotional, behavioural, and attitudinal ways (Fletcher, Hanton, & Wagstaff, 2012), that may have diverse consequences for burnout (Tabei et al., 2012), dissatisfaction (Noblet et al., 2003), negative emotions (Fletcher, Hanton, & Wagstaff, 2012), impaired preparation for and performance in major competitions (Daniel Gould et al., 1999) and substantially affected health and well-being (DiBartolo & Schaffer, 2002).

In keeping with Fletcher et al.’s (2006) definition of organizational stress, much research has sought to identify the types of organizational stressors encountered by individuals in sport (e.g., Arnold, Fletcher, & Daniels, 2016; Fletcher, Hanton, Mellalieu, & Neil, 2010; Fletcher et al., 2012; Kristiansen, Murphy, & Roberts, 2012). In a synthesis of this research, Arnold and Fletcher (2012a) developed a taxonomic classification of stressors in sport that included four main categories (viz. leadership and personnel, cultural and team, logistical and environmental, and performance and personal issues). In line with this taxonomy, Arnold et al. (2013) presented a series of studies describing its development and validation of the Organizational Stressor Indicator for Sport Performers (OSI-SP). More recently, Arnold et al. (2016) used the OSI-SP to identify demographic differences (i.e., gender, competition level, and team or individual sport type) in performers’ experiences of organizational stressors, providing a stimulus for future research to examine additional moderating variables aligned with organizational stressors. In addition to the identification and measurement of organizational stressors in sport, researchers have explored individuals’ responses to these demands
including, but not limited to, athlete burnout (e.g., Fletcher et al., 2012; Kristiansen, Roberts, et al., 2011; Tabei et al., 2012).

Within sport, athlete burnout has been described within a psychosocial framework comprising three key components: physical and emotional exhaustion (i.e., perceived depletion of energy due to the demands of sport participation and performance), sport devaluation (i.e., diminished interest in and negative attitude towards sports participation), and reduced athletic accomplishment (i.e., unfulfilled goals and a sense of constantly falling short of performance standards) (Raedeke, 1997). While a number of conceptual approaches have been put forth to explain burnout (see, for review, Cresswell & Eklund, 2006), recently an integrated model of burnout (see Gustafsson, Kenttä, & Hassmén, 2011) has been proposed that incorporates antecedents, early signs, key dimensions, consequences, personality factors, coping and the environment. Indeed, identifying antecedents that contribute to burnout in sport is of central importance to current models, with researchers (see Gustafsson, Hassmén, Kenttä, & Johansson, 2008) pointing to numerous situational and organizational antecedents of burnout in elite athletes.

The importance of investigating burnout within sport organizations stems from the detrimental impact it can have on health, well-being, and performance. Indeed, burnout has been associated with negative affective, cognitive, motivational, and behavioural consequences such as decreased performance, overtraining, reduced sense of accomplishment, depressed mood, feelings of helplessness, diminished motivation and eventual withdrawal from sport (Cresswell & Eklund, 2006b; Goodger, Gorely, Lavallee, & Harwood, 2007; Gustafsson et al., 2008, 2011).

Although stressors are an important component of the burnout process, not all individuals who experience stress will burnout or withdraw from sport (Raedeke,
Therefore, to better understand why individuals report different outcomes to similar organizational stressors, research might examine the role of potential moderating and mediating variables, including personal and situational characteristics and various cognitive, emotional, and attitudinal phenomena (see Arnold et al., 2016; Didymus & Fletcher, 2012; Fletcher et al., 2006; Hanton et al., 2012; Sarkar & Fletcher, 2014; Tabei et al., 2012). Indeed, a growing body of research (Fletcher et al., 2006; Fletcher, Hanton, Mellalieu, et al., 2012; Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009; Lane et al., 2012; Tamminen & Crocker, 2013; Wagstaff et al., 2012a, 2012b) has highlighted the importance of emotion regulation (i.e., monitoring, evaluating, and modifying emotional reactions) for performance and well-being outcomes in sport organizations. For example, Wagstaff et al. (2012a) noted the importance of regulating one’s emotions and aligning them with the expectations and social norms of the organization.

The need to manage emotions to fit with the expectations and social norms of the sport organization (see Wagstaff et al., 2012b, 2012a) aligns with the concept of emotional labour (Hochschild, 1983). Emotional labour has been defined as, “the process of regulating both feelings and expressions for the organizational goals” (Grandey, 2000). To elaborate, individuals will display organizationally-desirable emotional expressions regardless of the emotions that they are actually experiencing at that time (Grandey, 2000; Hochschild, 1983). According to Hochschild (1983), there are two main ways to engage in emotional labour: through surface acting (i.e., only regulating emotional expressions) or deep acting (i.e., consciously modifying feelings to express the desired emotions). Research conducted in non-sport organizations has shown deep acting to be associated with more positive outcomes compared to surface acting (see, for review, Hülsheger & Schewe, 2011). To
elaborate, deep acting, which occurs earlier in the emotion-generation process and involves reappraisal, has been shown to have positive outcomes such as greater personal accomplishment, job satisfaction, personal efficacy, and performance for employees (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2003). Conversely, surface acting, which occurs later on in the emotion-generation process, has been associated with more negative outcomes such as turnover intentions, actual turnover, reduced job performance, and depersonalisation (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Chau, Dahling, Levy, & Diefendorff, 2009; Goodwin, Groth, & Frenkel, 2011). Further, emerging research (e.g., Lee & Chelladurai, 2015; Rogers, Creed, & Searle, 2014) indicates that the management of emotions through surface acting may lead to negative well-being outcomes such as depressive symptoms and burnout.

In line with the potentially deleterious implications of emotion management, a body of research exists, which collectively indicates that withdrawal behaviours may be an outcome of emotional labour (e.g., Brotheridge & Lee, 2003; Grandey, 2000). Moreover, Chau et al. (2009) argued that surface acting may contribute to increased turnover of employees due to its effortful nature, creation of emotional dissonance, and associated emotional exhaustion. Within sport, Wagstaff (2014) found emotional suppression (i.e., surface acting) resulted in a 3.3% performance decrement on a 10k cycling time trial. Considering the potential ramifications and the requirements on individuals to display various emotions as part of their role and the necessity to regulate their own and others’ emotions to maintain interpersonal relationships and improve organizational functioning (see Wagstaff et al., 2012a, 2012b), it is surprising that no research has examined the interaction of such phenomena.
The purpose of the study presented here was to examine the relationship between organizational stressors and burnout in sport, with particular focus on the potential moderating role of surface acting, and the perceived impact that these relationships have on subsequent turnover intentions. The main study hypotheses were as follows: the frequency of organizational stressors will be positively related to burnout in individuals operating in sport organizations (H1); there will be a positive relationship between burnout and turnover intentions in individuals operating in sport organizations (H2); the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and burnout in sport will be moderated by surface acting such that the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and burnout will be stronger in individuals with high levels of surface acting (H3); and burnout will mediate the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and turnover intentions. This indirect effect will be moderated by surface acting such that the indirect relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and turnover intentions through burnout will be positive and stronger in individuals with high levels of surface acting (H4). Figure 4.1 provides a visual representation of the hypothesised research model.
Figure 4.1. Hypothesised model for organizational stressors, surface acting, burnout, and turnover intention.

Methods

Participants and procedure

Previous research examining organizational stressors in sport has typically recruited small, homogenous samples. In line with recommendations from prominent researchers in the area (i.e., Arnold et al., 2016; Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009), and to allow for a comprehensive first study examining moderators in the relationship between several components of the organizational stress process, a large and diverse sample of sport performers and key stakeholders were recruited for this study. Indeed, 487 participants from a variety of individual and team sports (e.g., football, cricket, netball) took part in the study. The age of participants ranged from 16 to 60 years ($M = 22.8$, $SD = 8.45$). At the time of data collection, all participants were operating within sport organizations as either athletes ($n = 389$), coaches ($n = 74$), performance directors ($n = 7$), or sport scientists and medics ($n = 17$). Within their organizations, participants were operating at a variety of levels ranging from club ($n = 183$), county ($n = 121$), regional ($n = 62$), national ($n = 75$), and international ($n = $...
Participants were recruited via opportunity sampling and online distribution. A link to a web-based online questionnaire or a paper hard-copy of the questionnaire was sent out to all participants. Prior to data collection, a favourable ethical opinion was received and information about the nature of the study and issues of confidentiality and anonymity were explained to all participants.

**Measures**

A range of validated questionnaires were used to address the research hypotheses and measured organizational stressors, emotional labour, burnout, and turnover intentions respectively. Both online and paper versions of the questionnaire were piloted prior to the main study but as this did not reveal any deficiencies in the design, format or length of the questionnaire, no changes were made.

**Organizational Stressor Indicator for Sport Performers (OSI-SP).** The 23-item OSI-SP (Arnold et al., 2013) was used to assess the frequency of a range of organizational stressors encountered by sport individuals. Arnold et al. (2013) stated using the frequency scale alone would be adequate for researchers requiring a shorter version of the indicator. Therefore, items were measured in relation to the frequency of each organizational stressor on a Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 5 (always). The five subscales on the OSI-SP were: goals and development, logistics and operations, team and culture, coaching, and selection. For the present study, all five frequency subscales showed acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = .66$ to .84).

**Emotional labour Scale (ELS).** The 15-item self-report ELS (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003) measures six facets of emotional display, including the frequency, intensity, and variety of the emotional display, and surface and deep acting. Higher scores on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (never) to 5 (always) indicate greater
emotional labour. Questionnaire items where adapted to the context of study with the word “job” being replaced with the word “role”; for example, “on an average day, how frequently do you express particular emotions needed for your role”. Internal consistency Cronbach’s alpha for the surface acting subscale was .76.

**Athlete Burnout Questionnaire (ABQ).** Athlete burnout was assessed using the 15-item ABQ (Raedeke & Smith, 2001). The ABQ comprises of three subscales designed to assess reduced sense of accomplishment, sport devaluation, and emotional/physical exhaustion. Items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). Higher total average scores on the ABQ indicated a greater degree of burnout. Internal consistency Cronbach’s alphas for the three subscales were .75 for reduced accomplishment, .78 for sport devaluation, and .88 for physical and emotional exhaustion.

**Coach Burnout Questionnaire (CBQ).** Coaches, performance directors, and sport scientists and medics included in the sample completed the CBQ. The CBQ is a 15-item measure that is reworded to assess burnout in coaches. The original ABQ question stems are altered for the CBQ to reflect coaching rather than athletic participation in sport. For example, “I’m accomplishing many worthwhile things in [sport]” is changed to “I’m accomplishing many worthwhile things coaching [sport].” Examination of fit, clarity and the meaning of revised items has found the CBQ to have appropriate content validity and modification of items, with acceptable Cronbach’s alphas (between .81 and .94) being reported (Harris & Ostrow, 2008). The CBQ was selected as it discriminates between dimensions of burnout in a sports context that previous measures of burnout do not (Lundkvist, Stenling, Gustafsson, & Hassmén, 2014). The CBQ was also deemed appropriate to use for performance directors and sport scientists and medics given their substantive coaching nature of
their roles. The title of “coach” is commonly used interchangeably for performance directors (e.g., head coach) and support staff (e.g., strength and conditioning coach) (see Wagstaff, 2016).

**Turnover intentions.** Turnover intentions were assessed using the three items (Kim & Stoner, 2008): “In the next few months I intend to leave this organization”, “In the next few years I intend to leave this organization”, and “I occasionally think about leaving this organization”. Items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Kim and Stoner (2008) reported a Cronbach’s alpha for internal consistency of .76. For the present study, internal consistency was found to be acceptable with a Cronbach’s alpha of .77.

**Data analysis**

It was deemed appropriate due to the exploratory nature of this study to group participants together for the purpose of analysis. To investigate whether the effect of organizational stressors on burnout varied in magnitude and nature as a function of surface acting, a simple moderation analysis was used. In addition, to examine whether the effect of organizational stressors on turnover intentions through burnout varied as a function of surface acting, a moderated mediation analysis was used (Hayes, 2013). Traditional techniques to test for moderation and mediation suffer from several problems including low statistical power and the inability to test multiple proposed moderators or mediators together (Hayes, 2012). Therefore, the present study used Hayes’s (2012) PROCESS macro, with 1000 bootstrap resamples and 95% confidence intervals to test indirect effects for significance at different values of the moderator (i.e., surface acting). This regression-based path analytic
framework allows the input of data, configuration and estimation of two and three-way interactions in moderation models.

The mean frequency of organizational stressors was entered into the moderation and moderated mediation analysis within PROCESS. Whilst PROCESS allows for multiple moderating variables and covariates, it will only allow for one independent variable, and therefore, will not permit for all five organizational stressor subscales to be separated and included within the analysis. However, the multidimensionality of the concepts and measures used within this study are acknowledged by reporting the means and intercorrelations of the separate variable subscales.

Results

Preliminary analysis

Table 4.1 shows the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for all study variable dimensions. In support of Hypothesis 1, there was a positive relationship found between the frequency of organizational stressors and mean burnout ($r = .32, p < .001$). Surface acting was also positively related to burnout ($r = .31, p < .001$) and turnover intentions item 3, “I occasionally think about leaving this organization” ($r = .14, p < .01$). In addition, mean burnout was positively related to turnover intentions ($r = .37, p < .001$), confirming Hypothesis 2.
Table 4.1. Correlations and Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. OSISP Freq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OSISP Int</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OSISP Dur</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OSISP G&amp;D</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. OSISP L&amp;O</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. OSISP T&amp;Cu</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. OSISP Co</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. OSISP S</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Deep acting</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Burnout</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. PEE</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. SD</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. RA</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. TI</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. TI1</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. TI2</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. TI3</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>10.97</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>12.75</td>
<td>7.70</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: G & D: goals and development; L & O: logistics and operations; T & Cu: team and culture; Co: coaching; S: selection; PEE: physical and emotional exhaustion; SD: sport devaluation; RA: reduced accomplishment; TI: turnover intention. **p < .01; * p < .05 (2-tailed)
Testing for moderation

The simple moderation results are presented in Table 4.2. Consistent with Hypothesis 3, surface acting moderated the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and burnout ($F (3, 483) = 33.03, p = <.001, R^2 = .20$). For every one unit increase in stressor frequency, there was a .95 increase in burnout $b = .95, t(483) = 5.67, p < .001$ and for every one unit increase in surface acting, there was a .87 increase in burnout ($b = .87, t(483) = 5.77, p < .001$). The interaction between stressor frequency and surface acting was $b = .46, t(483) = 3.02, p < .05$.

Table 4.2

Simple Moderation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>88.81</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[11.05, 11.54]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surface acting</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.58, 1.18]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSISP Frequency</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.62, 1.28]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSISP Freq x surface acting</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.16, .76]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LLCI: lower limit confidence interval; ULCI: upper limit confidence interval.

aBootstrapped sample size = 1,000. b95% confidence intervals.

To illustrate the nature of this interaction, the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors, surface acting, and burnout is displayed
graphically in Figure 4.2 (with one standard deviation above and below the mean of surface acting). Interaction slopes for stressor frequency predicting burnout showed that at low levels of surface acting burnout scores increased by .54 ($b = .54$, $t(483) = 2.36, p < .01$) compared to athletes who reported high levels of surface acting, for whom burnout scores increased by 1.37 ($b = 1.37$, $t(483) = 6.65, p < .001$).

**Figure 4.2.** Plot of the interaction between the frequency of organizational stressors and surface acting in predicting burnout.

**Testing for moderated mediation**

A moderated-mediation model was used to test whether the indirect effect of the frequency of organizational stressors on turnover intentions through burnout is moderated by surface acting (Figure 4.3). There was a conditional indirect effect of the frequency of organizational stressors on turnover intentions through mean burnout (index of moderated-mediation = .27, 95% CI [.10, .47]). Specifically, the indirect effect of organizational stressors on turnover intentions through burnout was positive and increased with higher levels of surface acting (Table 4.3). The
conditional direct effect was also moderated, as indicated by a statistically significant interaction (see Hayes, 2012). Indeed, the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and mean burnout was positive and significant when surface acting was high \( (b = .70, p < .05) \) but non-significant when equal to its mean \( (b = .42, p = .12) \) or when surface acting was low \( (b = .16, p = .66) \). Thus, the mediational effect of burnout in the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and turnover intentions were stronger in those with high levels of surface acting, confirming Hypothesis 4.

Table 4.3

*Conditional Indirect Effects of Organizational Stressor Frequency on Turnover Intentions (Through Burnout) at Three Levels of Surface Acting*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface acting</th>
<th>( b ) (SE)</th>
<th>LL 95% CI</th>
<th>UL 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-1SD (-.90)</td>
<td>.33 (.14)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (.00)</td>
<td>.57 (.12)</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1SD (.90)</td>
<td>.81 (.16)</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LL: lower limit; CI: confidence interval; UL: upper limit; SD: standard deviation; M: mean.

\(^a\)Bootstrap sample size = 1,000. \(^b\)95% confidence intervals.
Figure 4.3. Moderated-mediation model with surface acting as a moderator. *p < .05
Discussion

This study provides the first empirical examination of emotional labour (i.e., surface acting) in the context of organizational stressors and burnout in sport and offers a valuable insight into the role these constructs might play in such organizations. These findings serve to highlight the importance of surface acting in understanding how individuals respond to organizational stressors they encounter in sport.

Our results show that frequency of organizational stressors was positively associated with all three dimensions of burnout in sport. This finding is consistent with Tabei et al. (2012), who reported a positive relationship between organizational stressors and burnout in football players. Such findings also reinforce the notion that the organization of sport can create climates associated with higher incidences of burnout for individuals (Cresswell & Eklund, 2006b; Daniel Gould, Tuffey, Udry, & Loehr, 1996). Given the emerging findings pertaining to the important role emotional phenomena play in sport organizations (Wagstaff, 2014; Wagstaff et al., 2012b, 2012a, 2013), it is perhaps not surprising that organizational-stressor dimensions were most strongly correlated to physical and emotional exhaustion burnout scores in the present research. This observation also lends support to the assertion that physical and emotional exhaustion captures the ‘core meaning’ of burnout (see Cropanzano, Rupp, & Byrne, 2003).

The finding that surface acting moderates turnover intentions through burnout is salient because such findings significantly extend extant cross-sectional findings in this domain and provides empirical support for several hypotheses of the meta-model of stress and emotions (Fletcher & Fletcher, 2005). Indeed, the results of
this study show that at comparable stressor levels, surface acting increases burnout and turnover intention. One explanation for this may be that surface acting, which requires expressive suppression of socially undesirable emotions is effortful and drains limited mental resources (e.g., Richards & Gross, 2000). These self-regulatory cognitive and emotional resources are important for the intra- and inter-personal processes that demand emotion regulation within sport organizations (Wagstaff et al., 2012b, 2012a, 2013). Hence, the level of self-regulatory resources (i.e., sufficient or depleted) may account for the different well-being and performance outcomes (e.g., burnout and turnover intentions) for individuals performing emotional labour.

The findings reported here suggest that emotional labour has significant explanatory potential for psychosocial dynamics and outcomes in sport, specifically, that surface acting is likely to lead to negative outcomes such as burnout and turnover intentions. Hence, it would appear that the use of surface acting is maladaptive and should be discouraged, yet the author is reluctant to make such conclusions or recommendations at this time. To elaborate, in light of the negative outcomes associated with surface acting observed in the present study, one might question why individuals employ such strategies. In attempting to fathom such behaviour, previous research on organizational stressors in sport (see Hanton et al., 2012) might offer insight. Indeed, Hanton et al., (2012) found that when encountering organizational stressors in sport, individuals perceived them to be largely negative, and appraised themselves to have little control and limited resources to cope with such demands. Such findings offer insight into why individuals might employ surface acting; that is, because they do not think they can control or resolve the demand through problem-focused action, they supress their emotional response to it. Therefore, researchers should be encouraged to examine the
cognitive determinants of surface acting to better understand why individuals use such strategies despite the associated negative wellbeing consequences. In terms of the author’s reticence to advise the universal avoidance of surface acting, it is noteworthy that the consequences of acute versus chronic surface acting are not well understood, and it is possible that there are times when surface acting might be an effective short-term strategy (e.g., to avoid interpersonal conflict). Clearly, further research is required to better understand the complexity of emotional labour in sport organizations.

In addition to examining the complexity of the emotional labour process in sport, researchers might seek to develop and evaluate emotion-regulation interventions for promoting well-being and retaining talent and participation numbers in sport organizations. For example, in a non-sport sample, Parkinson and Totterdell (1999) trained employees to use either engagement strategies (i.e., direct attention towards current mood and challenges) or social support strategies (i.e., divert attention away from the current situation). Those employees who used engagement strategies to experience more positive moods were better at withstanding emotional demands than those taught social support strategies. Further, there exists a body of research in non-sport organizations evaluating the effectiveness of burnout prevention interventions. In a review of this literature, Awa, Plaumann, and Walter (2010) observed that the majority of interventions were directed at the individual level (68%), with 8% being aimed at organizational change, and 24% were a combination of both. The authors concluded their review by arguing that a combination of both intervention types should be further investigated, optimized and practiced.
There are several strengths aligned with the present research. Indeed, this study provides a comprehensive first examination of organizational stressors, well-being outcomes and turnover intention that extends quantitative research in organizational psychology in sport. Further, this study significantly advances the organizational stressor theory and research in sport by identifying surface acting as a moderating variable that can influence the impact of organizational stressors. This provides support for the various components of the meta-model of stress and emotion (Fletcher & Fletcher, 2005), as well as furthering theoretical understanding of the stages of the stress process. Nevertheless, as with all studies, there are limitations of the present research. One limitation of the present research was the absence of appraisal data. According to the meta-model of stress, appraisals play a key role in the stress process. Nonetheless, as appraisals are highly individualised, these phenomena are difficult to measure using existent quantitative methods and empirical examinations of organizational stress appraisals remain a key area for future research (cf. Didymus & Fletcher, 2012; Hanton et al., 2012). The absence of multilevel analyses allowing for handling of the potentially clustered nature of the data is also a potential limitation. However, very few participants were from the same sport or organization as others, and therefore, it is unlikely that data were skewed by organizational-level variables. In addition, the OSI-SP was developed and validated with a specific population in mind (i.e., athletes) and therefore, required slight modification when used with other populations (i.e., coaches, managers, sport scientists and medics). To aid future research wanting to identify and measure organizational stressors among other key stakeholders operating within sport, there is a need to develop and validate the OSI for other sport populations. Finally, it was beyond the scope of the present research to assess intensity and duration of stressors
in addition to frequency using the OSI-SP. Therefore, another potential area for future research would be to investigate these dimensions, particularly in relation to the experience of burnout and turnover intention.

In putting these findings into perspective, the present study significantly advances current stress theory and research and empirically links organizational stressors and burnout in sport. Further, the present study advances emotional theory and research by identifying surface acting as a moderating variable in the relationships between the frequency of organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intentions. These findings have the potential to assist sport organizations to change individuals’ experiences of organizational stressors and emotional labour and subsequently reduce individuals’ burnout and their desire to leave their organization.
Foreword to Chapter 5

The previous chapter presented the findings of the first empirical investigation of emotional labour in the context of stress and well-being outcomes in sport. This study highlighted the importance of emotional labour in understanding how organizational stressors might contribute to the experience of burnout and turnover intention of performers and personnel operating within sport organizations. The results suggested that emotional labour might have negative consequences for actual turnover through its influence on the relationship between organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intention. Therefore, the following chapter presents findings of a study that examined emotional labour in the stress-actual turnover process using a longitudinal design.
Chapter 5:

Emotional labour, turnover intentions, and actual turnover in sport:

A longitudinal study (Study 2)
Abstract

Chapter 5 presents findings from a 6-month longitudinal study examining the potential moderating role that emotional labour plays in the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressor experience, emotional labour, turnover intentions, and actual turnover in sport. A range of validated questionnaires were used to examine measures of organizational stressors (OSI-SP), emotional labour (ELS), turnover intentions, and actual turnover. Data was analysed using Hayes’s PROCESS macro for SPSS. Results showed that over the 6-month testing period, surface acting positively moderated the relationship between the organizational stressor frequency and turnover intentions in sport but not actual turnover. These results identify organizational stressors and surface acting as potential factors that may drive psychological disengagement in sport and highlight the importance of emotion management. Indeed, these results provide a rationale for developing targeted organizational and emotion-regulation interventions to support those individuals encountering frequent organizational stressors and prevent psychological withdrawal in sport.

Keywords: longitudinal, stress, surface acting, well-being, dropout, emotion regulation
Introduction

The first study (chapter 4) in this programme of research examined surface acting as a moderator in the relationship between organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intentions in sport, and as such, provides a first empirical examination of mechanistic factors (i.e., emotional labour) that influence the organizational stress-response process in sport and extends previous work by providing an insight into how such variables influence both psychosocial (i.e., burnout) and behavioural intentions (i.e., turnover) outcomes. Nevertheless, it was beyond the scope of Study 1 to examine how organizational stressors impacted actual turnover in sport. Therefore, Fletcher et al. (2006) and Arnold et al.’s (2013) call for a longitudinal approach to better capture the complex, ongoing nature of organizational stressors is reiterated here.

Turnover from sport organizations is a salient issue given the negative effect it can have on replacement recruitment and training, operational functioning, and morale of the remaining members. In elite sport the turnover of talent due to environmental demands will affect team climate, culture, stability, and functioning. At the non-elite level, turnover from sport organizations is likely to impact participation rates and, where chronic, will threaten the survival of amateur sport organizations. Further, as alluded to in chapter 4 (study 1), surface acting may contribute to turnover due to its effortful nature and association with burnout (Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2003). Therefore, and to extend the findings of Study 1, the purpose of this study was to examine the influence of surface acting in the relationship between organizational stressors, turnover intentions, and actual turnover in sport organizations. Hence, a longitudinal design was employed to examine whether surface acting moderated the relationship between organizational
stressors from time 1 and turnover intentions and actual turnover at time 2, which was six months after time 1. To the author’s knowledge, there have not been any longitudinal studies that have investigated the stress-turnover relationship in sport. It was hypothesised that the relationship between organizational stressors at time 1 and a) turnover intentions at time 2 and b) actual turnover will be moderated by surface acting such that the relationship between organizational stressors and a) turnover intentions and b) actual turnover will be stronger in individuals reporting high levels of surface acting.

**Methods**

**Participants and procedure**

In total, 90 participants from a range of individual and team sports (e.g., athletics, football, hockey) were recruited for this study (n = 28). The participants age ranged from 17 to 60 years (M = 26.70, SD = 10.98). All participants were operating within sport organizations as athletes (n = 65), coaches (n = 16), performance directors (n = 4), and or sport scientists and medics (n = 5). Within their organizations, participants were operating at a variety of levels ranging from club (n = 26), county (n = 21), regional (n = 12), national (n = 17), and international (n = 14). Either an online or paper hard-copy of a questionnaire including the OSI-SP, ELS, and turnover intentions was sent to all participants to be completed. After approximately 6 months (+/- 2 weeks), the same questionnaire pack was sent out to all participants again with one additional item to measure actual turnover. Prior to data collection, a favourable ethical opinion was received and information about the nature of the study and issues of confidentiality and anonymity were explained to all participants.
Measures

A range of validated questionnaires were used to address the research hypotheses and measured organizational stressors, emotional labour, turnover intentions, and actual turnover respectively. Both online and paper versions of the questionnaire were piloted prior to the main study but as this did not reveal any deficiencies in the design, format or length of the questionnaire, no changes were made.

Organizational Stressor Indicator for Sport Performers (OSI-SP). The 23-item OSI-SP (Arnold et al., 2013) was used to assess the frequency of a range of organizational stressors encountered by individuals in sport. Arnold et al. (2013) stated using the frequency scale alone would be adequate for researchers requiring a shorter version of the indicator. Therefore, items were measured in relation to the frequency of each organizational stressor on a Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 5 (always). The five subscales on the OSI-SP were: goals and development, logistics and operations, team and culture, coaching, and selection. All five frequency subscales showed acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = .66$ to .84).

Emotional labour Scale (ELS). The 15-item self-report ELS (Brotheridge & Lee, 2003) measures six facets of emotional display, including the frequency, intensity, and variety of the emotional display, and surface and deep acting. Higher scores on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (never) to 5 (always) indicate greater emotional labour. Questionnaire items were adapted to the context of study with the word “job” being replaced with the word “role”; for example, “on an average day, how frequently do you express particular emotions needed for your role”. Internal consistency Cronbach’s alpha for the surface acting subscale was .76.
**Turnover intentions.** Turnover intentions were assessed using the three items (Kim & Stoner, 2008): “In the next few months I intend to leave this organization”, “In the next few years I intend to leave this organization”, and “I occasionally think about leaving this organization”. Items are rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Kim and Stoner (2008) reported a Cronbach’s alpha for internal consistency alpha of .76. For the present study, internal consistency was found to be acceptable with a Cronbach’s alpha of .77.

**Actual Turnover.** A single-item question, “I am no longer part of this sport organization” was used to assess actual turnover.

**Data analysis**

A simple moderation analysis was used to ascertain whether the effect of the frequency of organizational stressors from time 1 on turnover intentions and actual turnover from time 2 varied in magnitude and nature as a function of surface acting. The present study used Hayes’s (2012) PROCESS macro, with 1000 bootstrap resamples and 95% confidence intervals to test indirect effects for significance at different values of the moderator (i.e., surface acting).

**Results**

**Preliminary analysis**

Table 5.1 shows the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for study variable dimensions. The mean values reported were in accordance with extant literature. For the main study variables, there was a positive relationship found between the frequency of organizational stressors (time 1) and surface acting ($r = .24, p < .05$) but not turnover intentions (time 2) or actual turnover (time 2). Turnover
intentions (time 1 and time 2) were positively related to actual turnover ($r = .27, p < .05; r = .46, p < .001$).

Dependent t-tests showed a significant increase in the scores between turnover intentions at time 1 ($M = 6.74, SD = 4.31$) to turnover intentions at time 2 ($M = 8.27, SD = 5.05$); $t(89)=-2.82, p < .01$. There was a small but non-significant decrease in reports of the frequency of organizational stressors from time 1 ($M = 1.45, SD = .74$) to time 2 ($M = 1.36, SD = .74$); $t(89)=.10, p > .05$. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. OSISP Freq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. OSISP Int</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. OSISP Dur</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.90**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. OSISP G&amp;D</td>
<td>.69**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. OSISP L&amp;O</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. OSISP T&amp;Cu</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. OSISP Co</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. OSISP S</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.56**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.52**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Surface Acting</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Deep Acting</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. TI (time 1)</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. TI1</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. TI2</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. TI3</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. TI (time 2)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.49**</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.47**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. TI1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. TI2</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.45**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. TI3</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Actual turnover</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M</strong></td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: G & D: goals and development; L & O: logistics and operations; T & Cu: team and culture; Co: coaching; S: selection; TI: turnover intention. **p < .01; * p < .05 (2-tailed)
Testing for moderation

As hypothesised, the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors (time 1) and turnover intentions (time 2) was moderated by surface acting ($F (3, 86) = 3.65, p = .01, R^2 = .11$). Indeed, the interaction of stressor frequency and surface acting on turnover intentions was $b = 2.41, t(86) = 2.66, p < .01$. Interaction slopes for stressors predicting turnover intentions showed that at high levels of surface acting turnover intention scores increased by 2.11 ($b = 2.11, t(86) = 2.39, p < .01$), and for performers reporting low levels of surface acting there was not a significant increase in turnover intention scores ($b = -.2.01, t(86) = -1.54, p = .13$). However, although 14 out of 90 participants had left their sport organization by time 2, the moderation results for actual turnover showed an insignificant interaction effect ($b = .54, 95\% CI [-.62, 1.48], Z = .81, p > .05$). Hence, the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors (time 1) and actual turnover (time 2) was not moderated by surface acting and the findings were not consistent with the study hypothesis (see Figures 5.1 and 5.2, and Table 5.2).

![Diagram](figure5.1.png)

*Figure 5.1. Moderation model for organizational stressor frequency, surface acting, and turnover intentions. *$p < .05$
Figure 5.2. Moderation model for organizational stressor frequency, surface acting, and actual turnover. *p < .05

Table 5.2. Conditional indirect effects of the frequency of organizational stressors on turnover intentions (time 2) and actual turnover at three levels of surface acting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surface acting</th>
<th>B (SE)</th>
<th>LL 95% CI</th>
<th>UL 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Turnover Intentions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1SD (-.85)</td>
<td>-2.01 (1.31)</td>
<td>-4.60</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (.00)</td>
<td>.05 (.80)</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1SD (.85)</td>
<td>2.11 (.88)*</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actual turnover</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1SD (-.85)</td>
<td>.16 (.56)</td>
<td>-.94</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (.00)</td>
<td>.53 (.41)</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1SD (.85)</td>
<td>.90 (.67)</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LL: lower limit; CI: confidence interval; UL: upper limit; SD: standard deviation; M: mean.

*aBootstrap sample size = 1,000. b95% confidence intervals. *p < .05
Discussion

To significantly advance the organizational stressor theory and research in sport by moving beyond the identification, appraisal, and consequences of organizational stressors, the study presented in this chapter used a longitudinal design to examine emotional labour as a moderator in the relationships between several elements of the stress process. Indeed, this study provides the first examination into the influence of the frequency of organizational stressors and emotional labour on turnover intention and actual turnover in sport.

The main finding was that surface acting positively moderated the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors (time 1) and turnover intention (time 2) whereby, the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors (time 1) and turnover intentions (time 2) was only significant at higher levels of surface acting. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the relationship between organizational stressors, surface acting, and actual turnover was not significant. Although intentions have been found to be the best predictors of behaviour (Armitage & Conner, 2001), this relationship can vary considerably. Indeed, the theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 2002) proposes the intention-behaviour relationship may itself be moderated. That is, the relationship between turnover intentions and actual turnover might be stronger in certain individuals and circumstances than others (e.g., those with greater perceived behavioural control, self-efficacy). For example, performers remaining in their current organization despite expressing a desire to leave may not be able to due to a lack of available and appropriate alternatives. Indeed, performers may want to leave their organization but resolve not to do so due to financial repercussions, distance to alternative organizations, or fears regarding reemployment. There is scope for future studies to
explore these possible explanations further and to differentiate between performers (e.g., demographic differences) for whom remaining in their organization may be more of a significant concern.

From an organization-level perspective, turnover can have negative consequences for replacement recruitment and training, participation rates, stability, and functioning of the organization. Indeed, for sport organizations, retaining individuals is paramount to increasing the depth of talent and experience of performers. However, for individual performers, turnover from their organization may be a positive outcome. For example, a coach or young athlete may decide to leave their organization in order to progress their career or skill level elsewhere (see, for review, Wylleman, Alfermann, & Lavallee, 2004a). Indeed, to gain a more complete understanding of turnover in sport, future research in this area should explore more deeply the different positive and negative reasons leading to turnover intentions and actual turnover among key stakeholders in sport, which could also be viewed in terms of dropout, career transitions, and career termination.

Despite the observation that turnover intention was not found to be a strong predictor of actual turnover, the finding that turnover intention increased over time indicates that performers were psychologically disengaged from their sport organization. Further, this study identified that organizational stressor frequency and surface acting are among the factors that drive psychological disengagement (i.e., turnover intention) in sport and provides a rationale for developing targeted organizational and emotion-regulation interventions to prevent further psychological withdrawal. To determine why some individuals remain in their organization despite stating turnover intentions, there is a need to examine sport-related attitudes, such as commitment, identity and engagement. Indeed, Jackson et al.(2014) found
organizational commitment mediated attrition rates in adolescent groups in sport. In the same study, Jackson et al. (2014) developed a sport-specific measure of organizational commitment providing an excellent opportunity for future research to understand engagement, and intentions to turnover or actual turnover in sport organizations (Wagstaff & Larner, 2015).

There are several strengths to this study; in particular, the use of a longitudinal design to predict the relationships between these variables over time provides a novel contribution to the literature. However, it is important to note the limitations of this study. Firstly, the variables examined in this study were measured using the same instruments pre and post, opening the possibility for the validity of the results to be affected by common method variance. Secondly, selecting the OSI-SP allowed comparison of the results to past and future studies within this programme of research. However, the OSI-SP was designed to be used specifically with athletes and therefore, some minor adaptations were necessary when used with the other populations in this study (i.e., coaches, managers, sport scientists and medics). As previously stated, the need for the OSI-SP to be developed and tested for other key populations within sport organizations. Thirdly, this study was based on a varied sample of individuals selected from a range of sports, and further research might study a concentrated sample from one sport to allow more comparisons between sports. Indeed, certain organizational stressors and attitudes might be stronger or more visible in certain sports than others. Finally, the number of individuals actually leaving their organization in this study was low. It is possible that this result may have been influenced by the proportion of students that were recruited within this study. That is, it is unlikely that the student-athlete population would report turnover unless they were also leaving their University, hence those
students early in their University careers may have wished to turnover from their organization, but remained to complete their academic studies.

In conclusion, the present study corroborates and extends theory and research linking organizational stressors and turnover intention in sport and illustrates the role of emotional labour in this relationship. Indeed, these findings offer a novel empirical examination of surface acting as a moderator of the longitudinal stressor-turnover intention and stressor-turnover relationship, and significantly contributes to mechanistic knowledge. These findings have the potential to assist sport organizations through targeted interventions aimed at changing individuals’ experiences of organizational stressors to reduce individuals’ desire to leave their organization.
Foreword to Chapter 6

Chapter 5 provides a longitudinal examination of the relationships between organizational stressors, emotional labour, and behavioural outcomes in sport. In line with Study 1, the results emphasised that emotional labour and organizational stressors can lead to psychological disengagement in sport (i.e., turnover intention). However, the relationship between organizational stressors, emotional labour, and actual turnover was not significant. In chapter 2, attitudes were identified as one of the core areas of research within organizational psychology in sport, and therefore, could explain why some individuals remain in their organization despite presenting signs of burnout and stating turnover intention. As a result, the following chapter presents findings of a study that examined sport-related attitudes in the relationship between organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intention.
Chapter 6:

Attitudes, Organizational Stress, Burnout, and Turnover Intention in Sport (Study 3)
Abstract

This manuscript presents the findings from a study examining the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intention, and whether attitudes (i.e., team commitment, team identity, and athlete engagement) moderated any such relationship. The study was conducted with 201 sportspeople from a variety of sport organizations. Participants completed measures of organizational stressors (OSI-SP), burnout (ABQ/CBQ), turnover intentions, team commitment, team identity, and athlete engagement (AEQ). The data were analyzed in a moderated regression model using Hayes’ (2012) PROCESS macro for SPSS. The results showed that the frequency of organizational stressors reported by participants was directly related to burnout and that commitment, identity, and engagement all moderated this relationship. Further, commitment, identity, and engagement moderated the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and turnover intention through burnout. These results advance current knowledge regarding individual differences that might buffer against the demands faced by those operating in sport organizations and offer implications for practitioners seeking to develop interventions intended to optimize the wellbeing and retention of performers in sport organizations.

Keywords: PROCESS, stress, well-being, turnover intention, attitudes
Introduction

The organizational environment in sport can be highly complex and impose numerous demands on the performers and personnel that operate within it (Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009). Indeed, performers recall four times as many organizational stressors (i.e., the demands associated with the organization within which an individual is operating) compared to competitive stressors (Hanton et al., 2005a). Research into organizational stress has gathered momentum over the past decade (see Arnold & Fletcher, 2012; Fletcher, Hanton, & Mellalieu, 2006; Fletcher, Hanton, Mellalieu, & Neil, 2010) with much of this research stemming from the development of the meta-model of stress and emotions (see Fletcher & Fletcher, 2005). The meta-model posits that stressors stem from the complex social and organizational environment in competitive sport and that these stressors are mediated by the processes of appraisal and coping, and consequently, individuals respond in different ways. In addition, this ongoing process is moderated by personal (e.g., resilience; Wagstaff, Hings, Larner, & Fletcher, 2018) characteristics that influence performers’ wellbeing and performance. Nevertheless, very few individual difference variables have been examined within the organizational stress research. To this end, the present research aimed to ascertain whether the frequency of organizational stressors encountered by performers and personnel in sport was related to burnout and turnover intention, and whether individuals’ attitudes to their organization moderated these relationships.

In line with the meta-model of stress and emotions, researchers have sought to identify the types of organizational stressors encountered by performers in sport (e.g., Arnold, Fletcher, & Daniels, 2016, 2017; Fletcher, Hanton, Mellalieu, & Neil, 2012; Kristiansen, Murphy, & Roberts, 2012). In an attempt to amalgamate this
research, Arnold and Fletcher (2012a) developed a taxonomy of organizational stressors in sport and found four main categories of stressors (i.e., leadership and personnel, cultural and team, logistical and environmental, and performance and personal issues). This classification of organizational stressors provided the conceptual foundation for the development of the organizational stressor indicator for sport performers (OSI-SP; Arnold, Fletcher, & Daniels, 2013), providing a valid and reliable means of assessing organizational stressors. In addition to the identification and measurement of organizational stressors in sport, the OSI-SP was used to identify demographic differences (e.g., gender, competition level, and team or individual sport type) in performers’ experiences of organizational stressors as well as responses to these demands. Indeed, research has found that the presence of organizational stressors can lead to negative outcomes such as dissatisfaction (Noblet et al., 2003), negative emotions (Fletcher, Hanton, & Wagstaff, 2012) and burnout (Tabei et al., 2012). Much of this research has advanced the organizational stress literature considerably over the past decade. However, most studies have focused on one component (e.g., stressors, appraisal, responses, coping) of the organizational stress process in one group of stakeholders (e.g., athletes, coaches, managers) in isolation. Therefore, to progress the organizational stress literature, researchers should explore the links between the organizational stress components across a diverse range of stakeholders within sport organizations (Fletcher & Arnold, 2017).

Within sport, the most widely used conceptualization of athlete burnout was posited by Raedeke (1997) and states that athlete burnout is a multidimensional cognitive-affective syndrome characterized by symptoms of physical and emotional exhaustion, reduced sense of accomplishment, and devaluation of the sporting context. In line with this conceptualization of athlete burnout, Raedeke and Smith
(2001) presented the Athlete Burnout Questionnaire (ABQ) to aid researchers in its examination. Since, the ABQ has not only been used to identify and measure burnout in athletes, but to also explore the antecedents that contribute to burnout. For example, research has examined the stressor-burnout relationship in athletes and reported organizational stressors to be positively associated with dimensions of burnout among football players (Tabei et al., 2012). Further, research by Gustafsson, Hassmén, Kenttä, and Johansson (2008) have found numerous situational and organizational antecedents of burnout in elite athletes; for example, perceived sport stress, multiple demands, and high expectations. These findings imply there are numerous environmental and situational demands that athletes face that might lead to burnout in athletes.

Given the potentially negative consequences of organizational stressors and the detrimental impact that burnout can have on health, well-being, and performance, researchers have recently turned their attention to variables that might directly impact or moderate the negative effects of organizational stressors. For example, Larner, Wagstaff, Thelwell, and Corbett (2017; chapters 4 and 5) investigated the relationship between organizational stressors, emotional labour, turnover intentions, and actual turnover in sport organizations using a longitudinal design. The authors found that performers who experience a higher frequency of organizational stressors and greater emotional labour (i.e., enhancing, faking, or suppressing feelings and expressions), expressed an increased desire to leave their organization in the next six months, yet did not actually turnover. Although intentions to leave an organization demonstrate one of the best predictors of behaviour, the intention-behaviour relationship varies widely (Vandenberg & Barnes Nelson, 1999). Expressing a desire to quit but not actually leaving suggests possible moderators of the turnover
intention-actual turnover relationship. Larner et al. (2017) suggested that examining an individual’s attitudes regarding their sport environment, such as organizational commitment, identity, and engagement could provide insight into the turnover intention-actual turnover relationship.

According to the sport commitment model (Scanlan, Carpenter, Simons, Schmidt, & Keeler, 1993), this attitudinal variable reflects an athlete’s desire and resolve to continue their sport participation. Research in this area has consistently found that higher levels of sport commitment leads to continued involvement within sport (for example, Raedeke, 1997; Weiss & Weiss, 2003). Echoing Jackson, Gucciardi, and Dimmock’s (2014) comments; these research studies are valuable in providing empirical support for the relationship between commitment and outcomes within a general sport context. Nevertheless, little attention has been devoted to exploring an individual’s commitment to their sport organization and the relevant correlates of such commitment. Indeed, since Jackson et al (2014) examined the role of organizational commitment in explaining adolescents’ attrition rates in sport, little research has been done to further explore organizational commitment in sport. This study sought to address this issue by using the sport-specific measure of organizational commitment developed by Jackson et al. (2014) to examine how an individual’s commitment to their organization might influence outcomes (i.e., burnout and turnover intention) in response to organizational stressors.

In addition to organizational commitment, understanding how individuals identify with their sport organization is another potentially salient attitudinal factor. Within sport, research has until recently focused on athletic identity (Brewer et al., 1993) fan identification (e.g., Lock, Funk, Doyle, & McDonald, 2014; Wann, Ensor, & Bilyeu, 2001), and transitions out of sport (see, for review, Wylleman, Alfermann,
More recently, researchers have begun to examine the impact of team identification. This research has shown a number of antecedents (e.g., justice and coach behaviour; De Backer et al., 2011) and outcomes (e.g., athlete satisfaction, task and social cohesion; Burns, Jasinski, Dunn, & Fletcher, 2012) of team identification. Given that the results found by Burns et al. (2012) demonstrate the positive impact that team identification can have in sport, the extent to which an individual identifies with their organization might be salient in the organizational stressor-burnout and turnover intention relationship.

Another attitudinal variable that merits research attention is an individual’s engagement with their sport organization. The concept of athlete engagement has been described as an enduring, relatively stable sport experience, which refers to generalised positive affect and cognitions about one’s sport as a whole (Lonsdale, Hodge, & Jackson, 2007; Lonsdale, Hodge, & Raedeke, 2007). Engagement dimensions include confidence, dedication, vigour, and enthusiasm (Lonsdale, Hodge, & Raedeke, 2007). Research into athlete engagement in sport has shown associations with positive outcomes such as enthusiasm, flow, higher confidence, perceived competence, and perceived autonomy (Hodge, Lonsdale, & Jackson, 2009; Martin & Malone, 2013). Importantly, engagement reflects a more adaptive, positive cognition towards one’s sport, and has been found to be strongly and inversely correlated to burnout (DeFreese & Smith, 2013; Lonsdale, Hodge, & Jackson, 2007). Given the potentially harmful implications of burnout in sport and the possibility that engagement could buffer against its occurrence, it is surprising that very little research has been published in this area within sport to date. Thus, it appears that there is much potential in examining the antecedents and consequences of engagement in sport.
Considering the preceding review and the rich potential for examining attitudinal variables and their relationship with components of the organizational stress process, the purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intention in sport, with a focus on the potential moderating roles of commitment, identity, and engagement. It is hypothesized that organizational commitment, identity, and engagement would moderate the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and burnout such that burnout symptoms will be lower in individuals with greater self-reported organizational commitment, identity, and engagement (H1). In addition, burnout will mediate the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and turnover intention. This indirect effect will be moderated by organizational commitment, identity, and engagement such that the indirect relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and turnover intention through burnout will be weaker in individuals with greater self-reported organizational commitment, identity, and engagement (H2). Figure 6.1 provides a visual representation of the hypothesized research model.

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 6.1. Hypothesized model for organizational stressors, burnout, turnover intention, and attitudes.*
Methods

Participants and procedure

201 participants from a variety of individual and team sports (e.g., football, netball, athletics) took part in the study. The age of participants ranged from 17 to 60 years ($M = 22.47, SD = 7.90$). At the time of data collection, all participants were operating within sport organizations as either athletes ($n = 144$), coaches ($n = 25$), performance directors ($n = 12$), sport scientists and medics ($n = 3$) or “prefer not to disclose” ($n = 17$). Participants were recruited via opportunity sampling and online distribution to elite sport organizations. A link to a web-based online questionnaire or a paper hard-copy of the questionnaire were used. Prior to data collection, University ethical approval was received and information about the nature of the study and issues of confidentiality and anonymity were explained to all participants.

Measures

A range of validated questionnaires were used to address the research hypotheses. Both online and paper versions of the questionnaire were piloted prior to the main study but as this did not reveal any deficiencies in the design, format or length of the questionnaire, and no changes were made.

Organizational Stress Indicator for Sport Performers (OSI-SP). The 23-item OSI-SP (Arnold, Fletcher, & Daniels, 2013) was used to assess the frequency of a range of organizational stressors encountered by sport individuals. Although Arnold et al. (2013) suggested using all three rating scales (i.e., frequency, intensity, and duration) to provide a more comprehensive view of performer-organization transactions, it was concluded that the frequency scale alone would be adequate for researchers requiring a shorter version of the indicator. Therefore, items were
measured in relation to the frequency of each organizational stressor on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (never) to 5 (always). Acceptable Cronbach’s alphas for each OSI-SP subscale were observed for the present sample: goals and development ($\alpha = .77$), logistics and operations ($\alpha = .82$), team and culture ($\alpha = .77$), coaching ($\alpha = .77$), and selection ($\alpha = .80$).

**Athlete Burnout Questionnaire.** Athlete burnout was assessed using the 15-item ABQ (Raedeke & Smith, 2001). Items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). Internal consistency Cronbach’s alphas ranged from .85 to .91 for all three burnout subscales (see Raedeke & Smith, 2001). Items were measured on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). Higher total average scores on the ABQ indicated a greater degree of burnout. Internal consistency Cronbach’s alphas for the three subscales were .71 for reduced accomplishment, .78 for sport devaluation, and .87 for physical and emotional exhaustion.

**Coach Burnout Questionnaire.** Coaches, performance directors, sport scientists and medics, and referees completed the CBQ (Malinauskas, Malinauskiene, & Dumciene, 2010; Raedeke & Smith, 2001). The CBQ is a 15-item measure that is reworded to assess burnout in coaches. The original ABQ question stems are altered for the CBQ to reflect coaching rather than athletic participation in sport. For example, “I’m accomplishing many worthwhile things in [sport]” is changed to “I’m accomplishing many worthwhile things coaching [sport].” Examination of fit, clarity and the meaning of revised items has found the CBQ to have appropriate content validity and modification of items, with acceptable Cronbach’s alphas (between .81 and .94) being reported (Harris & Ostrow, 2008). The CBQ was selected as it discriminates between dimensions of burnout in a sports context.
context that previous measures of burnout do not (Lundkvist et al., 2014). The CBQ was also deemed appropriate to use for performance directors and sport scientists and medics given their substantive coaching nature of their roles. The title of “coach” is commonly used interchangeably for performance directors (e.g., head coach) and support staff (e.g., strength and conditioning coach) (Wagstaff, 2016).

**Organizational commitment.** Participants’ commitment to their organization (Jackson et al., 2014) was measured on a 7-point Likert Scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Respondents were instructed to “respond to all the statements according to how you feel about your membership on this team right now at this moment in time”. Internal consistency Cronbach’s alphas for the three subscales were .78 for affective, .83 for normative, and .76 for continuance.

**Team identity.** As with previous research (Boen, Vanbeselaere, Brebels, Huybens, & Millet, 2007; Fransen et al., 2014), team identity was measured using three items: “I feel very connected to this team”, “being a member of the team is very important for me”, and “I am very happy that I belong to this team”. Responses were rated using a 7-point Likert scale anchored by 1 (strongly disagree) and 7 (strongly agree). All three items formed a highly reliable scale (α = .92).

**Athlete engagement.** Athlete engagement was assessed using the 16-item Athlete Engagement Questionnaire (AEQ) developed by Lonsdale, Hodge, and Jackson (2007). The AEQ measures four subscales: confidence, dedication, vigour, and enthusiasm using a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). Acceptable Cronbach’s alphas for each subscale were observed for the present study: confidence (α = .87), dedication (α = .90), vigor (α = .90), and
enthusiasm ($\alpha = .94$). A global engagement score was calculated by averaging scores across the four subscales.

**Turnover intentions.** Turnover intentions were assessed using the three items (Kim & Stoner, 2008; adapted from Nissly, Mor Barak, & Levin, 2005): “In the next few months I intend to leave this organization”, “In the next few years I intend to leave this organization”, and “I occasionally think about leaving this organization”. Items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). For the present study, internal consistency was found to be acceptable with a Cronbach’s alpha of .80.

**Data analysis**

To investigate whether the effect of organizational stressor frequency on mean burnout varied in magnitude and nature as a function of organizational commitment, identity, and engagement, a simple moderation analysis was used (Hayes, 2013). In addition, to examine whether the effect of organizational stressor frequency on turnover intention through burnout varied as a function of organizational commitment, identity, and engagement, a moderated-mediation analysis was used. Traditional techniques to test for moderation and mediation suffer from several problems such as low statistical power and the inability to test for multiple proposed moderators and mediators together (Hayes, 2012). Therefore, the present study used Hayes’s (2012) PROCESS macro, with 1000 bootstrap resamples and 95% confidence intervals to test indirect effects for significance at different values of the moderator (i.e., commitment, identity, and engagement). This regression-based analytic framework allows for the input of data, configuration, and estimation of two- and three-way interactions in moderation models.
Results

Preliminary analysis

Table 6.1 shows the means, standard deviations, and intercorrelations for all study variables. There was a significant positive relationship found between organizational stressor frequency and mean burnout ($r = .25, p < .001$). Significant negative relationships were found between attitudes and mean burnout (team commitment $r = -.23, p < .001$, team identity $r = -.39, p < .001$, athlete engagement $r = -.39, p < .001$) and between attitudes and turnover intentions (team commitment $r = -.18, p < .01$, team identity $r = -.37, p < .001$, athlete engagement $r = -.31, p < .001$).
Table 6.1. Correlations and Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. OSISP Freq Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ABQ Mean</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. RA</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. SD</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.83**</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. PEE</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.72**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Com Mean</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Affective</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.78**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Normative</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.79**</td>
<td>.60**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Continuance</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Team ID</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.68**</td>
<td>.70**</td>
<td>.58**</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Eng Mean</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.41**</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Confidence</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.44**</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.76**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Dedication</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.34**</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.88**</td>
<td>.62**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Vigour</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.26**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>-.20**</td>
<td>.24**</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.55**</td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Enthusiasm</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.23**</td>
<td>-.40**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>.19**</td>
<td>.26**</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>-.18**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.86**</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.71**</td>
<td>.77**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. ITO</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.37**</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>-.21**</td>
<td>-.27**</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>-.29**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SD</strong></td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: RA: reduced accomplishment; SD: sport devaluation; PEE: physical and emotional exhaustion; Com mean: commitment mean; Team ID: team identity; Eng mean: athlete engagement mean; ITO: turnover intention. **p < .01; * p < .05 (2-tailed)
**Hierarchical multiple regression analysis**

A hierarchical multiple regression analysis was used to predict mean burnout. On the first step, frequency of organizational stressors was entered into the model. It was significantly correlated with mean burnout as shown in Table 6.2. On the second step, all of the remaining predictors were entered simultaneously, resulting in a significant increase in $R^2, F(4, 113) = 20.03, p < .001$.

Table 6.2.

*Hierarchical Multiple Regression*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>9.67</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSISP Freq Mean</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSISP Freq Mean</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com Mean</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team ID</td>
<td>-.57</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng Mean</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.30***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Com mean: commitment mean; Team ID: team identity; Eng mean: athlete engagement mean.*** $p < .001$; **$p < .01$; * $p < .05$

**Testing for moderation**

To investigate Hypotheses 1, team commitment (see Figure 6.2), team identity (see Figure 6.3), and athlete engagement (see Figure 6.4) were examined as moderators between the frequency of organizational stressors and mean burnout. The simple moderation results are presented in Table 6.3.
Organizational commitment. Commitment moderated the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and burnout ($F(3, 197) = 11.19, p = <.001, R^2 = .14$). For every one unit increase in commitment, there was a -.78 decrease in burnout ($b = -.78, t(197) = -3.29, p < .01$) and for every one unit increase in stressor frequency, there was a 1.18 increase in burnout ($b = 1.18, t(197) = 3.88, p < .001$). The interaction between stressor frequency and commitment was $b = .85, t(197) = 2.01, p < .05$. Interaction slopes for stressor frequency predicting burnout was not significant at low levels of commitment ($b = .47, t(197) = 1.04, p > .05$) but showed that at high levels of commitment, burnout scores significantly increased by 1.90 ($b = 1.90, t(197) = 3.87, p < .001$).

Figure 6.2. Plot of the interaction between the frequency of organizational stressors and team commitment in predicting burnout

Team identity. Identity moderated the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and burnout ($F(3, 197) = 23.16, p = <.001, R^2 = .23$). For every one unit increase in identity, there was a -.69 decrease in burnout ($b = -.69,$
$t(197) = \ -6.25, \ p < .001$) and for every one unit increase in stressor frequency, there was a 1.15 increase in burnout ($b = 1.15, t(197) = 3.88, p < .001$). The interaction between stressor frequency and identity was $b = .46, t(197) = 2.35, p < .05$.

Interaction slopes for stressor frequency predicting burnout was not significant at low levels of identity ($b = .42, t(197) = 1.01, p > .05$) but showed that at high levels of identity, burnout scores significantly increased by 1.88 ($b = .1.90, t(197) = 4.25, p < .001$).

![Figure 6.3. Plot of the interaction between the frequency of organizational stressors and identity in predicting burnout](image)

**Athlete engagement.** Engagement moderated the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and burnout ($F(3, 197) = 23.45, p = <.001, R^2 = .25$). For every one unit increase in engagement, there was a -1.50 decrease in burnout ($b = -1.50, t(197) = -5.93, p < .001$) and for every one unit increase in stressor frequency, there was a 1.17 increase in burnout ($b = 1.17, t(197) = 4.00, p < .001$). The interaction between stressor frequency and engagement was $b = 1.25,$
$t(197) = 3.59, p < .001$. Interaction slopes for stressor frequency predicting burnout was not significant at low levels of engagement ($b = .28, t(197) = .80, p > .05$) but showed that at high levels of engagement, burnout scores significantly increased by 2.06 ($b = .206, t(197) = 4.97, p < .001$).

**Figure 6.4.** Plot of the interaction between the frequency of organizational stressors and engagement in predicting burnout
Table 6.3

*Simple Moderation Results for Burnout*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>se</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[LLCI, ULCI]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>11.42</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>61.43</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[11.06,11.79]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-3.29</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-1.25, -.31]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSISP Frequency</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.58, 1.79]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSISP Freq x Commitment</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.01, 1.69]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>11.45</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>64.75</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[11.10, 11.80]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-6.25</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-.91, -.47]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSISP Frequency</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.57, 1.74]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSISP Freq x Identity</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.07, .85]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>11.47</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>65.88</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[11.13, 11.82]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-5.93</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-2.00, -1.00]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSISP Frequency</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.59, 1.75]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSISP Freq x Identity</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[.56, 1.94]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LLCI: lower limit confidence interval; ULCI: upper limit confidence interval.

*a*Bootstrap sample size = 1,000.  
*b*95% confidence intervals.
Testing for moderated mediation

To investigate Hypothesis 2, three moderated-mediation models were used to examine whether the indirect effect of the frequency of organizational stressors on turnover intentions through burnout is moderated by team commitment (Figure 6.5), team identity (Figure 6.6), and athlete engagement (Figure 6.7). Conditional indirect effects for all models are presented in Table 6.4.

Organizational commitment. There was a conditional indirect effect of the frequency of organizational stressors on turnover intentions through mean burnout (index of moderated mediation = .45, 95% CI [.02, .93]). Specifically, the indirect effect of organizational stressors on turnover intentions through burnout was positive and increased at average and high levels of commitment. However, the conditional direct effect of organizational stressors on turnover intentions was not moderated, as indicated by a non-significant interaction at all levels of commitment.

Team Identity. There was a conditional indirect effect of the frequency of organizational stressors on turnover intentions through mean burnout (index of

Figure 6.5. Moderated-mediation model with organizational commitment as a moderator * p < .05
moderated mediation = .17, 95% CI [.02, .36]). Specifically, the indirect effect of organizational stressors on turnover intentions through burnout was positive and increased at average and high levels of identity. The conditional direct effect was not moderated, as indicated by a non-significant interaction at all levels of identity.

\[ \text{Organizational Stressors} \rightarrow \text{Burnout} \rightarrow \text{Turnover Intention} \]

\[ r = .35 (.55) \]

\[ r = .46 (.20)^* \]

\[ r = .06 (.34) \]

\[ r = 1.15 (18)^* \]

\[ r = .37 (12)^* \]

\[ \text{Identity} \]

\[ \text{Burnout} \]

\[ \text{Turnover Intention} \]

* \( p < .05 \)

**Athlete Engagement.** There was a conditional indirect effect of the frequency of organizational stressors on turnover intentions through mean burnout (index of moderated mediation = .64, 95% CI [.17, 1.13]). Specifically, the indirect effect of organizational stressors on turnover intentions through burnout was positive and increased at average and high levels of engagement. The conditional direct effect was not moderated, as indicated by a non-significant interaction at all levels of engagement.
Figure 6.7. Moderated-mediation model with engagement as a moderator * $p < .05$
Table 6.4.

**Conditional Indirect Effects of Organizational Stressor Frequency on Turnover Intentions (Through Burnout) at Three Levels of Attitudes (i.e., Commitment, Identity, Engagement)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>b (SE)</th>
<th>LL 95% CI</th>
<th>UL 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commitment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1SD (-.84)</td>
<td>.24 (.24)</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (.00)</td>
<td>.62 (.20)</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1SD (.84)</td>
<td>.99 (.31)</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1SD (-1.59)</td>
<td>.15 (.16)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (.00)</td>
<td>.42 (.17)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1SD (1.59)</td>
<td>.69 (.27)</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1SD (-.71)</td>
<td>.14 (.18)</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (.00)</td>
<td>.60 (.21)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1SD (.71)</td>
<td>1.05 (.34)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>1.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. LL: lower limit; CI: confidence interval; UL: upper limit; SD: standard deviation; M: mean.

*Bootstrap sample size = 1,000. *95% confidence intervals.
Discussion

This study aimed to advance organizational stressor theory (i.e., the meta-model of stress and emotions) and research by examining the role of attitudes in the context of organizational stressors and burnout in sport. In addition, this study sought to address previous calls by Larner et al. (2017) to examine sport organization-related attitudes such as commitment, identity, and engagement by examining attitudes (i.e., organizational commitment, team identity, and athlete engagement) as a moderator in the relationship between organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intention.

Following simple moderation analyses, the frequency of organizational stressors interacted with all attitudes to predict burnout, providing support for Hypothesis 1. To elaborate, the results show that as organizational stressor frequency increases, burnout also increases at all levels (low, average, high) of attitudes. However, this relationship is only significant at moderate and high self-reported levels of these attitudinal variables. In line with the study predictions, at comparable levels of organizational stressors, burnout scores remained lower for those reporting higher commitment, identity, and engagement scores compared to those reporting lower attitude scores. This trend is particularly apparent at low and average levels of organizational stressors. Indeed, it would appear that under low to average levels of organizational stressors, individuals reporting higher commitment, identity, and engagement are less prone to experience burnout than those reporting lower scores in attitudes. This finding is consistent with prior research in sport, which has shown that individual factors can reduce the influence of organizational stressors on burnout (Larner et al., 2017). It has been noted within these findings that although higher levels of commitment, identity and engagement buffer against low to average levels
of organizational stressors, they do not appear to be as effective at buffering against burnout at higher levels of organizational stressors. One explanation for this could be that individuals self-reporting higher organizational commitment, identity, and engagement also have a higher attachment to their organization, and this greater attachment increases their vulnerability to increased levels of organizational stressor frequency leading to negative consequences such as burnout.

From the findings, it is evident that commitment, identity, and engagement moderate the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and turnover intention through burnout, confirming Hypothesis 2. Together, the results indicate that an individual’s attitude to their sport organization plays key role in explaining the variation in their response to organizational stressors within their sport environment. This finding provides support for the meta-model of stress and emotions in sport (Fletcher & Fletcher, 2005) and confirms that organizational stressors do not directly only influence personal outcomes such as turnover intention in isolation. Indeed, an individual’s response to organizational stressors will likely vary depending on their commitment, identity, and engagement with their sport organization.

Overall, these results support and confirm the findings of previous research that organizational stressors are associated with burnout in sport (Tabei et al., 2012) and that the organizational stressor-burnout relationship can be moderated (Larner et al., 2017). The main contribution of this study to the research literature is that it provides the first examination of organizational commitment, identity, and engagement in the context of sport. Specifically, this study extends previous research in the areas of stress and wellbeing in sport by providing the first empirical investigation of organizational commitment, identity, and engagement as moderators.
in the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intention.

Organizational commitment reduced the experience of burnout, particularly at low to average levels of organizational stressors. This finding is consistent with previous research examining organizational commitment and burnout in the workplace (King & Sethi, 1997). Indeed, King and Sethi (1997) found that affective commitment moderated the relationship between role stressors and burnout among informational systems professionals, providing support for the argument that organizational commitment acts as a buffer against stressors. In addition, the finding that organizational commitment influences the relationship between organizational stressors and turnover intention through burnout is not surprising. Negative correlations between commitment and turnover intention are well-documented within the workplace (e.g., Meyer, Stanley, Herscovitch, & Topolnytsky, 2002) and have also been found in sport between commitment and attrition rates in adolescent groups (Jackson et al., 2014).

Although it is important for organizations to foster increased organizational commitment because of its relationships with burnout and turnover, organizations should aim to develop environments that focus on fostering greater affective and normative commitment. This study found significant negative correlations between affective and normative commitment and burnout and turnover intention; however, no correlation was found between continuance commitment and burnout and there was a significant positive relationship between continuance commitment and turnover intention. These findings are similar to Jackson et al. (2014) who found negative correlations between continuance commitment and athlete’s intentions to persist in sport.
Organizational identity reduced the experience of burnout at all levels of organizational stressor frequency, but the greatest reduction in burnout was found at low to average levels of organizational stressors. This finding is in line with research in other organizational domains; for example, Wegge, Schuh, and van Dick (2012) found that organizational identification functioned as a buffer against stress within a customer service setting. These findings also support previous research that has found negative relationships between organizational identification and turnover intention within the workplace (e.g., De Moura, Abrams, Retter, Gunnarsdottir, & Ando, 2009). To elaborate, identity moderated the relationship between organizational stressor frequency and turnover intention through burnout. This suggests that identifying with the group or organization can be a powerful resource against the experience of stress and negative outcomes such as burnout and turnover intention.

The finding that organizational engagement is negatively related to burnout supports previous research suggesting that athlete burnout and engagement are strongly and inversely correlated (DeFreese & Smith, 2013; Lonsdale, Hodge, & Jackson, 2007). Therefore, there may be value in evaluating intervention programmes designed to increase engagement. One study by Hodge et al. (2009) found that satisfaction of basic psychological needs contributed to higher levels of athlete engagement and flow. Other than Hodge et al.’s study, engagement is still a relatively new area in the sport psychology literature, and as such, little is known about its potential antecedents and consequences for individuals operating within sport organizations. Indeed, it is believed that no study to date has examined the interaction between engagement and turnover intention in sport. Yet, research among employees has found that engagement negatively predicts intentions to turnover (see,
for review, Shuck, 2011). Therefore, further studies are needed to examine the antecedents of engagement, as this may lead to practical implications from possible benefits of increased organizational engagement such as effective strategies to prevent burnout and turnover intention in sport organizations.

Our study has several important applied implications. The finding that high levels of commitment, identity, and engagement buffer against the experience of burnout in sport at low to average levels of organizational stressor frequency is important. Indeed, there is value in evaluating intervention programmes designed to help individuals increase their levels of commitment, identity, and engagement with a view to decrease the experience of burnout. Outside of sport, researchers (Grant, Dutton, & Rosso, 2008) looking to increase organizational commitment within the workplace have found that employee support programmes aimed at providing employees with opportunities to give and contribute strengthened their affective commitment to the organization. Indeed, Grant et al. (2008) suggested that in addition to the treatment that employees received from their organization, the giving behaviours in which employees engage toward their organization can strengthen employees’ emotional bonds with their workplace. Strategies to increase identification have also been discussed within the workplace literature (Van Knippenberg, 2003) suggested that identification could be fostered by emphasising the organization’s identity through communicating common goals and objectives, unique culture of the organization, and mission. Other workplace studies have found positive results in response to training and development programmes aimed to increase employee engagement. For example, Ten Brummelhuis, Bakker, Hetland, and Keuleman (2012) found that flexible work designs where employees were given the flexibility to decide when they work, where they work, and their communication
method, were positively related to daily engagement. These studies provide a starting point for sport-specific examinations of attitudes and ways to increase organizational commitment, identity, and engagement among individuals operating within sport organizations.

Organizations, where possible, should consider assessing an individual’s fit with the organization during selection of athletes and recruitment of athletes, coaches, managers, etc. Assessing an individual’s potential to align themselves with the organization’s objectives and the way that the organization works to meet these objectives is likely to result in better commitment, identity, and engagement with the organization. This could ultimately lead to individuals that are better equipped from the offset to handle the potential deleterious effects of organizational stressors and therefore, improve the health, well-being, and performance of individuals operating within sport organizations. Indeed, organizational socialisation research has found socialisation processes for new members to be associated with a range of positive outcomes such as reduced role ambiguity and role conflict and increased self-efficacy, social acceptance, and job satisfaction, as well as more committed group members that have greater intentions to remain (see, for meta-analyses, Bauer, Bodner, Erdogan, Truxillo, & Tucker, 2007; Saks, Uggerslev, & Fassina, 2007).

Several limitations must be discussed. First, the variables within this study are dynamic in nature, that is, they are likely to change over an individuals’ time with their sport organization. Therefore, in addition to examining these variables concurrently, there is a need for longitudinal studies to examine changes in these variables over time. Evidence suggests that burnout develops over extended periods (see, for review, Eklund & DeFreese, 2015), and as such, investigating how attitudes might influence the burnout process and it’s development during intense periods may
therefore be valuable. Relatedly, the emergence of organizational change research within sport (see, for example, Wagstaff, Gilmore, & Thelwell, 2015: 2016) might provide an excellent opportunity for researchers to examine the impact of changing conditions on individuals’ attitudes towards their organization and the development of burnout and turnover intention. A second limitation of the present research is that, although measures of whether individuals intended to leave their organization were obtained, actual turnover was not measured. It would be interesting to confirm the results of this study using a longitudinal design to establish whether the variables in this study influence actual turnover.

At present, there has been very little research published looking at attitudes within a sport context. This study has shown that attitudinal concepts such as commitment, identity, and engagement warrant further investigation and it is hoped that this will serve as a base for more systematic and widespread future studies. A greater understanding of these attitudes in sport might help in the development of burnout- and turnover-prevention strategies. Future research might consider investigating potential predictors of organizational commitment, identity, and engagement within sport. Occupational and workplace studies have highlighted several antecedents of employee attitudes. This body of research could provide a starting point for future research attempting to identify the most important factors for increasing attitudes among different roles within sport. It follows that an area for future research is to study experimental interventions on attitudes in sport such as training and support programmes. Indeed, investigating the degree to which interventions can develop individuals’ commitment, identity, and engagement towards their organization is likely to be a fruitful area for research.
In summary, this study provides evidence that attitudes play an important role in the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intention, helping to explain how an individual’s attitude to their sport organization may influence burnout and, ultimately, whether they wish to remain within their organization. Indeed, sport organizations that are better prepared to manage the negative consequences of stressors and build on the more positive aspects of organizational commitment, identity, and engagement through appropriate training and support programmes may achieve better outcomes in preventing burnout and in the retention of its members. Where possible, future research is needed to examine how organizations could promote these attitudinal variables. These findings provide a novel examination of the organizational stressor-burnout-turnover intention relationship and show the importance of analysing multiple components stress as a process comprised of multiple mediating and moderating variables.
Chapter 7:

Discussion and Conclusions
Overview

The purpose of this chapter is to bring together the findings of this programme of research, to present the applied implications, and to discuss directions for future research. In doing so, this chapter is organised into several sections that provide: (a) a summary of the aims and main findings from studies 1, 2, and 3, (b) empirical implications, (c) practical implications, (d) strengths and weaknesses of the thesis, (e) future research directions, and (f) concluding thoughts.

Summary of the Studies

This programme of research examined the psychosocial factors affecting the experience of performers and personnel that operate within sport organizations. To elaborate, the central aim of this thesis was to gain an in-depth understanding of the emotional and attitudinal phenomena, stress and well-being, and organizational environments that might help or hinder individuals in sport. At the beginning of this programme of research, the body of literature examining the identification of organizational stressors in sport had grown substantially but had yet to systematically examine the potential moderators and mediators aligned with organizational stressors in sport. This thesis aimed to address that gap in knowledge. To achieve this aim, the present programme of research sought to: (a) investigate emotional labour in the context of organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intention in sport (Study 1); (b) examine the impact of organizational stressors and emotional labour on behavioural outcomes over time using a longitudinal design (Study 2); and (c) explore sport-related attitudes that influence the stressor-burnout-turnover intention relationship (Study 3). The following sections provide an overview of the three studies that comprise this thesis.
Study 1: Organizational stressors, emotional labour, burnout, and turnover intentions in sport: A cross-sectional study. This study aimed to explore the moderating role of surface acting in the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors, burnout and turnover intention in sport. To achieve this, a cross-sectional questionnaire design was used to measure the aforementioned variables in a sample of 487 participants from a range of individual and team sports. The participants included 389 athletes, 74 coaches, 7 performance directors, and 17 sport scientists or medics. This sample represented a variety of sporting levels ranging from club to international performance.

The results identified that surface acting moderated the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and burnout in sport. Further, surface acting moderated the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and turnover intention through burnout. These findings serve to highlight the importance of surface acting in understanding how performers respond to organizational stressors they encounter in sport. Indeed, at comparable stressor frequency levels, surface acting increases burnout and turnover intention. It has been suggested that surface acting requires significant self-regulatory resources to suppress undesirable felt emotions, and that the cognitive and emotional effort depletes limited mental resources. Therefore, an individual’s level of self-regulatory resources (i.e., sufficient or depleted) may account for the various well-being and retention outcomes for performers and personnel that use surface acting as a strategy to manage their emotional reactions to organizational stressors. Taking the findings of this study into account, it was suggested that practitioners might encourage the avoidance of potentially deleterious surface acting when supporting individuals in sport. A caveat of this study was that it did not show whether the frequency of organizational
stressors and surface acting contributed to actual turnover. Future research recommendations were made to examine the role of surface acting on components of the organizational stress process using longitudinal designs and what, if any, impact this has on actual turnover.

Study 2: Organizational stressors, emotional labour, turnover intentions, and actual turnover in sport: A longitudinal study. Given the extent to which Study 1 highlighted the importance of surface acting as a moderator in the relationship between organizational stressor frequency, burnout, and turnover intention in sport, the purpose of this study was to further explicate how organizational stressors impacted actual turnover. Specifically, Study 2 aimed to better capture the complex, ongoing nature of organizational stressors and advance understanding of the organizational stressor-response process over time. Consequently, a longitudinal approach was used with 90 individuals from a range of individual and team sports. This sample included 65 athletes, 16 coaches, 4 performance directors, and 5 sport scientists or medics. As with Study 1, a questionnaire pack was sent to all participants to measure organizational stressors, emotional labour, and turnover intentions. After approximately 6 months, the same questionnaire pack was sent again to all participants with one additional item to measure actual turnover.

The findings showed that surface acting moderated the relationship between organizational stressor frequency and turnover intentions – but not actual turnover – over time. In doing so, the findings indicated that at comparable levels of organizational stressor frequency, higher reported surface acting increases an individual’s desire to leave their organization, yet they do not necessarily turnover. These results highlight that organizational stressors and surface acting are among the
factors that lead to psychosocial disengagement in sport and serve to expand our understanding of the positive and negative responses component of the meta-model of stress, emotions, and performance (Fletcher, 2006). Although participants asserted their desire to leave their organization, it is noteworthy that the relationship between organizational stressors, surface acting, and actual turnover was not significant. It is possible that the performers who remain in their organization despite expressing a desire to leave perceive themselves as having no choice but to remain. For example, they may fear reemployment or financial repercussions of leaving, or there may simply be a lack of available alternative organizations to move to. In addition to exploring these possible explanations, it was also recommended that future research examine other sport-related attitudes (e.g., commitment, identity, and engagement) to determine why some individuals decide to remain in their organization despite showing signs of burnout and stating turnover intentions.

**Study 3: Organizational stressors, attitudes, and turnover intentions in sport.** The purpose of study 3 was to examine the effectiveness of sport-related attitudes (i.e., commitment, identity, and engagement) as a moderator in the relationship between organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intention. The study employed a cross-sectional, questionnaire design with 201 participants from a variety of individual and team sport organizations. Participants included 144 athletes, 25 coaches, 12 performance directors, 3 sport scientists or medics, and 17 that “prefer not to disclose”. A link to a web-based online questionnaire or a paper hard-copy of the questionnaire was sent out to all participants.

The findings showed that all attitudes (i.e., organizational commitment, identity, and engagement) moderated the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and burnout in sport. Specifically, at comparable levels of...
organizational stressors, burnout scores remained lower for those reporting higher commitment, identity, and engagement scores compared to those reporting lower attitude scores. Further, attitudes moderated the relationship between the frequency of organizational stressors and turnover intention through burnout. These results advance previous literature regarding individual differences that influence several elements of the stress process by showing that an individual’s attitude towards their organization buffers against the demands faced by those operating within sport organizations. It was recommended that future research examine how organizations could promote higher commitment, identity, and engagement among their performers and personnel, as this research may lead to valuable burnout- and turnover-prevention strategies.

**Empirical Implications**

This thesis aimed to understand the emotional and attitudinal phenomena that might moderate an individual’s experience of the demands primarily and directly associated with their sport organization. In doing so, this work expands knowledge in the field of sport psychology by highlighting predictors of well-being and retention of performers and personnel. This programme of research has the following empirical implications: (a) it furthers theory in the area of stress and emotions by illustrating individual differences that affect several components of the stress process; (b) it addresses research recommendations suggested by Arnold, Fletcher, and Daniels (2016) in their study on demographic differences in performers’ experiences of organizational stressors, (c) it advances burnout theory and research in sport, and; (d) it extends past research on the factors that influence withdrawal (i.e., turnover intention and actual turnover).
As mentioned throughout this thesis, Fletcher and Fletcher’s (2005) meta-model of stress, emotions, and performance was developed to better understand the theoretical relationships between key processes, moderators, and consequences of the stress process. In their meta-model, Fletcher and Fletcher (2005) posit that stressors arise from the environment the individual operates in, are mediated by the processes of perception, appraisal, and coping, which results in either positive or negative responses, feelings, and outcomes. This ongoing process is moderated by various personal and situational characteristics. The current programme of research provides empirical support for several hypothesised aspects of the meta-model. Specifically, the results show that organizational stressors are positively related to negative consequences of burnout and turnover intention in sport. In addition, the present research found emotional and attitudinal moderators of this relationship. Specifically, surface acting was found to exacerbate the relationship between organizational stressors and resultant well-being and intention to turnover outcomes (Study 1 and Study 2), whereas an individuals’ commitment, identity, and engagement with their organization (Study 3) were shown to ameliorate this relationship. These findings provide support for the meta-model’s hypothesis that the stress process can be moderated, and that these moderators partially account for variance in the consequences of the stress process by impacting an individual’s vulnerability to the organizational stressors they encounter.

This programme of research not only contributes to stress theory, but also answers calls for future research by prominent organizational stress researchers (e.g., Arnold et al., 2016). To elaborate, Arnold et al. (2016) outlined several demographic differences (i.e., personal characteristics) that affect the dimensions of organizational stressors; namely, gender, sport type, and performance level. Concluding their study,
Arnold et al. encouraged researchers to investigate other moderating variables of the stress process. The authors also underlined the importance of future research exploring the effects of organizational stressors using large and diverse samples of sport performers, citing that previous research in the realm of organizational stressors has typically recruited small, homogenous samples. In line with these recommendations, the studies presented within this thesis (chapters 4 to 6) recruited large and diverse samples of sport performers and personnel to examine several emotion- and attitude-related moderators. Specifically, this programme of research was the first to examine emotional (i.e., surface acting) and attitudinal (i.e., organizational commitment, identity, and engagement) variables as moderators of the stressor-burnout-turnover intention relationship. In doing so, these findings highlight the importance of analysing the dynamics of stress as a process that involves multiple mediating and moderating variables.

In addition to the contribution to stress theory, the present studies also advance burnout theory in sport. Study 1 and Study 3 not only contribute to the conceptual understanding of burnout in performers and personnel operating in sport organizations, but also extend existent theory and research on stress and burnout by identifying moderators of the stressor-burnout relationship. In their integrated model of athlete burnout, Gustafsson, Kenttä, and Hassmén (2011) proposed several factors that contribute to burnout (i.e., perfectionism, trait anxiety, low social support, lack of coping skills, goal orientation, and motivational climate). Study 1 confirmed that surface acting is negatively associated with burnout dimensions, suggesting that surface acting should be added to the list of factors presented by Gustafsson et al. (2011). Conversely, the results of Study 3 showed that organizational commitment, identity, and engagement might buffer against burnout. Further, both Study 1 and
Study 3 highlighted the negative impact that burnout can have on an individuals’ intention to leave their sport organization. Given these findings, it is hoped that sport psychology scholars are moved to more proactively conduct applied research to further examine the role of emotions and attitudes in the prediction of burnout in sport organizations. Indeed, efforts to prevent and alleviate burnout among performers and personnel within sport organizations are likely to result in positive outcomes including, but not limited to, increased performance, higher levels of satisfaction, and lower turnover (see, for review, Wagstaff, Sarkar, Davidson, & Fletcher, 2017).

This programme of research also enhances our understanding of the antecedents and processes that influence turnover intention and actual turnover of performers and personnel in sport. Retention of talent is important for sport organizations that value committed and reliable personnel and that want to limit the negative impact that turnover can have on replacement recruitment and training, operational functioning, loss of performance and morale of the remaining members. Chapters four and five established, for the first time within a sport context, that an individual’s experience of organizational stressors, their use of surface acting, and subsequent development of burnout play a critical role in the turnover process by increasing an individual’s desire to leave their organization. These findings provide support for previous research within sport and non-sport populations that have found experienced stress (see, for examples, Hang-yue, Foley, & Loi, 2005; Kim & Stoner, 2008; Lee, Seo, & Lee, 2016), surface acting (see Chau, Dahling, Levy, & Diefendorff, 2009; Goodwin, Groth, & Frenkel, 2011) and burnout (e.g., Gustafsson, Hassmén, Kenttä, & Johansson, 2008; Jung & Kim, 2012) to be associated with the desire to withdraw from sport or work. More importantly, chapter five extends past
cross-sectional research by examining the influence of organizational stressors and surface acting on withdrawal behaviours over time and the impact on actual turnover. Despite finding that organizational stressors and surface acting was not significantly related to actual turnover, turnover intention was found to increase over time, indicating that individuals were psychologically disengaged from their organization. Given these findings and the importance of retaining and managing talent and participation levels in sport, there is value in developing targeted organizational and emotion-regulation interventions to prevent further psychological withdrawal.

**Practical Implications**

Several practical implications emerged from this programme of research, which have relevance for sport practitioners, performers, sport personnel, and sport organizations as a whole. With regard to the current studies, and in line with findings from previous research (e.g., Arnold & Fletcher, 2012; Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009; Hayward, Knight, & Mellalieu, 2017; Mellalieu, Hanton, Neil, Fletcher, & Wagstaff, 2007; Rumbold, Fletcher, & Daniels, 2018) the organizational environment imposes numerous demands on the performers and personnel that operate within it. In turn, these organizational demands can have a negative impact on performance, health, and well-being (e.g., Arnold, Fletcher, & Daniels, 2017; Fletcher, Hanton, & Wagstaff, 2012; Knight & Harwood, 2009; Kristiansen, Halvari, & Roberts, 2012; Kristiansen, Murphy, & Roberts, 2012; Levy, Nicholls, Marchant, & Polman, 2009). Therefore, it seems palpable that sport organizations should drive appropriate change to minimize the demands placed on their performers and personnel. Research has explored individual interventions that equip individuals with techniques to reduce role stress (e.g., Didymus & Fletcher, 2017), which are likely to be helpful and shows promise. Indeed, Rumbold, Fletcher, and Daniels (2012) recently reviewed the
literature on stress management interventions with sport performers. Examples of the psychosocial interventions that were identified within this review included cognitive (e.g., imagery and self-talk) and multi-modal (e.g., stress inoculation training and progressive muscular relaxation) treatments. The authors resolved that stress management interventions were generally associated with optimized stress experience and enhanced performance, but that interventions can be moderated by several design features (e.g., treatment adopted, age, competition level, and stress component outcome measured) that should be considered when designing interventions. In addition to individual-level interventions, organizational-level interventions that target the sport environment by reducing or removing organizational demands are likely to have a beneficial effect. Recently, Rumbold et al. (2018) conducted a stress audit within a sport organization to provide recommendations for stress management interventions. The authors concluded that organizational interventions aimed at modifying stressors or reducing the impact of stressors on performers’ well-being are more likely to be effective if a stress audit is first adopted and integrated into an organization’s management strategy. By conducting stress audits or “health checks” within an organization, common organizational stressors will be identified by performers, allowing practitioners to determine whether interventions that target the individual, organization, or a combination of both are appropriate. Overall, individual- and organizational-level interventions require changes to complex systems and activities; however, sport organizations have a duty of care towards their performers and personnel, and in the long run, such interventions are likely to have a pervasive, positive impact on both the individual and the organization.
Further to the recommendations for stress-management interventions outlined above, there is also a need for methods to reduce the incidence of burnout in sport. Previous literature in sport has found associations between negative affective, cognitive, motivational, and behavioural consequences of burnout; for example, decreased performance, reduced motivation, overtraining, depressed mood, feelings of helplessness, and eventual withdrawal from sport (Cresswell & Eklund, 2006b; Gustafsson et al., 2008; 2011). The current research (i.e., Study 1 and Study 3) highlighted that turnover intention can be added to these negative consequences of burnout in sport. Interventions to prevent and reduce burnout have been evaluated in non-sport populations. For example, West, Dyrbye, Erwin, and Shanafelt (2016) reviewed the literature relating to physician burnout and found meaningful reductions in burnout as a result of individual-focused (e.g., mindfulness-based approaches, small group curricula, and stress management training) and organizational strategies (e.g., duty hour requirements, modifications to work processes). In addition, Awa, Plaumann, and Walter (2010) evaluated the effectiveness of intervention programs aimed at reducing burnout in the workplace. The interventions reviewed were either individual-level (68%), organization-level (8%) or a combination of both (24%), with organization-level and a combination of both having longer lasting positive effects. The authors concluded that burnout-prevention interventions are beneficial and that both person- and organization-directed measures should be offered, practiced, and evaluated. Given the findings of Study 3 within the present programme of research, it is hoped that sport psychology scholars are encouraged to conduct applied research to further examine the role of sport-related attitudes in the prediction of burnout. In doing so, these findings might serve to elevate the importance of organizational commitment, identity, and
engagement in sport and stimulate their emergence as topics of interest in the development of methods to reduce the incidence of burnout.

An important finding from Study 1 and Study 2 was the negative influence that surface acting can have on the relationships between organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intention. Hence, surface acting can be detrimental for the well-being of those who use such strategies. In addition to the well-being and retention outcomes found within study 1 and study 2, surface acting can also have negative outcomes for performance. For example, in a recent study by Wagstaff (2014), suppressing emotions (i.e., surface acting) resulted in a 3.3% decrease in performance on a 10k cycling time trial. It is important to understand why individuals might employ surface acting despite the negative associations with well-being. First, emotional labour efforts are sometimes necessary for individuals to build successful relationships and to align themselves with the expectations and norms of the organization (see Wagstaff, Fletcher, & Hanton, 2012). Second, individuals may not believe that there is an alternative strategy for managing their emotional responses to stressors. To elaborate, previous research by Hanton, Wagstaff, and Fletcher (2012) found that performers perceived organizational stressors to be largely negative and considered themselves to have little control and resources to cope with the demands. Because of these perceptions, performers and personnel might employ surface acting to suppress their emotional response to stressors as they do not believe that they can control or resolve the organizational demands through problem-focused action. Study 1 and Study 2 highlighted that the consequences of acute versus chronic surface acting are not well understood, and as a result, the author was reluctant to recommend its universal avoidance. Nevertheless, practitioners should be aware of the potentially heightened negative emotional
consequences of chronically expressing emotions that differ from true felt emotions and avoid portraying surface acting as a positive approach until further research has explored the longer-term impact on well-being and performance. Instead, practitioners might encourage deep acting as an alternative to surface acting (Hochschild, 1983). Research in non-sport domains has found deep acting, which occurs earlier in the emotion-generation process and involves reappraisal, to be associated with more positive outcomes compared to surface acting; for example, greater personal accomplishment, job satisfaction, performance of employees, and personal efficacy (e.g., Brotheridge & Grandey, 2002; Grandey, 2003).

Retaining and managing talent and maintaining participation levels is a key challenge for sport organizations. This programme of research has consistently highlighted the detrimental impact that high levels of organizational stressors and burnout can have on turnover intentions. In addition, the results of study 3 (chapter 6) highlight the importance of organizational commitment, identity, and engagement in the relationship between organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intention, and therefore, provide specific areas of opportunity for practitioners to decrease turnover within sport. Specifically, to reduce individuals’ turnover intentions, sport organizations should seek to implement interventions focusing on increasing individuals’ organizational commitment, identity, and engagement. Ideas and lessons can be drawn from the work and organizational psychology literature that has looked at the ways to increase and maintain attitudes through employee support programmes and training and development programmes (see chapter 6). Although the costs of designing and implementing training and support programmes that build on the positive aspects of organizational commitment, identity, and engagement might be
substantial, the potential for turnover reduction and improvements in attitudes towards the organization offer hope.

Overall, there are four key practical implications from this programme of research: (1) develop and implement interventions aimed at minimising the organizational demands placed on performers and personnel in sport; (2) prevent burnout through person- and organization-directed strategies; (3) encourage performers and personnel to manage their emotional reactions to organizational stressors using more positive reappraisal strategies (i.e., deep acting rather than surface acting); and (4), develop and implement support and training programmes aimed at fostering individuals’ organizational commitment, identity, and engagement. With these recommendations, it is hoped that practitioners can help performers and personnel to improve their management of - and emotional reactions to - the organizational demands placed on them, and ultimately, negate the negative outcomes of burnout and turnover intention while enhancing positive outcomes through increased organizational commitment, identity, and engagement.

**Strengths and Weaknesses of the Programme of Research**

This programme of research is not without weaknesses. First, a possible weakness lies with Study 3 in its cross-sectional nature. This design did not allow the observation of how the participants’ experience of organizational stressors was influenced by their commitment, identity, and engagement over an extended period. Adding a longitudinal perspective to this study could have offered a useful insight into the dynamic nature of the study’s variables, and whether the attitudes measured influenced actual turnover of the performers and personnel in the study. Nonetheless, the use of a cross-sectional design was considered appropriate for initially exploring the attitudinal phenomena and relationships in this area. Indeed, the cross-sectional
design combined with moderation and moderated-mediation analyses was the first step in understanding how the study variables interacted. As this study was limited by the confines of completing a Ph.D., it will be for future researchers with additional resources and time to undertake confirmatory examinations of this work and to examine these relationships over time.

A potential weakness that runs throughout the whole programme of research is related to some of the measures that were used. To elaborate, several of the measures were developed and validated with specific populations in mind, and therefore, slight modifications were made to allow other populations (i.e., coaches, managers, sports scientists, and medics) to be used in these studies. For example, the OSI-SP was developed and validated using athletes as the sample population and so required some item stems to be modified for use with other coaches and other stakeholders within the sample. To reiterate the recommendations made in Study 1 and Study 2, there is a need to develop and validate the OSI-SP for other sport social groups. Another example is the Emotional Labour Scale, which was originally developed to measure an employee’s emotional labour in the workplace. To allow the measurement of emotional labour within Study 1 and Study 2, the word “job” was replaced with “role”. Ultimately, this problem was unavoidable due to the lack of alternative measures available at the time of selection, and further, an evidence-based selection process was used to identify the most suitable measures from those that were available in the literature. Moreover, internal reliability information from these studies provides some reassurance that these changes did not detrimentally influence the data. Given the findings and implications of emotional labour highlighted in Study 1 and Study 2, there is a need to develop a sport-specific
measure of emotional labour to aid future research aimed at better understanding emotional labour among all stakeholders within sport organizations.

Another possible limitation from the programme of research was that appraisal data was not collected. According to the meta-model of stress, emotions and performance (Fletcher, 2006), appraisals play a key role in the stress process, which includes stressors, appraisals, responses, coping, and outcomes. However, appraisals are highly individualized and notoriously difficult to measure using existing quantitative measures, and therefore, it was decided that it was beyond the scope of the present research to assess appraisals. Hence, future research should be conducted to develop and validate methods and measures to examine organizational stressor appraisals.

Finally, there was a proportion of students that were recruited within the sample of participants in Study 2, which may have influenced the low number of actual turnover reported within the study. Indeed, it is possible that students would not report actual turnover unless they were also leaving their University. Therefore, researchers continuing this line of inquiry by seeking to confirm or extend the work presented in this thesis should be cognisant of this potential sampling issue, in addition to other potential confounding variables such as long term contracts, personal relationships or stressors, or the geographic location of organizations, and aim to broaden the sample of participants.

Turning from the limitations, this programme of research makes important theoretical and methodological contributions to the stress and emotion literature. Indeed, this programme of research provides the first examination of emotional and attitudinal phenomena as moderators in the relationships between organizational
stressors and well-being outcomes. In doing so, this research significantly advances the organizational stressor theory (i.e., the meta-model of stress, emotions and performance) and research in sport. Specifically, this programme of research has identified both negative (i.e., surface acting) and positive (i.e., commitment, identity, and engagement) moderating variables that can influence the impact of organizational stressors on well-being and retention outcomes. This provides support for the various components of the meta-model of stress, emotions and performance as well as furthering theoretical understanding of several key elements in the stress process.

A further strength of this programme of research is that both cross-sectional (Study 1 and Study 3) and longitudinal (Study 2) research methods have been used to allow for the collection of information-rich data. Longitudinal research designs are few and far between within the area of organizational stress in sport. The reason for this may be that scholars wanting to test their theories using longitudinal research face many challenges. Indeed, there are multiple methodological and design (e.g., appropriate spacing of repeated measures, handling attrition) and analytical (i.e., appropriate analysis methods for longitudinal questions) decisions to be made (Ployhart & Vandenberg, 2010). Therefore, by adopting a longitudinal research design to predict the relationships between organizational stressors, surface acting, turnover intention, and actual turnover, this programme of research has provided a novel contribution to the literature in organizational psychology. It is hoped that future research wanting to investigate these areas further will be encouraged to also use longitudinal designs as well as other methods to study causality such as structural equation modelling and action research.
Future Research Directions

This programme of research has helped to advance knowledge and understanding of the organizational demands faced by performers and personnel in sport and the consequences on well-being outcomes. Further, the present studies advance emotion- and attitude theory and research by identifying surface acting, commitment, identity, and engagement as moderators in the relationships between the frequency of organizational stressors, burnout, and turnover intention. To further extend knowledge in this area, several recommendations are made throughout this section for prospective research directions emerging from the studies reported in this thesis.

With regard to methodological developments, research on organizational stress, emotional labour, and various associated outcomes in sport remains in its infancy, and therefore, a more holistic approach that makes use of both quantitative and qualitative methods might be beneficial. Indeed, the convergence of qualitative and quantitative methods in future research studies might allow researchers to illuminate the full spectrum of moderators and mediators of the stress process as well as helping to understand the mechanisms by which such variables work. Qualitative research designs such as interviews, reflexive journals, ethnography, and observations will enable researchers to develop a deeper understanding of the complex, contextually-rich organizational environment that performers and personnel operate in. Indeed, qualitative methods may offer scholars the chance to discover other underlying patterns of relationships, illuminate other variables of potential interest, and provide reasoning behind participants’ responses. Additionally, quantitative research methods such as experiments, interventions, Bayesian approaches, and structural equation modelling will allow conclusions to be drawn
that might lead to potential strategies to reduce the negative health implications and other issues resulting from organizational stressors.

Given the advantages of the longitudinal design adopted in Study 2, it is recommended that future studies should continue to examine changes in variables over time, especially if these variables are likely to be dynamic in nature, as within this programme of research. Through such longitudinal research designs, the reciprocal relationships between the complexities of team and organizational environments and individuals’ performance and well-being can be addressed. Specifically, longitudinal research could be conducted to identify the optimal length (e.g., short-intense or longer-diffuse), type (e.g., preventative and reactive), and target level of interventions (e.g., individual or organizational) that lead to sustained organizational performance and well-being in sport. As suggested within chapter 6, the emergence of organizational change research (for example, Wagstaff, Gilmore, & Thelwell, 2015; 2016) provides an excellent opportunity for longitudinal research designs to examine the impact of challenging, changing conditions on individuals’ performance and well-being. Such research is likely to identify other potential individual differences (e.g., mental toughness, resilience, hardiness) and social factors (e.g., leadership styles, dynamics, cultural values, relationships) that influence key components in the stress process.

With regard to the measurement of organizational-related variables in sport, positive steps have been made to develop and validate sport-specific measures of organizational stressors (Arnold et al., 2013) and commitment (Jackson et al., 2014) as these areas of inquiry have emerged. Indeed, this programme of research supports the continued use of these measures in future examinations of organizational stressors and their relationships. It should be noted that, to shorten the overall length
of the OSI-SP used within this programme of research, the frequency scale of the OSI-SP alone was used. Arnold et al. (2013) stated that using the frequency scale alone would be adequate for researchers requiring a shorter version of the indicator. Thus, this decision was made to promote participant retention and prevent incompletion of the questionnaire if participants perceived that it may take too long to complete. For future research to assess the intensity and duration dimensions as well as the frequency of organizational stressors, a shortened version of the indicator could be investigated and tested. In addition, to facilitate future research in this line of inquiry, it is recommended that researchers look to develop new sport-specific measures of the other variables involved within the stress process (i.e., appraisals, responses, coping, as well as moderators, mediators, and outcomes). An additional future research suggestion involves validating the use of current measures from other organizational domains within a sporting context as well as identifying the transferability of existing sport-specific measures that were developed for use with specific populations in sport (e.g., athletes, coaches, managers). For example, the OSI-SP was developed and validated for use with athletes, and therefore, future research could test how it could be modified for use with other key stakeholders in sport such as coaches, managers, sport scientists, and medics.

With regard to the stress and burnout interventions alluded to previously in this discussion, future research is needed to evaluate their effectiveness, moderating factors, as well as assessment of their feasibility and associated costs (see, for review, Rumbold et al., 2012). To achieve this aim, best practice would suggest that researchers and practitioners will need to work in partnership. To elaborate, through the development of research agendas, researchers can provide recommendations and tailored advice based on intervention effectiveness to practitioners to help improve
their practice with performers and personnel (e.g., Rumbold et al., 2018). Yet, it is perhaps the immersed practitioner, with tacit knowledge of the daily to and fro of an organization, who is better placed to judge the efficacy and value of these interventions on the organization. Further, without support from practitioners and key stakeholders within the organization, the design and implementation of interventions are unlikely to be engaged with.

**Concluding Thoughts**

The aim of this thesis was to gain an in-depth understanding of the emotional and attitudinal phenomena, stress and well-being, and organizational environments that might help or hinder individuals in sport. Findings from this programme of research have highlighted the salient role that the organizational environment can have in creating undesirable outcomes for a variety of stakeholder and social agent groups within sport organizations. As such, the findings might assist organizations and practitioners by highlighting emotional labour (i.e., surface acting) and individuals’ attitudes to their organization (i.e., their commitment, identity, and engagement) as moderators of several key elements in the stress process, particularly with regards to burnout and intention to leave the organization. It is hoped that these findings facilitate progress towards changing individuals’ experiences of organizational stressors with a view to improving their well-being and retention in sport.
Chapter 8:

Reflective Epilogue
Abstract

The purpose of this final chapter was to reflect on the programme of research and present a personal account of completing this Ph.D. The chapter reflects on some of the obstacles faced throughout the process of conducting the present research with the intention of enabling the reader to gain an insight into the author’s experiences. The reflections within this chapter focus on the approach to this programme of research, the nature of quantitative, questionnaire-based research, the challenges of being a part-time researcher, and the lessons learned from undertaking a Ph.D.
My approach to this programme of research

At the start of this programme of research, I reviewed the extant literature (Chapter 2) within the area of organizational psychology in sport and identified the need for further examination in the areas of organizational stressors and emotions in sport. Taking this into account, I concluded that while the body of literature examining the types of organizational stressors and their allied responses had grown, little was known about how such individuals managed their emotional responses to these stressors or the consequences of such behaviours. As a result, I decided that the aim of my thesis would be to gain an in-depth understanding of the emotional and attitudinal phenomena, stress and well-being, and organizational environments that might help or hinder individuals in sport. To achieve this aim, I debated over the appropriate approach to take in conducting this programme of research. The following subsection provides a reflection on the ideas and beliefs that shaped how I approached this thesis.

In considering the appropriateness of potential methodologies and methods to explore the research aims of this thesis, I first deliberated the philosophical background for the research programme; specifically, issues relating to the questions of epistemology (i.e., the assumptions and foundations of knowledge) and ontology (i.e., the nature of reality). One end of the ontological continuum assumes that a single reality exists independent of people’s perceptions of it (i.e., realism) and the other end of the continuum assumes that there are multiple realities constructed by individuals (i.e., constructivism). On the epistemological continuum, at one end there are assumptions that it is possible to achieve direct knowledge of the world through direct observation or measurement of the phenomena (i.e., positivism). At the other end of this continuum, there are assumptions that direct knowledge of the phenomena
is not possible, and that observations and accounts of the world provide indirect indications of interpretation (i.e., interpretivism). Positivist epistemological assumptions and realist ontology are almost always linked because the direct objective measurement of phenomena is validated by repeated measures over time, and so the phenomena is constant and there is a single objective reality (Weed, 2009). I decided that positivist epistemology and realist ontology resonated with me most, but would the methodological approaches aligned with these assumptions (i.e., quantitative methodology) be suitable for this programme of research and would they contribute to the body of knowledge that already exists within stress and emotions?

The evolution of the organizational stress and well-being literature began to bloom with several early studies that illustrated the range of organizational demands (i.e., stressors) experienced by performers (Fletcher & Hanton, 2003; Hanton et al., 2005a; Woodman & Hardy, 2001a). Later, Fletcher and colleagues (Fletcher & Fletcher, 2005; Fletcher et al., 2006) developed the meta-model of stress, emotions, and performance as a framework of organizational stressors, stimulating further work in the area (Fletcher, Hanton, Mellalieu, et al., 2012; Fletcher, Hanton, & Wagstaff, 2012; S Mellalieu et al., 2009). In these earlier studies, a range of qualitative methods were used (e.g., case studies and interviews) to explore the content and quantity of the stressors experienced by performers. More recently, following a synthesis of the organizational stressor research (see Arnold & Fletcher, 2012), Arnold et al. (2013) developed the Organizational Stressor Indicator for Sport Performers (OSI-SP), providing researchers with a valid and reliable tool to assess organizational stressors. Considering the current state of the organizational stressor literature, I decided that quantitative research methods (underpinned by a positivist
and realist approach) were needed to further advance what was already known about
performers’ experiences of organizational stressors.

While I fully commit to my choice of philosophical framework and
methodology, I’ve increasingly appreciated that there are many ways to answer
research questions. Indeed, I align myself with Hardy’s (2015) call for the use of
both quantitative and qualitative methods in the study of research questions, even if
the philosophical underpinning of the two methods are different. Looking beyond
this programme of research, I’m intrigued to explore the different types of
epistemological approaches to research design and methodology within the sphere of
organizational stressors, emotional labour, and sport-related attitudes. This
programme of research was the first to explore emotional labour in sport, and I
would be interested to explore this area further using both quantitative and
qualitative methods. Indeed, the apparent importance of emotion regulation for
facilitating organizational functioning has previously been highlighted within sport
(see Wagstaff et al., 2012b), therefore, I would consider investigating both the costs
and benefits of emotional labour. Qualitative methods such as interviews, narrative
inquiry, and observation may be useful to collect information about the actual
emotions experienced by individuals and how they manage them (i.e., surface or
deep acting), as well as the types of events that individuals respond to within sport
organizations. Quantitative methods such as experimental designs, questionnaires,
and exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis may be used to further explore the
impact of emotional labour on psychosocial outcomes in sport and identify
moderators and mediators of emotional labour.
Reflections on doing quantitative research

To conduct the research contained within this thesis, I have had to overcome several challenges. Certainly, access to and recruitment of participants was a major obstacle in the completion of the research process. While I was planning my first study, I remember thinking that gaining access to performers and personnel in sport organizations would be easy. I naively thought that because I was using questionnaires to collect the required data rather than more intrusive or time-consuming methods, that organizations and their members would be more than happy to take part. Yet, the reality was very different, and I quickly learned that gaining access for data collection is a pervasive problem in organizational studies. To obtain access to sport organizations and their members, I had to break through the first barrier: those persons who act as “the gatekeeper” between the outside world and the organization. Often, the gatekeepers (e.g., performance directors, managers, head coaches, club secretaries, chairman) would initially be suspicious about the aims of my research and were resistant to being studied. Most were concerned about the amount of time that the research would take up for them and their members. Those that didn’t want to participate would give reasons for their response; including, they didn’t have enough time to participate, they think the research area (i.e., emotions and stress) is too sensitive, they’ve just been part of another research project, or simply that they don’t ever get involved with scientific research. I was unhappy about the lack of interest from these organizations. There were also organizations that didn’t return my invitation to participate at all, which was even more frustrating and disheartening.

Once I had penetrated the initial layer (i.e., the gatekeepers) and was ‘in’ with the organizations, I still had to get the participants to voluntarily co-operate. Usually,
with the gatekeepers’ permission, I would arrange to travel to a training session or club meeting to collect the data from the members. Sometimes, I would be introduced to the organization’s members by the gatekeepers, which certainly helped to build an immediate rapport and trust with the participants. At other times, I would be dependent upon my own ability to build relationships with the individuals operating within the organizations without prior introduction or communication. In these situations, I felt as though I had to “sell” the benefits of taking part in my research project before they would participate. Aside from the obvious problems such as not taking a questionnaire seriously, I also perceived that some participants had survey fatigue and the opinion of being “surveyed to death”. After a few early rebuffed requests to participate, I noted some of their reasons for disinterest to try and influence the success of future recruitment attempts. Some had the impression that surveys were long and complicated and thought it would take up too much of their time and require too much effort. Others were worried about the confidentiality of their information potential loss of privacy. Learning from this initial feedback, I attempted to get the participants to emotionally invest in the process, by letting them know that this was an opportunity to contribute to the research literature and by explaining how important their experiences were to the aims of the study. I also believe that by being open about how long the survey would take from the offset kept participants from giving up on the survey and ensured good quality responses. This may have influenced the success of my practice and participants’ perceptions of me, as even in today’s world where it feels as though we are “surveyed to death”, I was able to acquire a great response rate of nearly 800 participants throughout the programme of research. I concluded that a researcher’s networking skills and ability to build relationships with gatekeepers is a vital part of gaining access and recruiting
participants in organizations. It is important to be creative in trying to find ways to
resonate with the participants that we are interested in recruiting.

Taking the lessons that I had learned from Study 1, I was more confident in
my abilities when it came to gaining access to organizations and recruiting
participants in Study 2. However, different issues in dealing with the organizations
and research design came to light in these latter studies. Study 2 included further
questioning of respondents in a longitudinal survey design. Collecting the
questionnaire data at one juncture in the first study was difficult enough, so
extending the survey research to include a second data collection from the same
sample of participants was even harder. The engagement and commitment of the
organizations and their members were essential to the outcomes of this study.
Therefore, I was highly motivated to make a positive impression and worked hard to
build a rapport with the gatekeepers and participants during the initial period of data
collection. I believed that this would be vital for preventing loss of respondents and
influencing the accuracy of the data. Frustratingly though, an additional challenge
with the data collection came from a change in my own circumstances, as I had to
increase my hours in paid employment outside of my Ph.D. This left very little time
to physically go to sport organizations to meet potential participants face-to-face.
The outcome was that I had to attempt to build relationships with key gatekeepers via
telephone calls or email, which was less than ideal. I also had to rely on my own
organizational skills in the process of finding and retaining participants for this study.
I learnt that it was important to use study reminders and that scheduling the next
contact was key to retaining participants.

By the time that I had come to conduct my third study, I felt as though the
difficulties that I had experienced with gaining access to organizations in the first and
second studies made the data collection process easier. However, another obstacle that I overcame in relation to this programme of research related to the sensitive and potentially political nature of the research areas. Questions relating to stress, emotions, and attitudes can be a sensitive topic for participants. A strength of using a questionnaire design to measure these questions was that participants had the choice to answer questions in a private setting, and it was made clear that they could hand in a blank questionnaire if they wanted to. Questions relating to potential consequences or implications (e.g., burnout and turnover) was a sensitive area for both the participants and the organizations that they are a part of. It is possible that participants were suspicious of me in case I fed the information received about their experiences and intentions up to higher levels in their organization. It is also possible that the gatekeepers and key stakeholders of the organizations felt threatened by the potential outcomes of the research. What if the research showed unfavourable information regarding the culture and environment of their organization? Hence, it was important for me to obtain permission to conduct the research and to build trust with the organization’s gatekeepers and members to soften these perceptions.

Overall, the obstacles that I experienced in conducting the studies in this Ph.D. project helped to develop me as a researcher. I know that the skills and experiences gained from this programme of research relating to gaining access, building trust, and developing relationships will make my future path as a researcher easier. I also faced challenges throughout this Ph.D. that have influenced my learning and development as a person, which I feel also warrants discussion. In the following section, I share the challenges that I have experienced through conducting this Ph.D. as a part-time researcher.
The challenges of being a part-time researcher

I always knew that undertaking a Ph.D. would be a challenge but doing it part-time while in paid employment made it even tougher. I am, of course, glad that I decided to embark on this research journey because of the experiences gained and lessons learned throughout the process. Many things have changed over the six years of my Ph.D., both within my scholarly life and within my personal life. At the start of my Ph.D., I was living with my parents and lucky enough to be able to split my time equally between being at the university and my paid employment. On the weekdays that I was able to travel to university, I could be part of a brilliant research environment filled with students and staff that motivated and supported each other in many ways. During this time, I felt lucky to have great supervisors nearby and close friendships that I had developed with the other Ph.D. students within our research office.

Between my second and third year, I moved out of my parents’ home and bought my first house. This decision brought new challenges: paying a mortgage and running a home. To manage the first challenge, I had to increase my hours in paid employment from part-time to full-time hours. Running a home meant that these duties ate into the time outside of my job that I would usually keep aside for Ph.D. work. There were times when I felt overwhelmed; having to earn a living, run a home, deal with family commitments, maintain relationships, and at least attempt to keep a social life led to feelings of stress and anxiety about the lack of available Ph.D. time. I anticipated these challenges, and for the most part and was able to divide my time between the Ph.D. and other areas of my life sufficiently. Indeed, I learnt to use my free time productively to help me balance my employment and Ph.D. For example, I would read journal articles on my lunch break or watch video
tutorials while making dinner in the evening. Using my free time constructively in this way not only helped me to manage working and studying, it would also help me to feel less guilty and stressed about spending time away from my Ph.D. doing other things. I also learnt that it was important to schedule time for Ph.D. work around my other commitments in advance. Each week, I would write down my plans for the week and put time aside for my Ph.D. work around my other commitments. This took discipline, but helped to relieve my stress and anxiety as well as keep me on track with my Ph.D.

The biggest challenge that came with moving to full-time employment, however, was not being able to travel to university on a regular basis. Being separated from where my supervisors, friends and colleagues were in the research office made it a lot harder. Towards the end of my Ph.D., it became more and more difficult to feel a part of the research office and university environment. The friends that I had made at the start of my Ph.D. were mostly full-time students and had left the university after completing their research programmes. On the rare occasion that I was able to travel to university, I felt I knew the people there less and less, and I felt as though most of them didn’t understand why I was not at my desk most of the time. I experienced feelings of “imposter syndrome” and this impacted my own insecurities as a researcher. Staying connected with the trusted friends that I had made at the start of my Ph.D. and keeping up with a social network of other part-time or remote students helped me to counteract the effects of imposter syndrome. Having honest and supportive friendships provided valuable encouragement and a ‘reality check’ when needed.

The support that I’ve received from my family and friends at home has generally been fantastic, but it has been clear to me that none of them really
understood what I was doing. On many occasions, to be supportive of me, they would ask questions like, “what are you doing exactly?”, “how much longer will it take?”, and “what are you going to do with it when you’re done?”. I would always try to answer positively but I felt that I couldn’t fully explain to them the process of doing doctoral research, and most of the time, these questions just frustrated me. In the end, to avoid being asked questions, I stopped working on my Ph.D. in view of my parents, friends, and family at home. Instead, I would stay behind at my workplace to work on my Ph.D. This generally worked well for me, offering a quiet space to get on with writing my thesis, but it was also very lonely. If I ever reached a sticking point with my work or was experiencing a period of low morale, I didn’t have anyone close by to talk to about it. At these low points, I really missed the support and understanding of being in a research environment surrounded by people who were going through the same process as myself. Although being distant from the university and other research students was difficult it also made it easy for me to bury my head in the sand and ignore the work that I needed to do during these periods of frustration and low motivation. Of course, this would just lead to feelings of anxiety that I wasn’t doing enough and guilt for giving myself time off. I’ve learnt to accept that these frustrating and dispiriting times are to be expected as part of the Ph.D. life, especially for those research students who are conducting their Ph.D. at a distance or while juggling other forms of paid work.

During these times of low morale and reduced motivation, it was really important that I sought support from my supervisor. Although it was initially difficult to admit that I was struggling mentally, the response that I received was really positive. Research students, including myself, often have the misguided idea that we work best through motivation alone. However, I learnt that being able to talk through
my frustrations about my work and share with them my milestones and goals was important. It helped to know that my planning was realistic and achievable.

During my Ph.D., studying concepts such as stress, burnout and emotional labour, I realised that there was a lot of crossover between the areas of my research and my own life. Certainly, I believe that throughout the process of my Ph.D., I’ve battled with multiple and persistent stressors. To name a few, worries about money, self-doubt and fear of failure, anxiety, and time demands contributed to periods of high stress. In these moments, I would feel as though the Ph.D. was not only very hard, but impossible. Eventually, this stress and worry led to feelings of burnout: I was exhausted by constant thoughts of not being able to finish and fatigued from dividing my time between my Ph.D. and other areas of my life. Throughout this though, I didn’t want to show others that I was struggling: I needed to appear in control and confident in myself despite what I actually felt inside. I would suppress my negative feelings and emotions in front of my friends and family, and particularly in front of my supervisors. At one point, in the middle of my six years of study, I considered dropping out. I didn’t, and this period of uncertainty and diminished motivation improved, and although the stressors associated with my Ph.D. remained, I think I got better at managing them. Indeed, I learnt the importance of remaining optimistic, and discussing my feelings with other Ph.D. students and my supervisor. Strong support, encouragement, and constructive feedback helped to alleviate feelings of isolation and negative emotions. In addition, seeking varied, interesting, and rewarding tasks (e.g., presenting at a conference to boost my confidence) helped to manage dips in motivation, self-confidence, and morale. In the end, my drive for personal fulfilment and understanding that the Ph.D. process is a training exercise
meant to challenge me so that I can be ready to take on the rigors of academic life propelled me forward with the emotional stamina needed to finish this thesis.

Before embarking on a Ph.D., I think it’s important for any future researcher to understand that the process is equally filled with pleasures and challenges. When I first began my Ph.D., I had an ideal way and timeframe for completing it, but the reality has been very different, with many unexpected turns along the way. This has all been part of the journey for me and has not only influenced my development as a researcher, but also my personal development. My experience of this process has taught me several things that I would recommend to any future researcher, whether they are part-time or full-time:

- Celebrate the good moments. It’s easy to get caught up in negative feelings. To sustain motivation, it is important to pay attention to when things go well.
- Take a break when you need it and don’t feel guilty. While I was working full-time hours in my job, it meant that I had to compress my Ph.D. work into evenings, weekends, and holidays. You will struggle to do any good work if you are always exhausted and worn-out.
- Look after your mental and physical health. It’s easy to sit in front of a computer for hours on end when working on your Ph.D., and this is not healthy or productive. Stepping away from the computer, taking regular breaks, and exercising are great for regaining focus.
- Talk to your supervisors if you’re feeling overwhelmed. By raising your concerns early, you will be able to discuss priorities and arrange appropriate deadlines if needed. I have been lucky to have incredibly supportive supervisors who were understanding of my other commitments.
• Accept that you will make mistakes and that your motivation will drop on occasions. The Ph.D. is a training and learning programme, and this is all part of the process.
References


https://doi.org/10.1080/1091367X.2012.639608


https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.10.020

https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200903204754


https://doi.org/10.1300/J490v21n02


among top volleyball and handball players in Belgium and Norway. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise, 12*(2), 192–201.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.09.009


Eklund, R., & DeFreese, J. D. (2015). Athlete burnout: what we know, what we could know, and how we can find out more. *International Journal of Applied Sport Sciences, 27*(2), 63–75.


https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2010.541927

https://doi.org/10.1080/0958519050315141

https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118270011.ch2


https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2012.682376

Hardy, L. J. (2015). Epilogue. In S. D. Mellalieu & S. Hanton (Eds.), *Contemporary*
reviews in sport psychology (pp. 258–269). London: Routledge.


https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2010.484068


https://doi.org/10.1080/026999399379285


Vandenberg, R. J., & Barnes Nelson, J. (1999). Disaggregating the motives underlying turnover intentions: when do intentions predict turnover behavior?


https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2011.589423


https://doi.org/10.1080/14697017.2015.1062793


https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.01.006


https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.2016-0068

Wagstaff, C. R. D., & Larner, R. J. (2015). Organizational psychology in sport:
Recent developments and a research agenda. In S. D. Mellalieu & S. Hanton (Eds.), *Contemporary reviews in sport psychology*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.


Weed, M. (2009). Research quality considerations for grounded theory research in


https://doi.org/10.1016/S1469-0292(02)00049-3

https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1469-
Appendices
Appendix 1: Participant Consent Form

This study is part of a programme of research being conducted by the University of Portsmouth examining the interplay between individuals, their sport organization, and performance. It is hoped that this research will identify areas that may obstruct sport performance and highlight interpersonal areas for improvement.

Participation requires you to complete a questionnaire about your personal involvement in sport. This should take approximately 20-30 minutes to complete.

Ethics information

The raw data, which would identify you, will not be passed to anyone outside the study team and will be kept securely by the principle investigator Rebecca Larner.

The data, when made anonymous, may be presented to others at scientific meetings, or published as a project report, academic dissertation or scientific paper or book.

Anonymous data, which does not identify you, may be used in future research studies approved by an Appropriate Research Ethics Committee.

This study has been scientifically and ethically reviewed by the Department’s Scientific and Ethics Review Committee and also reviewed and been given favourable ethical opinion by the Science Faculty Ethics Committee.

I agree to take part in this study (please initial) □

Name of Participant: Date: Signature:
Appendix 2: Demographic Questionnaire

What is your gender?

Male ☐ Female ☐

What is your age?

[Blank]

What sport are you involved in?

[Blank]

What is your highest competition level?

[Blank]

How many years have you spent at your highest level of competition?

[Blank]
What is the name of the sport organization (the structure in which you most often operate, i.e., club or national governing body) that you are currently involved in?

________________________

How many years have you been a member of your current sport organization?

________________________

What is your main role within your current sport organization?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Athlete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport scientist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (Please specify)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Organizational Stressor Indicator for Sport Performers

Sometimes sport performers feel they should not admit to any pressures that they experience because these demands have the potential to have powerful effects on them and their performance. Actually, these pressures are quite common and a normal part of participation in competitive sport. To help us understand them, we want you to share your experiences with us in an open and honest way. With this in mind, please remember that there are no right or wrong answers to the questions because every sport performer is different and their environments are often changing.

Several of the questions use the word ‘team’. This refers to any of the people in your sport organization, such as managers, coaches, and teammates. If you represent more than one team in your main sport, please refer to the team that you have competed most frequently for in the past month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In the past month, I have experienced pressure associated with...</th>
<th>1 Frequency</th>
<th>2 Intensity</th>
<th>3 Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often did this pressure place a demand on you?</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How demanding was this pressure?</td>
<td>No demand</td>
<td>Very low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long did this pressure place a demand on you for?</td>
<td>No time</td>
<td>A very short time</td>
<td>A short time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>...the responsibilities that I have on my team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>...the relationship between my coach and I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>...the regulations in my sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>...my coach’s personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>...the accommodation used for training or competitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>...the training or competition venue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>...the organization that governs and controls my sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>...the atmosphere surrounding my team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>...how my team is selected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>...my teammates’ attitudes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>...the spectators that watch me perform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>...the food that I eat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>...the shared beliefs of my teammates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>...what gets said or written about me in the media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>...selection of my team for competition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>...my training schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>...the organization of the competitions that I perform in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>...injuries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>...the funding allocations of my sporting career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>...the development of my sporting career</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>...the technology used in my sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>...travelling to or from training or competitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>...my goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Emotional Labour Scale

Please tick the box that best indicates your level of agreement with each of these statements regarding the people within your sport organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly disagree</th>
<th>Slightly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I often pretend to have the emotions I need to show for others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I often ‘put on an act’ in order to deal with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I often find myself faking to others that I am in a good mood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I can create a look of concern for others, when in reality I am not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When dealing with a difficult person I can put on a sympathetic face, even though in reality I am feeling irritated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If someone angers me, I can resist by faking a happy face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Even if I am in a bad mood, I can leave a good impression with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I try to feel the positive emotions I must show to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I work very hard to really feel the positive emotions I consistently show to others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I take to heart the positive feelings needed to work with others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I can control my feelings enough to really put myself in others’ shoes to relate to their concerns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. In order to be what others expect, I can modify my true feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I adapt to see and feel things from others’ point of view</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I can manage my feelings to help me understand others’ perspective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. When dealing with someone difficult, I can find something positive to change my feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. In difficult situations, I can step back and modify my feelings so that I don’t take their rudeness personally</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I can separate my feelings enough to deal positively with a tough person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 4: Athlete Burnout Questionnaire

The following statements are designed to assess your feelings about YOUR PERSONAL INVOLVEMENT with your sport. Please mark a number from 1 to 5 to indicate your level of agreement with each of these statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Almost never 1</th>
<th>Rarely 2</th>
<th>Sometimes 3</th>
<th>Frequently 4</th>
<th>Almost always 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I’m accomplishing many worthwhile things in sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel so tired from my training that I have trouble finding energy to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>doing other things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The effort I spend in sport would be better spent doing other things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I feel overly tired from my sport participation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am not achieving much in sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I don’t care as much about my sport performance as I used to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am not performing up to my ability in sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I feel “wiped out” from sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I am not into sport like I used to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I feel physically worn out from sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I feel less concerned about being successful in sport than I used to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I am exhausted by the mental and physical demands of sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. It seems that no matter what I do, I don’t perform as well as I should</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I feel successful at sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I have negative feelings toward sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5: Questionnaire to Assess Turnover Intentions and Actual Turnover

Please tick the box that best indicates your level of agreement with each of these statements regarding your sport organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In the next few months, I intend to leave this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In the next few years, I intend to leave this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I occasionally think about leaving this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am no longer part of this organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 6: Organizational Commitment Questionnaire

Below are a series of statements that may or may not be reflective of your feelings about your sports team; please respond to all the statements according to how you feel about your membership to this team at this moment in time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would be very happy to spend the rest of my sporting life with this team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel as if this team’s problems are my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I do not feel a strong sense of belonging to this team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do not feel emotionally attached to this team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Being part of this team has a great deal of personal meaning for me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I do not feel any obligation to remain with this team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave this team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would feel guilty if I left this team now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. This team deserves my loyalty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I would not leave this team right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I owe a great deal to this team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Right now, staying with this team is a matter of necessity as much as desire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I feel that I have too few other options to consider leaving this team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. If I had not already put so much of myself into this team, I might consider joining a different team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. One of the few negative consequences of leaving this team would be the lack of available alternative teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. It would be very hard for me to leave this team right now, even if I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wanted to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Too much of my sporting life would be disrupted if I decided to leave this team now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 7: Team Identity Questionnaire

Please indicate below how much you agree with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel very connected with this team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Being part of the team is very important to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I am very happy that I belong to this team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8: Athlete Engagement Questionnaire

Please consider your sport experiences over the past four months when answering the following questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Almost never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Almost always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I believe I am capable of accomplishing my goals in sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel capable of success in my sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I believe I have the skills/technique to be successful in my sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am confident in my abilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I am dedicated to achieving my goals in sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I am determined to achieve my goals in sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I am devoted to my sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I want to work hard to achieve my goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I feel energised when I participate in my sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I feel energetic when I participate in my sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I feel really alive when I participate in my sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I feel mentally alert when I participate in my sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I feel excited about my sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I am enthusiastic about my sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I enjoy my sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I have fun in my sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 9: Participant Information Request Form (Study 2)

This survey is part of a programme of research. We would like to contact you to include you in the remainder of the research project. If you are happy to be contacted, please provide your email address and contact number below.

Thank you very much for your participation.

Email address

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Contact number

-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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