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Introduction

According to Tuner and Stets (2007), emotions are an inextricable feature of human experience, behaviour, and interaction. They are, from their perspective, the glue that can bind people together or, alternatively, drive us apart. Unfortunately, while scholars in other fields (e.g. sociology, education, and psychology, among others) have recognised the indisputable centrality of emotions “at all levels of social life”, be it “micro, macro, personal, organisational, political, economic, cultural, and religious” (Denzin, 1984, p. xiii), similar strides are yet to occur in the sports coaching literature. Indeed, despite some notable exceptions (e.g. Jones, 2006; Nelson, Potrac, Gilbourne, Allanson, Gale, & Marshall, 2013), the explicit consideration of emotion has been largely absent from the coaching literature base, inclusive of on-going efforts to develop its conceptual vocabulary (e.g. Jones, Edwards, Viotto Filho, 2016; North, 2017; Lyle & Cushion, 2017).

Thus far, much coaching inquiry has adopted, either overtly or implicitly, a cognitive lens. Perhaps one of the unintended consequences of examining coaching (and indeed coach education) in this way has been the representation of coaches, coach educators, and various other contextual stakeholders (e.g. athletes, support staff, administrators) as largely rational, calculating, and dispassionate individuals (Potrac, Jones, Purdy, Nelson, & Marshall, 2013). In this respect, the field has afforded little consideration to how emotions such as excitement, joy, anger, anxiety, guilt and embarrassment may be produced in, as well as through, the social interactions and contextual relationships that comprise various coaching and coach education settings (Jones, Potrac, Cushion & Ronglan, 2011; Potrac et al., 2013; Potrac, Jones, Gilbourne, & Nelson, 2013). Relatedly, our understanding of coaches’ decision-making has yet to examine how emotion might play an integral role in helping individuals to narrow down “the range of potential actions into a manageable assortment” (Potrac et al., 2013, p. 238). Here, a greater engagement with Hargreaves (2005, p. 280) suggestion that
“you can’t judge if you can’t feel”, represents, for us at least, an important way forward for the field. This point is also eloquently explicated by Oatley and Jenkins (1996), who noted that:

In real life, a purely logical search through all the possibilities is not possible (because of limitations of time, multiple goals and problems of co-ordination with others). Nevertheless, we must act…despite our limitations we must take responsibility for our actions and suffer their effects. This is why emotions, or something like them are necessary to bridge across the unexpected and unknown, to guide reason, and to give priorities among multiple goals.

Equally, the consideration of emotion as “a permanent dimension of our being in the world and being towards others” (Crossley, 2011, p. 62), would enhance our understandings and representations of the “coalitions, conflicts, and negotiations” (Fineman, 2005, p. 2) that lie at the heart of this social endeavour (Jones et al., 2011; Potrac & Jones, 2009a, 2009b; Thompson, Potrac, & Jones, 2015). Similarly, our conceptualisations of coach and athlete learning could also be enriched by recognising how emotions such as hope, anger, pride, anxiety, and boredom are “frequent, pervasive, manifold, and often intense” features of this activity (Pekrun & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2014, p. 1).

In fairness, the paucity of research addressing emotion in sports coaching likely owes much to the relatively short history of coaching scholarship rather than any conscious decisions by researchers to relegate emotion to the “ontological basement” of inquiry (Liston & Gibson, 2003, p. 5). As such, the above comments are not criticisms of the existing sports coaching research milieu. Instead, we believe the study of emotion can help us build upon the significant intellectual developments that have characterised this fledgling field of inquiry (Lyle & Cushion, 2017). Indeed, from our perspective at least (also see Potrac & Marshall,
2011; Potrac, et al., 2013), there is much to gain from embracing (fully) emotion as “the prime medium through which” coaches act and interact with others (Fineman, 2005, p. 1).

It is against this backdrop that we chose to pursue this special issue on the emotional dimensions of sport coaching. Our motivations for this project were various and interconnected. On one level, inspiration came from our own embodied, emotional, experiences as coaches and coach educators. While they often varied in duration, intensity, and connection, emotions such as joy, pride, guilt, and anger, among other emotions, have been (and remain) constant companions in our respective coaching ‘careers’ (e.g. Potrac et al., 2013). They are as Crossley (2011, p. 91) noted, not something that we turn on and off, such that we are sometimes emotional and other times not. Instead, our respective experiences of coaching and coach education always maintain an affective dimension. What varies, however, is the flavour and the intensity of affect (Crossley, 2011). We also understand our emotional experiences to be an inherent feature of our (inter)dependencies and relations with others (e.g. other coaches, athletes, parents, administrators, among others) (Burkitt, 2014; Crossley, 2011). That is, our emotions are never absent from our relationships with, and connections to, other people in our respective coaching worlds (Crossley, 2011). Indeed, our coaching practices have been variously “shaped, negotiated, rejected, reformed, fought over, [and] celebrated because of feelings” (Fineman, 2005, p. 1); both ours and those of others. Ultimately, we concluded that our experiences in the field certainly did not, and do not, match with the accounts of practice that we frequently read about in, and had contributed to, the body of knowledge in sports coaching.

We also found this state of affairs to be problematic when helping students to consider realistically the demands that coaching can make of people (Harris, 2015). For us, coaching is not about unproblematic recipes and ‘guaranteed’ prescriptions, or, indeed, heroic individual performances (Jones et al., 2011). Instead, the essence of coaching lies in how we manage
“the pressures, constraints, and possibilities of context” (Jones et al., 2011, p. 4). Here, we frequently wished for a rich, developed, and subject specific body of literature upon which to illustrate and consider how the ambiguities, pathos, and everyday politics of coaching are felt by individuals and groups, be they coaches, athletes, parents, or administrators (Harris, 2015; Jones et al., 2011). Over time, we grew increasingly worried about the apparent disjuncture between the material we presented in our respective coaching courses (i.e. how we might coach) and the emotional realities (i.e. how we, and others, might experience coaching) that we discussed informally with coaches, athletes, and coach educators in various sport settings (Harris, 2015; Cushion & Lyle, 2017).

In taking steps to address our concerns, we were thankful to be able to draw upon the contributions made by various and eminent scholars in mainstream social science (see Bolton, 2005; Denzin, 1983; Fineman, 2005, 2008; Turner & Stets, 2005, among others) and education (see Day & Lee, 2011; Leithwood & Beatty, 2007; Schutz & Pekrun, 2007; Schutz & Zembylas, 2009; Zembylas, 2005, among others). Rather than providing theoretical tinsel, as some have suggested, our engagement with such scholarship has undoubtedly advanced our own thinking, teaching, and, indeed, research in sports coaching (Potrac, Jones, & Nelson, 2014). Here, we found Hargreaves’s (1998) theorising on the emotional practice and politics of teaching and Thoits’s (2013) consideration of emotions, social ties, and well-being to be particularly inspiring. While we primarily make connections between these respective works and potential avenues for researching coaches’ emotions, we, of course, recognise that their application could extend to all those individuals that comprise the social networks of coaching (e.g. athletes, performance analysts, strength and conditioners, sport psychologists, parents, and administrators) and coach education (e.g. coach learners, assessors, administrators). Equally, we do not position these frameworks as the best or only ways for
researching and understanding emotion in sports coaching. Instead, we simply believe that such insightful scholarship can point us in a variety of productive directions.

In his article addressing the emotional politics of teaching and teacher development, Hargreaves (1998) proposed several interconnected points about the emotional dimensions of teaching that coaching researchers and coach educators may also wish to consider in their own research and applied endeavours. Firstly, in drawing upon the work of Denzin (1983), Hargreaves (1998) proposed that, like all aspects of social life, our engagements in pedagogical activity are not just technical and cognitive. Here he argued that:

…as an emotional practice [our italics], teaching activates, colours, and expresses teachers’ own feelings, and the actions in which those feelings are embedded. Likewise, as an emotional practice, teaching activates colours and otherwise affects the feelings and actions of others with whom teachers work and form relationships. Teachers can enthuse their students or bore them; be approachable to parents or alienate them; feel supported by their colleagues (and therefore willing to take risks in improving their craft) or mistrusted by them (and therefore more inclined to play safe (Hargreaves, 1998, p. 320).

From our perspective, such arguments could equally be made about coaching, be it in high performance, development, or community settings (Lyle & Cushion, 2017). Indeed, alongside the papers presented in this special issue, there is certainly some evidence that is suggestive of this observation (e.g. Jones, 2006; Nelson et al., 2013; Purdy & Potrac, 2016; Purdy, Potrac & Jones, 2008; Potrac et al., 2013).

Relatedly, Hargreaves (1998) highlighted how teaching entails emotional understanding and emotional labour. The former refers to:

…an intersubjective process requiring a person to enter into the field of experience of another and experience for himself or herself the same or similar experiences
experienced by another. The subjective interpretation of another’s emotional experience from one’s own standpoint is central to emotional understanding. Shared and shareable emotionality lie at the core of what it means to understand and meaningfully enter into the emotional experiences of another (Denzin, p. 1984, p. 137).

In the context of coaching, emotional understanding refers to a coach seeking to comprehend the intentions, thoughts, feelings, and behaviours of others using empathy and emotional imagination (Hargreaves, 1998). Given the importance of obtaining, maintaining, and advancing a connection with athletes (and other situational stakeholders), examining how coaches recognise and respond to fear, pride, embarrassment, or disgust in others is a potentially fruitful avenue of inquiry for advancing our understanding of coaches pedagogical and micro-political tact (Hargreaves, 1998).

In drawing upon the classic work of Hochschild (1983), Hargreaves (1998) argued that teaching entails active emotional labour. Here, emotional labour refers to work that:

…requires one to induce or suppress feelings in order to sustain the outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others…This kind of labour calls for co-ordination of mind and feeling, and it sometimes draws on a source of self that we honour as deep and integral to our personality (Hochschild, 1983, p. 322).

For Hargreaves (1998), the emotional labour of teaching entails more than superficially acting out feeling such as surprise or disappointment. For example, he also suggested that it requires “consciously working one-self up into a state of actually experiencing the necessary feelings that are required to perform one’s job well” (Hargreaves, 1998, p. 322). Hargreaves (1998) further argued that emotional labour is not always a negative phenomenon, where individuals feel obliged to trade parts of their self for the security and rewards that they obtain from employers. Instead, he contended that there could also be some positive aspects
to emotional labour. These can include, for example, circumstances where an individual understands his or her emotional performances to be a genuine form of giving to others; such as enhancing their learning. Importantly, Hargreaves (1998) also stressed that emotional labour is something that can also be turned against the person exercising it, be it through ever increasing performance expectations and workload, stress, and extreme self-sacrifice. These factors have potentially profound consequences in terms of promoting burnout and teacher cynicism (Hargreaves, 1998). While the concept of emotional labour and emotion management has received some initial attention in the coaching literature (e.g. Cassidy, Jones, & Potrac, 2016; Nelson et al., 2013; Potrac & Marshall, 2013), they remain little understood and under-researched aspect of coaches’ (and other stakeholders) lives.

Hargreaves (1998) further described how the emotions of teaching are also shaped by the moral purposes of those who teach and, relatedly, the extent to which workplace conditions allow them to achieve their desired goals and purposes. While the fulfilment of our moral purposes can result in happiness, joy, and pride, the failure to be able to pursue or achieve them can lead an individual to experience guilt, anxiety, anger, and frustration (among other negative emotions). In an educational context, Hargreaves (1998) suggested that these negative emotional experiences can be influenced by several factors. These include: a) when teachers face perceived obstructions (e.g. increased form-filling, meetings, and performance assessment); b) when they are compelled to achieve other people’s goals that they find inappropriate (e.g. mandated curriculums and standardised teaching episodes); c) when they are required to pursue standards that are defined too ambitiously for the learners in their charge; and d) when they are unable to choose between multiple (and sometimes) conflicting goals. For Hargreaves (1998), it is a sense of loss relating to moral purposes that can lead educators to feel demoralised. In the context of coaching, Hargreaves (1998) theorising regarding moral purposes provides a valuable lens for considering how coaches’
emotions may be tied up in their purposes, what stakes they have and are asked to have in them, whether the conditions of the coaching setting make them achievable or not, and the implications these various factors have for coach retention and well-being (Cassidy et al., 2016).

Hargreaves’s (1998) theorising also acknowledges how teachers’ emotions are rooted in, as well as affect, their selves, identities, and situational relationships with others. In particular, he argued that many of the emotions that “we feel are intimately related to our sense of physical safety, psychological security and moral integrity” (Hargreaves, 1998, p. 323). Here, feelings of security, being valued, wanted, and protected can lead to happiness. The opposite can result in an individual experiencing fear, shame, and anxiety (Hargreaves, 1998). Interestingly, Hargreaves (1998) highlighted how working with others can be an emotionally laden experience. For example, collaborating with, performing for, or being assessed by, others often entails some degree of discomfort and anxiety, as individuals are, for all intense purposes, putting their professional persona and sense of self at risk (Hargreaves, 1998).

While he recognised that risk itself is not an emotion, Hargreaves (1998) argued that it is certainly capable of generating strong emotions. These include “the fear and anxiety of confronting danger and threat, as well as the exhilaration of mastery and achievement when difficulties have been surmounted” (Hargreaves, 1998, p. 324-325). While a certain level of individual anxiety is essential to pedagogical risk-taking and professional development, Hargreaves (1998) suggested that it needs to be balanced with collective feelings of security, trust, and of being valued. Here, Hargreaves (1998) drew on the work of Bauman (1997), who noted that “freedom without security assures a no more steady supply of happiness that security without freedom” (p. 3). While coaching researchers have begun to explore the interconnections between a coach’s sense of self, organisational relationships, and inter-
personal trust (e.g. Jones, 2006; Potrac et al., 2013a; Purdy & Potrac, 2016; Purdy, Potrac, & Nelson, 2013, among others), there has been little explicit attention of the inherent emotional components. Equally, there has yet to be any concerted effort to explore coaches’ (and other stakeholders’) experiences of specific positive (e.g. happiness, joy, pride) and negative (e.g. fear, shame, anger) emotions are grounded in an individual’s sense-making and responses to the interpretations, feedback, and actions of others (Burkitt, 2014).

The penultimate point addressed by Hargreaves (1998) concerns teachers’ experiences of power and powerlessness. At the heart of his argument is the recognition that “emotions are a political as well as personal phenomena” (Hargreaves, 1998, p. 326). That is, “a very large number of human emotions can be understood as responses to the power and/or status meanings and implications of situations” (Kemper, 1995, p. 45). In drawing upon the writings of Kemper (1995), Hargreaves (1998) contended that when an individual experiences an increase in their own power, he or she may feel more secure. An increase in status can also lead to feelings of happiness, pride, and gratitude. In contrast, and of equal importance, a perceived reduction in power can invoke fear and anxiety, while a loss of status might variously provoke anger, shame, or depression (Hargreaves, 1998). Importantly, these emotions are affected by the micro-politics of the organisations in which individuals are enmeshed, as well as the wider neoliberal values and policy milieu in which the activity occurs (Hargreaves, 1998). While the political nature of coaching has been the subject of some initial inquiry (e.g. Potrac & Jones, 2009a, 2009b; Thompson et al., 2015; Potrac et al., 2013, among others), there has been little consideration of the various emotions that are at the heart of these dynamics and interactions. As alluded to earlier in this introduction, the study of emotions may enable to us to understand better not only how coaches experience various acts of collaboration, negotiation, and conflict within an organisation, but also why they interpret and respond to them in the ways that they do.
The final component of Hargreaves (1998) theorising is concerned with *culture* and *context*. Here, Hargreaves (1998) addressed how the emotion some individuals feel, as well as their decision to hide or show an emotion to others, may “vary among cultures, occupations, genders, and ethnocultural groups” (Hargreaves, 1998, p. 329). By way of an example, he contrasted Nias (1989) disapproval of teachers’ anger in British primary school classrooms with the North American Native Indian Medicine Way Path of Learning, which “values anger at injustice as something worth cultivating in students” (Hargreaves, 1998, p. 329). For Hargreaves (1998, p. 329) there is much to gain from recognising how “emotions and their legitimate expression…are culturally loaded, being afforded different value within different cultural, racial, and ethnic groups”. When applied to coaching and coach education, Hargreaves’s (1998) insights may provide a lens for helping us to critically consider how coach recruitment and development is not an emotionally or morally neutral process. Instead, these activities include exposure to the political and cultural sensitivities and differences in the relations between minority and majority groups (Hargreaves, 1998). This is certainly an area that is ripe for research by coaching scholars.

In moving onto the work of Thoits (1989, 2004; 2011), we believe that her interactionist theorising of emotion also raises a number of conceptual ideas that could usefully inform future coaching scholarship. At the centre of her social thought is the belief that the investigation of everyday emotions should not be restricted to their innate, biophysical features. Instead, she argued for a greater recognition of how emotions, such as anger, fear, happiness, disgust, and sadness, are grounded in our social relations with others. In drawing upon various historical and cross-cultural examples of how people variously experience, understand, display, and regulate emotion, she illustrates how “subjective experiences and emotional beliefs are both socially acquired and socially structured” (Thoits, 1989, p. 319).
In keeping with her chosen ontological position, Thoits (1989, 2004, 2011) attaches considerable importance to investigating the normative content of emotions. That is, what children and adults learn through the process of emotional socialisation. For Thoits (2004, p. 364), “emotion norms not only define situationally appropriate feelings and displays”, but they also inform people’s sense making and responses to their social environments. Like Hargreaves (1998), Thoits (2004) suggests that emotional expectations can vary across social settings and that societies can be comprised of “multiple, overlapping and potentially conflicting emotional ideologies” (p. 365). For the field of sport coaching, Thoits (2004) stimulates us to understand better how these ideologies may be deliberately created to justify and/or serve the goals of small groups, specific organisations or whole industries. Indeed, Thoits’s (1989, 2004, 2011) insights arguably raise important questions about how emotional rules are learnt and shape the evaluations, expressions, and practices of coaches, athletes, and other key stakeholders.

In her analysis of literature addressing workplace emotion, she highlighted how employees across a range of organisations and roles have actively conformed to the emotion rules of their working contexts (Thoits, 2004). According to Thoits (2004), they do so to secure the social approval of significant others and avoid those sanctions associated with the violation of these normative expectations. Her critical review also addressed a range of emotion management strategies utilised by employees. These include cognitively reframing social situations to elicit alternative emotional responses, altering their physiological state through bodily work, and performing desired behaviours through purposive expression work (Thoits, 2004). In a similar vein to the work of Hargreaves (1998) then, Thoits’s (1989, 2004, 2011) theorising might help us to understand better how coaches’ social and emotional performances relate to individual and group understandings of
normative expectations, social approval, and sanctions. For us, this represents an important line of research for coaching scholars.

In addition to the management of their own emotions, Thoits (1989, 2004, 2011) also explores how employees may be required to influence the emotions of those individuals with whom they work. She refers to this feature of organisational life as *interpersonal emotion management*. Developing an understanding of this feature of organisational life is, from her perspective, of considerable importance to explaining why acts of “cohesion, cooperation, and loyalty” as well as “conflict, discrimination, injustice, and cruelty” may occur (Thoits, 2004, pp. 369). In her discussion of the social function of emotional conformity and the responsive interpretation of others’ emotions, Thoits (2004, 2011) drew on Cahill's (1999) notion of *emotional capital* as a sensitising device. Emotional capital refers to an individual’s understanding of the cultural norms and expectations of his or her social contexts, as well as their ability to regulate and transform one’s own and other’s emotions (Thoits, 2004, 2011). She explained that individual’s possessing considerable emotional capital have the potential to “deliberately manipulate other people’s emotions to sustain, usurp, upset, or withhold social placement from some and to convey it to others (or themselves)” (Thoits, 2004, p. 371). Emotional capital also permits workers to “evaluate the self from the perspective of other people” so that they may strategically conform to the expectations of others. This can feature in “the restoring and repairing of self-image when damaged, and manipulating others’ emotions for personal benefits or gain” (Thoits, 2004, p. 372). To date, there has yet to be any concerted effort to explore if coaches seek to manage the emotions of those key contextual stakeholders with whom they interact, the interactional strategies that they use to obtain desired outcomes, and the reasoning that underpins this aspect of their practice. From our perspective, this state of affairs certainly needs to be addressed.
According to Thoits (2004, 2011), sensitivity to the emotional experiences of others permits individuals to actively develop a sense of collective identity and social solidarity. In her theorisation of those mechanisms linking social ties to physical and mental health, Thoits (2011) argued that perceived emotional support can positively impact on an individual’s psychological well-being. Indeed, Thoits (2011) claimed that the everyday emotional (in addition to informational and instrumental) support that individuals may receive in their relationships with others might not only sustain their self-esteem and sense of belonging, but also the level of control that an individual perceives that they have over future events. In addition to routine everyday emotional support, Thoits (2011) contends that the caring, sympathetic, and comforting presence offered by significant primary and secondary group members may reduce physical and psychological adversity during times of distress. She explained that individuals, who have experienced similar stressful situations, are particularly able to offer empathic and tolerant understandings of another’s concerns and emotional reactions. Such interactions, she argued, can help to validate the normalcy of the other’s emotional reactions, reduce the psychological arousal that he or she may be experiencing, as well as strengthen their potentially lowered self-regard (Thoits, 2011). While researchers have started to investigate how coaches’ interactions with other stakeholders may impact on the value an individual attaches to his or her self (e.g. Thompson et al., 2013; Potrac et al., 2013), little explicit attention has been given to examining how the supportive (or unsupportive) actions of others may impact, either positively or negatively, on coaches’ psychological well-being (Nelson, in press). This certainly represents an important strand of inquiry, especially in terms of assisting and retaining coaches in high performance, developmental, and community settings.

For us, Hargreaves (1998) and Thoits (1989, 2004, 2011) raise several important aspects that are worthy of attention. The first relates to the need to develop a greater
understanding of coaching as an emotional practice that likely entails (considerable) emotional labour. Indeed, we know very little about how coaches manage their own emotions, as well as attempt to influence the emotional experiences of others. The second is concerned with the futility of continuing to reduce coaching to technical competencies alone. Emotions, from our perspective, ought to be at the core of coaching and should not be seen as secondary or “sentimental adornments” to the technical and functional parts of a coach’s (and other stakeholders) work (Hargreaves, 1998, p. 330). Thirdly, there is perhaps much to gain, both theoretically and practically, from explicitly examining the interconnections between the moral purposes of coaches, the political dynamics of coaching policy and organisational life, the social relationships that comprise coaching, and the (heavy) investment of the self that coaches make into this activity (Hargreaves, 1998; Thoits, 1989, 2004, 2011). They also encourage us to recognise how the emotional politics of coaching and coach education may vary from coach to coach, setting to setting, from one time to another, and between different cultures. Finally, our engagement with the social thought of these scholars has stimulated us to give greater consideration towards to how the emotional support that coaches do or not receive from situational stakeholders may impact upon their psychological well-being.

In practical terms, curriculum leaders and developers, including ourselves, arguably need to do more to embrace the emotional dimensions of coaching and coach development. An initial first step in this regard might be to “acknowledge and even honour the centrality of the emotions to the processes” of coaching, learning, performance, and caring in practice. While various educational strategies could be utilised to achieve this goal (see Beatty 2004, 2006, 2007), the overarching intent should be “to put the heart back into” coaching, learning, and leading in a sincere manner and for the benefit of all (Hargreaves, 1998, p. 333).
The papers in this Special Issue

For this special issue, we subscribed to the definition of emotion developed by Turner and Stets (2005). They suggested that emotions can be understood to consist of five core elements:

(a) the biological activation of key body systems; (b) socially constructed definitions and constraints on what emotions should be experienced and expressed in a situation; (c) the application of linguistic labels provided by culture to internal sensations; (d) the over expression of emotions through facial, voice, and other paralinguistic moves; and (e) perceptions and appraisal of situational objects or events. (Turner & Stets, 2005, p. 9)

While no single element can explain when, how and why emotions are expressed and understood in particular ways, the articles in this issue specifically focus on the socially constructed, personally enacted, and embodied features of coaches’ and athletes’ emotions. In doing so, we do not deny individual, physical and psychical dimensions of emotions, but, instead, seek to understand them from a broadly social-relational perspective (Cantó-Milà, 2016).

In the first paper, ‘Desire and paranoia: An embodied tale of emotion, identity, and pathos in sports coaching’, Potrac, Mallett, Greenough, and Nelson address the lead author’s (emotional) understandings of coaching an amateur women’s football. Through a process of collaborative inquiry, the authors consider how a coach’s embodied emotional experiences and meaning making were, produced in, as well as through, the interaction of self and other in the club context. Following the presentation of storied experience, the complementary works of Burkitt (1997, 2014) and Scott (2015) are deployed as the primary heuristic devices. Here, the authors’ interpretation focuses on the interconnections between emotion, identity, and embodied experience. In concluding the paper, Potrac et al. advocate a greater integration
of emotion into ongoing and future coaching scholarship.

The next article, by Martinelli, Day and Lowry, focuses on coaches’ experiences of guilt in relation to athlete injury. Here, in-depth semi-structured interviews were used to generate data concerning coaches’ understandings of the development and regulation of guilt. The coaches’ stories were then critically interrogated using psychological theorising concerning trauma-related guilt. As well as illuminating how guilt may be embodied and managed in different ways by coaches, the authors also raise some important concerns regarding the deontological approach used to define a ‘good’ coach in much coach education provision. In particular, Martinelli et al. argue that dominant discourses regarding coaches’ obligations and athletes’ entitlements may be instrumental in entrenching coaches’ experiences of guilt in everyday practice.

The third paper by McNeill, Durand-Bush, and Lemyre investigates coaches’ understandings of burnout. Based on in-depth interviews with professional coaches, the authors present five non-fictional short stories highlighting the emotions that underpinned the coaches’ experiences and sense making. As well as considering emotions such as anxiety, anger, apathy, and dejection, the authors also consider these emotions in relation to the three dimensions of burnout; namely, emotional exhaustion, depersonalisation, and reduced personal accomplishment. Finally, the authors highlight the need for further intervention research that aims to better understand, reduce, and manage coach burnout.

The penultimate contribution to this special edition is provided by Douglas and Carless. For this study, ethnographic data were collected at a golf intervention where civilian coaches worked among serving injured, sick, and wounded military personnel in a recovery setting. Through the utilisation of a series of vignettes, the authors consider how emotions are evoked, hidden, or made visible depending on different social situations and relationships. The stories also reveal some of the potential costs or risks of becoming more empathetic and
caring. The authors conclude the paper by considering the value of narrative inquiry for illuminating the social and emotional aspects of our lives, work, and relationships that can otherwise be difficult to articulate and share.

In the final paper, Magill, Nelson, Jones, and Potrac consider the emotional dimensions of athletes’ everyday participation in video-based feedback sessions. Data for this study were obtained through a process of collaborative critical reflection and in-depth interviews with elite female footballers. Using fictional narratives as their mode of representation, the authors highlight the emotional, embodied, and relational features of two players’ experiences of video-based feedback. Burkitt’s (1999, 2014) writings addressing (complex) emotions and social relations are used as the primary sense-making framework, with the analysis focusing on the interconnections between sensate, corporeal experience, and the power relations and interdependencies in which high performance athletes are enmeshed. In their conclusion, Magill et al. suggest that the exploration of individual emotion management within a network of social relations would help us to understand better the emotionality of athletes (and other stakeholders) within high performance sport settings.
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