

Campo, Mickael, Sanchez, Xavier ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3498-0276> , Ferrand, Claude, Rosnet, Elisabeth, Friesen, Andrew and Lane, Andrew M. (2016) Interpersonal emotion regulation in team sport: mechanisms and reasons to regulate teammates' emotions examined. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 15 (4). pp. 379-394.

Downloaded from: <http://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/2050/>

Usage of any items from the University of Cumbria's institutional repository 'Insight' must conform to the following fair usage guidelines.

Any item and its associated metadata held in the University of Cumbria's institutional repository Insight (unless stated otherwise on the metadata record) may be copied, displayed or performed, and stored in line with the JISC fair dealing guidelines (available [here](#)) for educational and not-for-profit activities

provided that

- the authors, title and full bibliographic details of the item are cited clearly when any part of the work is referred to verbally or in the written form
 - a hyperlink/URL to the original Insight record of that item is included in any citations of the work
- the content is not changed in any way
- all files required for usage of the item are kept together with the main item file.

You may not

- sell any part of an item
- refer to any part of an item without citation
- amend any item or contextualise it in a way that will impugn the creator's reputation
- remove or alter the copyright statement on an item.

The full policy can be found [here](#).

Alternatively contact the University of Cumbria Repository Editor by emailing insight@cumbria.ac.uk.

**Interpersonal emotion regulation in team sport:
Mechanisms and reasons to regulate teammates' emotions examined**

11 **Abstract**

12 The interpersonal dimension of emotion regulation in the field of sport has lately received
13 a burgeoning interest. Nevertheless, how and why athletes regulate their teammates'
14 emotions in competitive setting remains unclear. Across two studies within a team sport
15 context, we uncovered athletes' mechanisms for, and reasons to regulate teammates'
16 emotions during competition. In Study 1, we investigated how rugby (n = 22 males)
17 players' emotions were self- and interpersonally regulated during games. Findings revealed
18 the emergence of a continuum of self-involvement in the regulatory processes, wherein two
19 forms of emotion regulation co-existed: self-regulation (total self-involvement) and
20 interpersonal regulation, which included co-regulation (partial self-involvement;
21 regulation with others) and extrinsic regulation (no self-involvement; regulation by/of
22 others). In Study 2, we examined the motives that lead rugby (n = 30 males) players to use
23 interpersonal extrinsic regulation strategies during games. Interview data indicated that
24 players regulated teammates' emotions for altruistic reasons (to help a teammate), egoistic
25 reasons (for one's own benefits), or both. Overall, our findings further knowledge to better
26 understand interpersonal emotion regulation within competitive team sport contexts. From
27 an applied perspective, findings highlight the role that both individual goals and ego
28 involvement may play in optimising efficient interpersonal regulation during competition
29 at team level.

30 *Keywords:* affective states, coping, emotional contagion, emotion regulation, rugby
31 union.

32

33 **Introduction**

34 Fear of injury, guilt after a mistake, pride following personal success, anger towards
35 a referee's decision, happiness after a win... these are only a few of the many emotions
36 athletes might need to manage during competition (e.g., Jones, 2012). In the last two
37 decades, academics had been interested in the study of affective regulatory processes that
38 facilitate attainment of optimal emotional states that, ultimately, facilitate best sport
39 performances (Stanley, Lane, Beedie, Friesen, & Devonport, 2012). Recently, attention has
40 been drawn to the need to study interpersonal regulation – emotions modulated and
41 regulated by others (see Zaki & Williams, 2013) – within competitive team sport so as to
42 better understand team emotions. However, to date, knowledge and understanding on this
43 issue is relatively unexplored (Campo, Mellalieu, Ferrand, Martinent, & Rosnet, 2012;
44 Uphill, McCarthy, & Jones, 2009) and “vague and imprecise” (Friesen, Devonport, Sellars,
45 & Lane, 2013, p.1). The aim of the present two-study research was to investigate
46 interpersonal emotion regulation within the context of team contact sport with particular
47 attention directed to athletes' mechanisms and reasons to regulate teammates' emotions
48 during competition.

49 Emotion regulation is defined as “the process by which individuals influence which
50 emotion they have, when they have them, and how they experience and express these
51 emotions” (Gross, 1998, p. 275). Within the process model of emotion regulation (Gross,
52 1998; Gross & Thompson, 2007), it is stated that emotions can be self-regulated but also
53 interpersonally regulated (Netzer, Van Kleef, & Tamir, 2015) – the latter as applying to an
54 emotion regulated by others as well as the regulation of others' emotions (Zaki & Williams,
55 2013). In mainstream (social) psychology, past research has shown the utility of
56 understanding interpersonal regulation in other settings than sport (e.g., Niven,
57 Totterdell, & Holman, 2009; Zaki & Williams, 2013). Within the broad domain of affective
58 regulation in sport, strategies that imply social interactions have been identified, including

59 communal coping, talking to other players and seeking support from teammates. Within
60 the sport context, emotion regulation research has predominantly focused on the study of
61 self-regulation while the examination of its interpersonal dimension has been neglected
62 (e.g., Balk, Adriaanse, Ridder & Evers. 2013); this has recently been highlighted as a
63 limitation (Tamminen & Crocker, 2013).

64 To date, the process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998) has only partially
65 been considered within the sport domain. For instance, Uphill, Lane and Jones (2012)
66 tested the psychometric properties of Gross' Emotion Regulation Questionnaire with
67 athletes (ERQ; Gross & John, 2003). Nonetheless, they considered only two (reappraisal
68 [cognitive change] and suppression [a form of response modulation]) of the five emotion
69 regulation families according to Gross' (1998) framework (see below for details). More
70 recently, Balk et al. (2013) examined the strategies used by athletes under pressure in a
71 golf putting task. Here, this research was also based on a partial view of the process model
72 of emotion regulation; that is, only reappraisal (cognitive change) and distraction
73 (attentional deployment) were manipulated.

74 According to Gross (1998), there are five different families of emotion regulation
75 strategies: situation selection, situation modification, attentional deployment, cognitive
76 change, and response modulation. The first four families are considered "antecedent-
77 focused"; they occur before the emotional response. Situation selection involves taking
78 actions to increase or decrease the likelihood of creating desirable or undesirable emotions.
79 Thus, an athlete might avoid an opponent who often makes him/her feel angry. Situation
80 modification is also based on the interaction between the features of a situation and the
81 expected emotional responses, but it emphasizes the manipulation of situation
82 characteristics. For example, if the aim of the regulation is to prompt functional emotions,
83 an athlete might modify training in order to increase the likelihood of success. Attentional
84 deployment refers to the use of specific attentional cues for particular situations. This

85 process may involve diverting attention away from unwanted feelings; for example, a
86 player could listen to music to distract from the fatigue he/she is feeling (Stanley et al.,
87 2012). Cognitive change refers to modifying how an individual appraises a situation to alter
88 the situation's emotional significance; symptoms of physiological arousal before a
89 competition may be interpreted either as facilitative or debilitating to performance
90 (Martinent, Campo, & Ferrand, 2012). In contrast, the fifth family is defined "response-
91 focused"; response modulation is used after an emotional response has occurred and refers
92 to efforts to suppress, decrease or increase specific feelings after they emerge. For example,
93 in the late minutes of a game when victory is imminent, an athlete might suppress joy to
94 focus on the task at hand until the game actually finishes. Furthermore, while Gross (1998)
95 initially focused on self-regulation, Gross and Thompson (2007) suggested that an
96 individual could regulate the emotions of others by using all the five families of the process
97 model. This latter regulatory process, labelled extrinsic regulation (Gross & Thompson,
98 2007) or interpersonal regulation (Zaki & Williams, 2013), suggests that emotion
99 regulation can be viewed, by extension, as an interpersonal process with sensitivity to
100 group contexts, such as team sport (Tamminen & Crocker, 2013).

101 As an opportunity to influence social interactions, Gross and Thompson (2007)
102 pointed out that "one as-yet unresolved issue is whether emotion regulation refers to
103 intrinsic processes (self-regulation), to extrinsic processes (extrinsic regulation) or both"
104 (Gross & Thompson, 2007, p.8). For instance, an athlete may over-exaggerate expressions
105 of serenity to increase his own positive emotions, to evoke anxiety in his opponents, or
106 both. Recent findings by Stanley et al. (2012), showing that runners used regulation
107 strategies such as "providing support" and "negativity directed toward others", illustrate
108 such ambiguity. Indeed, their study focused on self-regulation and, therefore, the
109 abovementioned strategies were considered as self-regulation strategies. However, it could
110 be argued that these strategies had also been used to regulate other runners' emotions.

111 Research ~~on~~on the motives that lead athletes to regulate a teammate's emotions is scarce.
112 One of the few examples is that of Friesen and colleagues, who showed that the motivation
113 to regulate teammates' emotions depended upon whether regulation was taking place at an
114 individual, dyadic, group, or cultural level (Friesen, Devonport, et al., 2013). Nevertheless,
115 their in-depth analysis was limited to a sample of two ice hockey captains. Thus, research
116 to better understand why players, whether with or without given roles, regulate their
117 teammates' emotions remains warranted.

118 The aim of the present two-study research was to explore athletes' mechanisms and
119 reasons to regulate the emotions of others within the context of team sport. Given its
120 suitability to explore intra- and interpersonal dimensions of regulation in the context of
121 social interactions in general (Gross & Thompson, 2007), and that of team sport in
122 particular (Jones, 2012), in Study 1 we used Gross (1998) process model of emotion
123 regulation to investigate how rugby players' emotions were self-regulated and
124 interpersonally regulated during games. In line with Gross and Thompson (2007), we
125 hypothesized that the five families of regulation strategies would be used in the regulation
126 of teammates' emotions. In Study 2, building on the findings from Study 1, we investigated
127 the reasons for which players use extrinsic regulation strategies. More precisely, we
128 examined why players regulate their teammates' emotions.

129 Because social situations are inherently complex, qualitative methods have been
130 suggested as appropriate to study interpersonal processes such as interpersonal emotion
131 regulation (Keltner & Haidt, 1999). Similar to previous research in this area (e.g., Friesen,
132 Devonport et al., 2013; Tamminen & Crocker, 2013), we adopted a qualitative
133 methodology based on a post-positivist epistemological positioning (Weed, 2009). Such
134 approach ensured appropriate identification and description of emotion regulation
135 strategies used (Study 1) and motives associated with such extrinsic regulation (Study 2).

136 **Study 1**

137 **Method**

138 *Participants*

139 Twenty-two French male rugby union players took part in Study 1; ages ranged
140 from 22 to 35 years ($M = 27.59$, $SD = 3.64$ years). All players, who had been competing at
141 a professional level for 2 to 8 years ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 1.95$ years), were members of the
142 same second professional French division team.

143 *Materials*

144 *Interview guide.* A semi-structured interview guide was developed to gather
145 information on the regulation processes that occurred during rugby games. To ascertain
146 participants' understanding of the different questions, the interviewer defined key
147 terminology such as "emotion regulation, dealing/coping with emotions, and regulation
148 strategies" at the beginning of the interview. The different definitions were based on the
149 literature of coping and emotion regulation in sport (see Tamminen & Gaudreau, 2014).

150 For each interview, and because intense emotions (a) lead individuals to use more
151 regulation strategies (Gross & Thompson, 2007) and (b) tend to be more readily recalled
152 (Kensinger, Piquet, Krendl, & Corkin, 2005), we began by asking participants to identify
153 salient parts (if any) of the game being watched where they experienced intense emotions
154 (see Procedures below). Example questions included: "Could you identify a specific part
155 of the game in which you experienced intense emotions?" and "Do you remember if you
156 experienced intense emotions during the game, and if so, when?" Following this, players
157 were asked to identify and describe what they thought caused these emotions. Related
158 questions included: "Could you describe what you felt during this episode?" and "Do you
159 know why you experienced this emotion?" Players were then asked about the consequences
160 of each emotion experienced, and whether they tried to regulate these emotions. Related
161 questions included: "At this moment, do you feel that this emotion influenced your
162 behaviour or your thoughts?" and "Did you try to regulate your emotion? If so, then how?"

163 Elaboration (e.g., “Could you say something else about that?”) and clarification probes
164 (e.g., “What do you mean by that? Could you give me an example?”) were used throughout
165 the interview to allow participants the opportunity to explain their perceptions fully (Miles,
166 Huberman, & Saldaña, 2014; Patton, 2002).

167 *Videos.* The video recordings of the games that we showed to the players during the
168 interviews were obtained from the national TV channels that broadcasted them live.

169 *Procedures*

170 Permission to conduct Study 1 was granted by the Human Research Ethics
171 Committee where the first author was affiliated. Following permission from the team staff,
172 players were contacted by telephone. Written informed consent was given to all
173 participants, and anonymity and confidentiality were assured (i.e., participant numbers
174 from R1 to R22 were assigned).

175 Similar to past research, stimulated recall interviewing techniques were used to
176 facilitate the recalling and stimulate the reporting of emotions experienced (e.g., Martinent
177 et al., 2012). Participants were shown video clips of given moments and situations they had
178 chosen themselves from games they had recently played.

179 Previous studies have shown convergence of actual and retrospective reports of
180 emotions within a delay of seven days (Tenenbaum & Elran, 2003). In the present study,
181 all interviews took place within three days post-game ($M = 2.14$, $SD = 0.67$ days). More
182 precisely, to multiply situations that could be analysed, we interviewed four to eight players
183 per game during an eight-game period. Ultimately, each player was individually
184 interviewed twice ($N = 44$ interviews, $M = 40.27$, $SD = 13.41$ min); one for a home game
185 and another for an away game. Participants were explicitly prompted to talk about how
186 they were feeling and what they were doing in that moment shown on the screen – not to
187 report how they were feeling whilst viewing themselves on the video. Players were able to
188 stop and rewind the videotapes to allow them the opportunity to expand on their

189 explanations. Sessions were conducted in the players' first language (French). The first
190 author, who conducted all face-to-face interviews, was trained in stimulated recall
191 interviewing techniques and possessed expertise in qualitative methods.

192 *Content Analysis*

193 All interviews were transcribed verbatim and resulted in a data corpus of 412 pages
194 (single-spaced, Times New Roman 12). We employed an inductive-deductive approach to
195 analyse our qualitative data, as discussed by Uphill and Jones (2007). Initially, an inductive
196 approach was used to allow a more grounded knowledge to emerge, as perceived by the
197 participants (Weed, 2009). Data were processed by two researchers who divided transcripts
198 into meaningful units according to thoughts and behaviours used to regulate participants'
199 emotions. Then, similar elements were compared and categorized into labelled themes
200 describing all different emotion regulation strategies.

201 We followed with a deductive approach to categorize the strategies previously
202 identified. We based this categorization on Gross (1998) emotion regulation families, thus
203 providing five themes (i.e., situational selection, situation modification, attentional
204 deployment, cognitive change, and response modulation). As this study aimed at
205 examining whether others might influence one's emotions, each emotion regulation
206 strategy was then categorized into sub-themes according to whether the regulation involved
207 others or not (i.e., interpersonal regulation vs. self-regulation). Three researchers with
208 expertise in qualitative research and emotion theory examined the categories; any
209 divergence when categorizing was discussed until agreement was reached.

210 *Trustworthiness.* Qualitative research should follow some criteria to ensure the
211 trustworthiness of the coding process (Patton, 2002). According to Lincoln and Guba
212 (1985), the credibility of qualitative results can be ensured through peer debriefing
213 sessions, including direct meetings with other authors and other researchers who can be
214 considered as "disinterested peers" (p. 308). This procedure was conducted to debate the

215 authors' interpretations of the overall findings. To that end, all of the transcripts were re-
216 read to ensure that the categories were representative of the original material.

217 Throughout the content analysis, emerging themes (i.e., Gross [1998] emotion
218 regulation families) and sub-themes (interpersonal regulation vs. self-regulation) were
219 adjusted according to raw data. Following this process, an outside researcher served as a
220 *devil's advocate* by challenging the coding and the subsequent interpretations (Krane,
221 Andersen, & Streat, 1997). Following these different steps, some minor adjustments were
222 made; the changes represented less than 1% of the 391 categorizations. Following Miles et
223 al.'s (2014) procedures, we organized an additional meeting for participants to check
224 researchers' interpretations (of their statements). Finally, we followed checking processes
225 used in previous research by providing multiple quotes in the Results section that allow the
226 "reader to judge for themselves the authors' interpretation of the data" (Uphill & Jones,
227 2007, p.82).

228 **Results**

229 Forty-seven emotion regulation strategies emerged from data analysis. Both self-
230 regulation and interpersonal emotion regulation strategies had been used during games.
231 Amongst the latter, two dimensions emerged that appeared to be scaled to the relative
232 amount of self-contribution in the regulatory process: interpersonal co-regulation and
233 extrinsic regulation. The first dimension highlighted emotions regulated with the help of
234 teammates (i.e., partial self-involvement; regulation with others). The second dimension
235 showed that interpersonal extrinsic regulation was used by teammates to help athletes to
236 regulate their own emotions (i.e., no self-involvement; regulation by others), suggesting
237 that the nature of the support was enacted independently of the targeted athlete, and might
238 fall under a specific type of emotion regulation.


239 As a result, athletes used self- as well as interpersonal emotion regulation strategies
240 representing every family of Gross' (1998) process model. In Figure 1, we present every

Figure 1. Self- and interpersonal emotion regulation strategies used by rugby players during competition categorised from the process model of emotion regulation (Gross, 1998). Values in brackets express percentage of players from the total sample (N = 22) whereas values in bold express percentage of players with regards to the given emotion regulation family.

Process Model Families (Gross, 1998)

Self- vs. Interpersonal Regulation

Regulation strategies



241 strategy (and frequencies) determined through the inductive analysis and classified
242 according to (a) Gross (1998) five families, and (b) the three dimensions identified in this
243 study (i.e., self-regulation, co-regulation, and extrinsic regulation). Note that all
244 participants reported that, at least on one occasion, their emotions were interpersonally
245 regulated.

246 [Figure 1 near here]

247 The following quotes illustrate the wide range of emotion regulation strategies
248 reported by the athletes interviewed, as classified by Gross (1998). Concerning situation
249 selection, R2 explained that he had chosen to go into the defence line to increase his
250 serenity: “I felt good... confident, and I wanted to continue to be like this. So, I got into
251 the line, and tried to tackle toughly while defending [...], a big hit is the best way to feel
252 confident.” (R2).

253 Situation selection was also illustrated when R21 explained he was afraid of injury
254 because he had a painful leg at the time he had to kick a kick-off, and at that moment, a
255 teammate suggested to stand in for him (i.e., extrinsic regulation using situation selection):

256 I am frequently injured [...], I used to tear my hamstrings, and at this moment, I
257 was really fatigued because of my latter action. So, when the opponents scored the
258 3 points, I said to myself “Goddammit!”... not really because of the score..., we
259 were winning..., but rather because of the coming kick-off. I was afraid of a re-tear.
260 I think everybody could see it on my face and was at that moment that J came and
261 took the ball. He looked at me and I understood he was going to do it. Well, the
262 kick-off, it’s J who’s taking it. I was really relieved. (R21)

263 Also, anxious when he saw that the game was about to be lost, R12 explained that
264 he tried to modify the situation: “I can see we are about to be defeated [...], I was
265 worried...So, I tell myself that I’m going to try to intercept the ball.” (R12)

266 Situation modification was also used by teammates to regulate others' emotions.
267 For instance, R1 (a prop) explained that during a scrum, he was anxious because the
268 opponent was smaller than him. R1 said that a teammate reduced his anxiety by giving him
269 technical instructions to deal with the specific situation (i.e., extrinsic regulation using
270 situation modification). R1 described it as follows:

271 It was hard to perform well against him (the direct opponent in the scrum). He was
272 too small. When you are smaller than your opponent, it is better from a technical
273 perspective because, when you are taller, you cannot place yourself under him. So,
274 I could not stabilize the scrum. It was terrible. I was feeling bad because he was
275 pushing me upwards (and destabilising the scrum). At that time, V (a teammate)
276 told me to move my feet backwards and press him down. This changed everything.
277 The scrum became easier for me and I felt more confident. (R1)

278 Attentional deployment could be illustrated, for instance, by R1 who described that
279 he tried to distract himself from what he judged to be a referee's mistake, which lead him
280 to experience anger: "I was angry towards him (the referee) and I switched to something
281 else. It helps me to shut up and keep away from taking a yellow card." (R1).

282 Teammates also used attentional deployment to regulate the emotions of other
283 players. For instance, after having scored a try, R20 explained that he felt happy, which
284 seemed to worry his teammates who told him to stay focused on the game (i.e., extrinsic
285 regulation using attentional deployment):

286 I scored a try. Okay...for this one, C did most of the work... but still, this was my
287 first one this season. I was really proud... I could not think of anything else...
288 Teammates warned me and L told me to keep focused on the match rather than keep
289 daydreaming about the try. (R20)

290 The fourth family determined by the process model of emotion regulation (i.e.,
291 cognitive change) can be illustrated by R9's discourse, when explaining that he tried to

292 decrease his guilt after a mistake in the following way: “I told to myself that’s not my fault,
293 well, it’s my fault, but I told myself that I’ve got nothing to do with it, that it is the referee
294 who does.” (R9)

295 The players also mentioned that their emotions had been regulated by their
296 teammates, who used strategies illustrating cognitive change. For instance, R20 explained
297 that, after the opponents had scored a try, he felt guilty and anxious, but that these
298 unpleasant emotions decreased when teammates told him that he had no responsibility in
299 this given action (i.e., extrinsic regulation using cognitive change). This was explained in
300 the following manner: “I did not really know. I thought that it was because of me [...] but
301 later they said that it was not my fault, so it felt better.” (R20)

302 Lastly, following a personal mistake, R3 noted that he sought to decrease the
303 intensity of his guilt and anger applying a response modulation strategy – the fifth family
304 as defined by Gross (1998): “I feel down, guilty... At that moment in time, I was angry
305 with myself for missing that tackle. What I was feeling at that time was so strong that I
306 yelled to vent my anger and control my breathing. If I had not done that, I would have
307 burst!” (R3)

308 Also, the participants mentioned that their emotions were directly regulated by
309 teammates through response modulation strategies. For instance, R14, a young player,
310 explained that his pleasant emotions were directly regulated by an experienced teammate
311 who thought that it could be, ultimately, dysfunctional for the team (i.e., extrinsic
312 regulation using response modulation):

313 I’ve scored a try. Watch me jumping of joy! I look like a big rabbit! I jumped in
314 every direction. But this seemed to worry G! At that time, he (G) told me “stop it
315 now, we hadn’t won as yet!” He also told me that he didn’t want to lose me and that
316 I needed to calm down because the match had not finished. I can tell you that it
317 calms you down immediately! (R14)

318 *Discussion*

319 The purpose of Study 1 was to identify emotion regulation strategies used by rugby
320 union players during competition, and to examine the extent to which players' emotions
321 were self- or interpersonally regulated. To that end, Gross (1998) process model of emotion
322 regulation was adopted. Some of the emotion regulation strategies identified in this study
323 had already been reported in team contact sports (see Campo et al., 2012, for a review). In
324 addition, in the present study we identified other emotion regulation strategies that had not
325 been found thus far, such as “modification of the teammates' emotional states that could
326 influence the situation”, “playing for oneself”, “trying to be at the heart of some favourable
327 game situations”, and “adoption of a foul play to modify the situation” (Figure 1). In this
328 way, we argue that our findings provide a more comprehensive identification of emotion
329 regulation strategies taking place within rugby, and suggest applying such methodology to
330 other team sports in general to further knowledge and understanding of interpersonal
331 emotion regulation in sport.

332 The need to examine the influence of others in the regulation of one's own emotions
333 had recently been highlighted (e.g., Friesen, Lane et al., 2013; Stanley et al., 2012;
334 Tamminen & Crocker, 2013). In the present study, players' emotions appeared to be not
335 only self-regulated but, critically, interpersonally regulated via co-regulation and extrinsic
336 regulation – and this through the five families of Gross' (1988) process model. The
337 suitability of this model to study affective regulatory processes in team sports is supported
338 by our findings, which highlight the determinant role teammates play in the way emotions
339 are regulated during rugby games.

340 While current knowledge in regulatory processes in the field of sport is mainly
341 based on the study of self-regulation (e.g., Jones, 2012; Tamminen & Crocker, 2013), our
342 findings offer other perspectives to generate knowledge and understanding on the entire
343 scope of strategies that are actually used by individuals in team sport context. From an

344 applied perspective, this will open the development of new avenues to optimize team sport
345 performance. For instance, a coach might consider training players in regulating others'
346 emotions with the aim of facilitating functional emotional contagion within the entire team,
347 or to influence opponent's emotional states.

348 Study 1 examined the strategies athletes used to regulate their own emotions,
349 regardless as to whether this was achieved by self- or interpersonal regulation. This
350 approach naturally incited the participants to recall more strategies in which they had a
351 self-involvement (self- and co-regulation) rather than those in which they had no self-
352 involvement (extrinsic regulation). This may, therefore, be considered as a limitation,
353 which could explain the difference in the amount of self- and co-regulation strategies
354 players reported to have used (n = 43) compared to the amount of extrinsic strategies
355 players reported to have been the target of (n = 6).

356 Moreover, this approach precluded the exploration of the behaviours that
357 participants might have adopted to regulate their teammates' emotions. In that sense,
358 Stanley et al. (2012) stated that, athletes "reported the altruistic provision of support to
359 others with no indication of this needing to be reciprocated" (p.167). However, it is also
360 worth noting that, while participants did not mention that they were looking for reciprocity,
361 this does not mean that this intention was absent. When a participant reported that his
362 emotions were regulated by a teammate, we do not know whether that teammate used such
363 extrinsic regulation for the purpose of regulating, actually, his own emotions too. That is,
364 it is unclear whether, when a player apparently regulates his teammate's emotion, his
365 behaviour is adopted by the teammate or by the player himself, too. This illustrates the
366 complexity of interpersonal regulation as athletes often might regulate their own and
367 others' emotions without fully appreciating the emotional state of their teammate.

368 As a result, an apparent extrinsic regulation could, in fact, be a behaviour adopted
369 by the teammate to self-regulate her/his own emotions. Several authors in social

370 psychology (e.g., Gross and Thompson, 2007) as well as sport psychology (e.g., Friesen,
371 Devonport et al., 2013) have stressed the need to shed light onto such ambiguity. In this
372 line, Batson and colleagues (Batson, Ahmad, & Tsang, 2002) suggested the “importance
373 of focusing one’s attention on motives rather than on behaviour” (p. 431-432). That is,
374 studies on interpersonal emotion regulation should also examine the motives associated
375 with extrinsic regulation in team sport contexts. This would allow researchers to understand
376 the emergence of interpersonal strategies during a game so as to suggest more effective
377 applied interventions to optimise performance in (team) sports. Therefore, the aim of Study
378 2 was to investigate the motives of rugby union players to regulate their teammates’
379 emotions during competition.

380 **Study 2**

381 *Method*

382 *Participants*

383 To maintain consistency with Study 1, we purposely recruited rugby union players
384 from a professional club for Study 2 (N = 30); their age ranged from 18 to 21 years ($M =$
385 19.06, $SD = 0.78$ years). All players were members of a team playing in U23 first French
386 division – note that none had participated in Study 1. These players had been competing at
387 this level for 1 to 4 years ($M = 2.53$, $SD = 1.2$ years).

388 *Material*

389 *Interview guide.* Similar to Study 1, a semi-structured interview guide was
390 developed and key terms were defined to players prior the interview, to ensure full
391 understanding of the questions. The same questions from Study 1 were used to help players
392 identifying parts (if any) of the game during which they experienced intense emotions. In
393 addition, this interview guide sought to produce information about the motives associated
394 with the use of interpersonal extrinsic regulation (i.e., regulation of other’s emotions).
395 Related example questions included: “Did you try to regulate your teammate’s emotion? If

396 yes, how? If you did not, why?"; "Did you communicate with your teammate at this
397 moment? If yes, what did you say?"; "Why did you communicate or behave in that way?";
398 "Did you try to modify the situation such as correcting a teammate's technical fault or
399 provide technical information about the game to your teammates?". As per Study 1, we
400 used both elaboration and clarification to increase the quality of probes.

401 *Videos.* The game was recorded with three synchronized cameras that provided
402 views from different angles (narrow, medium and wide). Likewise, we captured the
403 players' movements, even when players would not be directly involved in the main action
404 (i.e., far from where the ball was being played).

405 *Procedures*

406 Permission to conduct Study 2 was granted by the Human Research Ethics
407 Committee of the first author's University. Following a meeting with the sporting director
408 of the club, the research team met with the teams' head coach to organize a competitive
409 game for the purpose of Study 2. Written informed consent was obtained from all
410 participants, and anonymity and confidentiality were guaranteed (i.e., participant numbers
411 from P1 to P30 were assigned).

412 *Step 1.* Following the coach's agreement, we organized a competitive game.
413 Conditions were similar to those of any official competitive game; that is, team captains
414 and a medical doctor were present, officials refereed the game, and an audience (of 97
415 people) was present. To help generate genuine emotional experiences as they might in any
416 competitive game, the head coach had previously explained to the players that the team
417 staff had scheduled that game "to select the players for the starting team in the forthcoming
418 championship game". Following experimental social psychology procedures (Harmon-
419 Jones, Amodio, & Zinner, 2007), we scheduled time to debrief athletes about the purpose
420 of the study.

421 *Step 2.* Each player was individually interviewed ($N = 30$ interviews, $M = 49.10$, $SD = 9.12$

422 min) on the intense emotional episodes they mentioned they had experienced during that
423 game. The first author conducted all interviews within three days after the game ($M = 1.81$
424 days, $SD = 0.86$). Similar to Study 1, video footage of the game was used to facilitate the
425 recall process during the interviews. Sessions were conducted in the players' first language
426 (French).

427 *Content Analysis*

428 Interviews were transcribed verbatim resulting in a data corpus of 607 pages (single-
429 spaced, Times New Roman 12). An inductive content data analysis was used as coding
430 procedure to identify the motives associated with the use of extrinsic regulation (Lincoln
431 & Guba, 1985; Patton, 2002). The issues of trustworthiness were similar to Study 1.

432 **Results**

433 Interview data showed that all players attempted to regulate their teammates'
434 emotions during the game. Three main categories emerged from the data, highlighting the
435 reasons why the players have used interpersonal extrinsic regulation: altruistic, egoistic, or
436 both.

437 Altruistic motives – extrinsic regulation carried out in the perceived best interest of
438 the teammate – were reported by 73.33% of the participants and accounted for 26.6% of
439 all the motives reported. The following statements illustrate this point: “I do this intuitively.
440 Telling the guys ‘is ok, it’s useless to panic!’ I think it’s a positive reaction, not a negative
441 one. (...) I do this because it brings something to the team” (P27). Another player (P30),
442 for instance, explained that he regulated a faulty teammate so as he would feel less guilty:
443 “Why I did this? I want to increase his motivation [...], I tried to make him feel better”.
444 P19 also illustrated altruistic motives behind the use of extrinsic regulation when he
445 explained that regulating his teammate’s emotion does not bring anything personally: “I
446 encouraged him. Telling him to move his a** [sic], I think it could modify his emotions. It
447 didn’t bring me anything personally, but I think it brought him a lot” (P19).

448 Yet, results also indicate that 40% of the players adopted concomitant motives on
449 17.15% of all the motives reported. For instance, a player explained that he encouraged his
450 teammates to help them to experience functional emotions, though he said that he behaved
451 that way to help himself too: “Well, that was... to reassure, encourage my friends to
452 continue in the same direction. It does cost nothing to encourage (a teammate). It shows
453 that I'm happy... I think it helps, it helps me and it helps the team” (P13).

454 Lastly, egoistic motives were reported by 80% of the participants, which accounted
455 for 56.25% of all the motives reported. There, extrinsic regulation was used selfishly; that
456 is, actions to regulate teammates’ emotions were performed to achieve own personal
457 benefits only. P13’s statements illustrate egoistic motives behind the use of extrinsic
458 regulation: “I tried to control how he was feeling after the scrum. I don’t know if it was
459 needed, but I, I needed to do it. That makes me more confident”. Thus, extrinsic regulation
460 was directly used to modify the intensity of one’s own (un)pleasant emotions, regardless
461 of the effects that, by doing so, it might have on teammates’ emotions. Another example is
462 found when a player described to have influenced his teammates’ emotional states by
463 encouraging them in order to increase the intensity of his own positive emotions: “I
464 encourage my teammates. This is to show the others that... maybe this reinforced their
465 confidence but... I do not know what it is. It is firstly to help myself, maybe to encourage
466 me. It helps me” (P2).

467 Moreover, within the egoistic motives, participants expected to receive the same
468 strategies back from their teammates. One of the participants described as follows: "Yeah,
469 I expect he will do the same for me later. It happens sometimes that you fail. It's good if
470 the guys are behind (you) and tell you "it’s okay, we're going to back you up, this is not
471 important” (P3). Similarly, participants revealed that they tried to regulate the emotions of
472 others to avoid future negative consequences of others’ emotional states on team
473 performance. For instance, a player explained that he tried to decrease the intensity of his

474 teammate's anxiety in order to avoid any negative emotional contagion within the team:

475 I say "It's not useful to panic!" I think this is a positive reaction. We must not
476 panic. I don't want everybody panicking. It can make us lose the game, [...], so,
477 it must bring something to the team performance. So, I say, "come on guys, let's
478 keep focused! (P27).

479 Finally, we explored the motives that might have led participants to forego using
480 extrinsic emotion regulation. The three main reasons given were that (a) it was useless;
481 ~~(that-b)~~ that it was as a consequence of the sport norms and values, and ~~that~~-(c) that it was
482 impossible to do because the player was self-regulating his own emotions. The following
483 two statements illustrate the first reason: "I did not communicate with him because it's of
484 no avail. I don't think it was useful. He knows well what he did" (P1); "Well, it annoys me
485 and then, I say that if you have to chafe during the entire game against your teammate, it is
486 useless, it will not help to move forward the situation" (P27).

487 As per the role of accepting/respecting team norms and values, two principles were
488 identified: humility and solidarity. For instance, P7 said that when he would have wished
489 to influence his teammates' emotional states after the opponents scored a try, he did not
490 behave in such a way because it was not his role, but that of the captain: "I wanted to
491 encourage the guys. Everybody looked at his feet! But no, it's not my role! There is a
492 captain, and it's him who must refocus the troops. I have to shut up" (P7). Similarly, P11
493 stated that it was impossible to make a teammate feel guilty after a mistake: "I had hatred
494 towards him, yes. I was angry but I did not insult him! It is not a proper thing to do in
495 rugby. I cannot blame him just because he had made a mistake" (P11).

496 Participants also explained that they were not able, at times, to use extrinsic
497 regulation because they were focussed on self-regulating their own emotions. The
498 following two quotes illustrate this point:

499 I did not regulate the emotions of anyone. I could not do it because I made efforts

500 to stay focused” (P17). “Maybe I’m too individualistic because I was more thinking
501 about me rather than about others at this time, but I knew that I was really angry
502 and so, I did not want to make anyone feel better. Primarily I had to take care of
503 myself. (R13)

504 *Discussion*

505 The purpose of Study 2 was to investigate the motives of rugby union players to
506 regulate their teammates’ emotions during competition. Findings showed that players
507 regulated their teammates’ emotions for altruistic reasons (i.e., to help others) egoistic
508 reasons (i.e., to help oneself) or both. This finding is consistent with literature supporting
509 that emotion regulation requires the activation of a goal, both intra- and interpersonally
510 (Gross & Thompson, 2007).

511 In line with the view that extrinsic regulation might be driven by the willingness to
512 help others, our findings show that players could regulate their teammates’ emotions to
513 bring them (the teammates) in a better emotional state as perceived by the player who was
514 regulating. This finding is consistent with research by Niven, ~~Totterdell and Holman~~
515 ~~(2009)~~ [et al.](#), who reported that extrinsic regulation was used altruistically (i.e. to help
516 others) to regulate pleasant and unpleasant emotions experienced by others. However,
517 players’ identifications of their teammates’ emotions might not always be accurate, and the
518 effect of such extrinsic regulation could end up becoming dysfunctional. Given the
519 idiographic characteristic of the emotion-performance relationship (Hanin, 2000), for a
520 player to know how to regulate each individual teammate’s emotions may be an arduous
521 endeavour – there are 15 players in a rugby union team.

522 Furthermore, some of the behaviours displayed by athletes (e.g., encouraging a
523 teammate) may appear altruistic even though, originally, they could have been driven by
524 egoistic motives (e.g., encouraging a teammate to increase his own positive emotions). In
525 line with the notion that helping oneself drives extrinsic regulation, our findings suggest

526 that a self-oriented approach to emotion regulation is at the core of interpersonal emotion
527 regulation strategies. Indeed, participants in Study 2 reported trying to regulate emotions
528 of their teammates to regulate their own emotions and/or to control the influence of others'
529 emotions that were (in)congruent with their personal goals. This suggests that helping
530 behaviours such as extrinsic regulation could potentially be viewed as egoistic. In our
531 study, when a player tried to regulate his teammates' emotions, approximately three times
532 out of four did so to modify his own feelings, or to avoid negative consequences of the
533 teammate's emotion on performance. This adds to findings from Friesen, Devonport et al.
534 (2013), who found that the affective states of the two captains they interviewed influenced
535 their decision to regulate their teammates' emotions. This highlights therefore the intricacy
536 of the motivational processes behind interpersonal emotion regulation.

537 Despite a growing interest in the topic of interpersonal emotion regulation, little is
538 known about the question of what motivates athletes to regulate teammates' emotions.
539 Moreover, findings are contradictory. While some authors have reported that a person
540 might try to regulate other's emotions to make her/him feel better (e.g., Gable & Reis,
541 2010), others have shown that interpersonal regulation is employed to achieve hedonic
542 personal benefits (e.g., Zaki & Williams, 2013). The same ambiguity has also been reported
543 for instrumental motives (Netzer et al., 2015). In our study, players reported such
544 ambivalence within the sport context.

545 Furthermore, the present findings inform us that regulating teammates' emotions
546 may be mainly driven by individual goals and values. Thus, both individual goals and ego
547 involvement would be critical when addressing interpersonal regulation in team sports.
548 Lazarus (1999) argued that three components should be considered to understand emotions:
549 goal relevance, goal congruence, and ego-involvement (i.e., individual's values). While
550 individual emotional states might drive players to use extrinsic regulation (Friesen,
551 Devonport, et al., 2013), our findings also indicate that cognitive and motivational

552 processes behind the emotional experience are similar to those behind interpersonal
553 affective regulatory processes. In that sense, our findings hint at the importance of shared
554 team goals and values, and how these might influence motives to regulate other's emotions.
555 This is in line with previous research that has examined the influence of social cognitions
556 in the emotion–regulation process outside the sport context (e.g., Tamir & Mauss, 2011).
557 Our findings provide a more complete picture to Friesen, Devonport et al.'s (2013)
558 findings; cultural values and ideologies also influence the decision to regulate the emotion
559 of others. Thus, according to a self-oriented approach of the use of extrinsic regulation, it
560 could also be suggested that if a player shares the team's goals and values, and acts in
561 accordance with these, her/his behaviours are in accordance with what it is important for
562 her/him. Therefore, we believe that the use of extrinsic regulation is potentially driven,
563 ultimately, by individual motives and is, at least partly, unconsciously egoistic.

564 An important topic addressed by the literature is the notion that emotion regulation
565 occurs both consciously and non-consciously. Different authors have tackled the question
566 of non-conscious emotional regulation, which could explain why emotion regulation
567 occurs in concert with several psychological processes (see Bargh & Williams, 2007, for a
568 discussion). One could argue that, in the present study, when a player said to regulate a
569 teammate's emotions, whether it was with the intention to increase or decrease his
570 emotional intensity, in fact, such strategy was used unconsciously to regulate his own
571 emotional state. Thus, future research examining the continuum between conscious and
572 non-conscious emotional regulation in competitive team sport context would be warranted.

573 From an applied perspective, interventions targeting emotion regulation motives
574 need to be developed and tested. Our findings show that self-interests could be at the origin
575 of extrinsic regulation, which highlights the need to understand athletes' motives first
576 before being able to modify their behaviours. While interpersonal relationships and
577 emotion regulation are intertwined in team sport (Tamminen & Crocker, 2013), coaches

578 may also wish to stimulate extrinsic emotion regulation within their teams. In that sense,
579 teaching how to communicate well between teammates during critical moments may be a
580 strategy to control emotional contagion phenomena and avoid collective dysfunctional
581 effects of extrinsic regulation. Having found that egoistic motives could be at the origin of
582 the use of extrinsic regulation, it appears necessary for coaches and sport psychologists to
583 ensure that each team member adheres to the group's goals and values.

584 **Final conclusion**

585 This two-study research aimed at better understanding emotion regulation in team
586 contact sport. Findings showed that interpersonal processes are at the core of emotion
587 regulation strategies used by players in competitive setting. Furthermore, whereas the
588 context of a contrived match with a young elite population has to be considered in the
589 interpretation of the current results, findings indicated that both individual goals and ego
590 involvement are critical in interpersonal regulation. Leading to an ambiguity between
591 egoistic and altruistic motives, this could, ultimately, result in players using dysfunctional
592 extrinsic emotion regulation strategies. Consider a player who regulates a teammate's
593 emotion to vent her/his anxiety, for instance, by over-encouraging the teammate. This
594 extrinsic regulation may make the teammate over-aggressive and lead to counter-
595 performances (Campo et al., 2012).

596 From a more applied perspective, we suggest that coaches increase their players'
597 awareness of the risks associated with self-oriented motives and with the ignorance of
598 reciprocal knowledge between teammates about their own emotional functioning.
599 Accordingly, emotional intelligence reflects how people deal with their own emotions and
600 those of others (Mayer, Caruso, & Salovey, 1999). That appears, therefore, to be a relevant
601 way to optimise emotional relationships within a sport team. Thus, we suggest that future
602 research examines the participants' interpersonal emotion regulation skills, which may
603 ultimately help coaches to build new ways to optimise performance (Campo, Laborde, &

604 Weckemann, 2015). Also, matching team interests to those of their members could be an
605 effective way to achieve team optimal performance levels and avoid critical moments
606 during games such as negative psychological momentum. Thus, we suggest that future
607 research examines the relationship between extrinsic regulation and emotional contagion
608 in team sport.

609 Lastly, some researchers have shown that interpersonal emotion regulation may be
610 driven by the achievement of hedonic and instrumental goals (Netzer, et al., 2015; Tamir
611 & Mauss, 2013). This highlights the need to disentangle emotion regulation efficacy from
612 emotion regulation efficiency. A strategy might be adapted to make a teammate feel better
613 (efficacy: effect of emotion regulation on emotional states) but also might be ineffective to
614 optimise performance (efficiency: effects of emotion regulation on performance). In this
615 two-study research we did not distinguish between these two dimensions, which we
616 acknowledge it is a limitation. Thus, further studies shall consider the influence of
617 interpersonal extrinsic strategies on actual performance for both *regulator*-players and
618 *regulated*-players.

619

References

- 620
- 621 Balk, Y. A., Adriaanse, M. A., de Ridder D. T. D., & Evers, C. (2013). Coping under
622 pressure: employing emotion regulation strategies to enhance performance under
623 pressure. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 35(4), 408-418.
- 624 Bargh, J. A., & Williams, L. E. (2007). The Nonconscious Regulation of Emotion. In J. J.
625 Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation* (pp. 429-445). New York, NY US:
626 Guilford Press.
- 627 Batson, C. D., Ahmad, N., & Tsang, J. (2002). Four motives for community involvement.
628 *Journal of Social Issues*, 58(3), 429-445. doi:10.1111/1540-4560.00269
- 629 Campo, M., Laborde, S., & Weckemann, S. (2015). Emotional Intelligence training:
630 implications for performance and health. In A.M. Colombus (Ed.), *Advances in*
631 *Psychology Research* (pp. 75-92). New York: Nova Publishers.
- 632 Campo, M., Mellalieu, S., Ferrand, C., Martinet, G., & Rosnet, E. (2012). Emotions in
633 team contact sports: a systematic review. *Sport Psychologist*, 26(1), 62-97.
- 634 Folkman, S., & Lazarus, R. S. (1988). The relationship between coping and emotion:
635 Implications for theory and research. *Social Science & Medicine*, 26(3), 309-317.
636 doi:10.1016/0277-9536(88)90395-4
- 637 Friesen, A. P., Devonport, T. J., Sellars, C. N., & Lane, A. M. (2013). A narrative
638 account of decision-making and interpersonal emotion regulation using a social-
639 functional approach to emotions. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise*
640 *Psychology*, 11(2), 203-214. doi:10.1080/1612197X.2013.773664
- 641 Friesen, A. P., Lane, A. M., Devonport, T. J., Sellars, C. N., Stanley, D. N., & Beedie, C.
642 J. (2013). Emotion in sport: considering interpersonal regulation strategies.
643 *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 6(1), 139-154.
644 doi:10.1080/1750984X.2012.742921
- 645 [Gardner F, Moore Z. \(2012\). Mindfulness and acceptance models in sport psychology: A](#)

- 646 ~~decade of basic and applied scientific advancements. *Canadian Psychology*, 53(4),~~
647 ~~309-318.~~
- 648 Gross, J. J. (1998). The emerging field of emotion regulation: An integrative review.
649 *Review of General Psychology*, 2(3), 271-299. doi:10.1037/1089-2680.2.3.271
- 650 Gross, J. J., & John, O. P. (2003). Individual differences in two emotion regulation
651 processes: Implications for affect, relationships, and well-being. *Journal of*
652 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 85(2), 348-362. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.2.348
- 653 Gross, J. J., & Thompson, R. A. (2007). Emotion Regulation: Conceptual Foundations. In
654 J. J. Gross (Ed.), *Handbook of emotion regulation* (pp. 3-24). New York, NY US:
655 Guilford Press.
- 656 Hanin, Y. L. (2000). *Emotions in sport*, United States: Human Kinetics,.
- 657 Harmon-Jones, E., Amodio, D. M., & Zinner, L. R. (2007). Social psychological methods
658 of emotion elicitation. In J. A. Coan & J. J. B. Allen (Eds.), *Handbook of emotion*
659 *elicitation and assessment* (pp. 91-105). New York, NY US: Oxford University Press.
- 660 Jones, M. V. (2012). Emotion Regulation and Performance. In S. Murphy (Ed.). *The*
661 *Oxford Handbook of sport and performance psychology* (pp. 154-172). New York,
662 NY: Oxford University Press.
- 663 Keltner, D., & Haidt, J. (1999). Social Functions of Emotions at Four Levels of Analysis.
664 *Cognition & Emotion*, 13(5), 505-521. doi:10.1080/026999399379168
- 665 Kensinger, E. A., Piguett, O., Krendl, A. C., & Corkin, S. (2005). Memory for Contextual
666 Details: Effects of Emotion and Aging. *Psychology and Aging*, 20(2), 241-250.
667 doi:10.1037/0882-7974.20.2.241
- 668 Krane, V., Andersen, M. B., & Streat, W. B. (1997). Issues in qualitative research
669 methods and presentation. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 19, 213-218.
- 670 Lazarus, R. S. (1999). *Stress and emotion: A new synthesis*. New York, NY US: Springer
671 Publishing Co.

- 672 Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry* (1st ed.). Newbury Park, CA:
673 Sage.
- 674 Martinent, G., Campo, M., & Ferrand, C. (2012). A descriptive study of emotional
675 process during competition: Nature, frequency, direction, duration and co-occurrence
676 of discrete emotions. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 13*(2), 142-151.
677 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2011.10.006
- 678 Martinent, G., Nicolas, M., Gaudreau, P., & Campo, M. (2013). A cluster analysis of
679 affective states before and during competition. *Journal of Sport & Exercise*
680 *Psychology, 35*(6), 600-611.
- 681 Mayer, J. D., Caruso, D. R., & Salovey, P. (1999). Emotional intelligence meets
682 traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence, 27*, 267-298. doi:
683 10.1016/S0160-2896(99)00016-1
- 684 Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: a*
685 *methods sourcebook* (SAGE.). Los Angeles.
- 686 Netzer, L., Van Kleef, A., Tamir, M. (2015). Interpersonal instrumental emotion
687 regulation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 58*, 124-135. doi:
688 10.1016/j.jesp.2015.01.006
- 689 Nicholls, A. R., Jones, C. R., Polman, R. C. J., & Borkoles, E. (2009). Acute sport-related
690 stressors, coping, and emotion among professional rugby union players during training
691 and matches. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 19*(1), 113-120.
- 692 Niven, K., Totterdell, P., & Holman, D. (2009). A classification of controlled
693 interpersonal affect regulation strategies. *Emotion, 9*(4), 498-509.
694 doi:10.1037/a0015962
- 695 Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods* (3rd revised edition).
696 Thousand Oaks, CA US: SAGE.
- 697 Schwarzer, R., & Knoll, N. (2003). Positive coping: Mastering demands and searching

698 for meaning. In S. J. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Positive psychological assessment:*
699 *A handbook of models and measures* (p. 393-409). Washington, DC, US: American
700 Psychological Association.

701 ~~[Smith, E. R., Seger, C. R., & Mackie, D. M. \(2007\). Can emotions be truly group-level?](#)~~
702 ~~[Evidence regarding four conceptual criteria. *Journal of Personality and Social*](#)~~
703 ~~[Psychology, 3, 431-446. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.3.431](#)~~

704 Stanley, D. M., Lane, A. M., Beedie, C. J., Friesen, A. P., & Devonport, T. J. (2012).

705 Emotion regulation strategies used in the hour before running. *International Journal of*
706 *Sport and Exercise Psychology, 10*(3), 159-171. doi:10.1080/1612197X.2012.671910

707 Tamir, M., & Mauss, I. B. (2011). Social cognitive factors in emotion regulation:

708 Implications for well-being. In I. Nykliček, A. Vingerhoets, & M. Zeelenberg (Eds.),
709 *Emotion regulation and well-being* (pp. 31-47). New York, NY US: Springer Science.

710 Tamminen, K. A., & Crocker, P. R. E. (2013). « I control my own emotions for the sake
711 of the team »: Emotional self-regulation and interpersonal emotion regulation among
712 female high-performance curlers. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 14*(5), 737-747.
713 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.05.002

714 Tamminen, K., & Gaudreau, P. (2014). Coping, social support, and emotion regulation in
715 teams. In M. Beauchamps & M. Eys. (Eds). *Group dynamics in sport and exercise*
716 *psychology: Contemporary themes (2nd ed.)* (pp. 222-239). New York, US: Routledge.

717 Tenenbaum, G., & Elran, E. (2003). Congruence between actual and retrospective reports
718 of emotions for pre- and postcompetition states. *Journal of Sport & Exercise*
719 *Psychology, 25*(3), 323-340.

720 Uphill, M. A., & Jones, M. V. (2007). Antecedents of Emotions in Elite Athletes: A
721 Cognitive Motivational Relational Theory Perspective. *Research Quarterly for*
722 *Exercise & Sport, 78*(2), 79-89.

723 Uphill, M. A., Lane, A. M., & Jones, M. V. (2012). Emotion Regulation Questionnaire
724 for use with athletes. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise, 13*(6), 761-770.

725 Uphill, M. A., McCarthy, P. J., & Jones, M. V.(2009). Getting a grip on emotion
726 regulation in sport: Conceptual foundations and practical application. In S. Mellalieu
727 & S. Hanton, (Eds.), *Advances in applied sport psychology* (pp.162-194). London:
728 Routledge.

729 Weed, M. (2009). Research quality in sport & exercise psychology: Introduction to the
730 collection. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise, 10*(5), 489-490.

731 Zaki, J., & Williams, W. C. (2013). Interpersonal emotion regulation. *Emotion, 13*(5),
732 803-810. doi:10.1037/a0033839