

**Lung Hung Chen and Chia-Huei Wu**

# When does dispositional gratitude help athletes to move away from experiential avoidance? The moderating role of perceived coach autonomy support

**Article (Accepted version)  
(Refereed)**

**Original citation:**

Chen, Lung Hung and Wu, Chia-Huei (2016) *When does dispositional gratitude help athletes to move away from experiential avoidance? The moderating role of perceived coach autonomy support*. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology* . ISSN 1041-3200  
DOI: [10.1080/10413200.2016.1162221](https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2016.1162221)

© 2016 Taylor & Francis

This version available at: <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/65692/>

Available in LSE Research Online: March 2016

LSE has developed LSE Research Online so that users may access research output of the School. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LSE Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain. You may freely distribute the URL (<http://eprints.lse.ac.uk>) of the LSE Research Online website.

This document is the author's final accepted version of the journal article. There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

1 **When does dispositional gratitude help athletes move away from experiential avoidance?**

2 **The moderating role of perceived autonomy support from coaches**

3

4 Lung Hung Chen

5 National Taiwan Sport University

6 Department of Recreation and Leisure Industry Management

7

8 Chia-huei Wu

9 Department of Management

10 London School of Economics and Political Science

11

12 Acknowledgement

13 The first author's research on gratitude was supported by Ministry of Science and Technology

14 (103-22628-H-179-001-MY2), Taiwan, R.O.C.

15

16

17 Corresponding author: Lung Hung Chen

18 Department of Recreation and Leisure Industry Management, National Taiwan Sport University,

19 No. 250, Wen Hua 1st Road, Guishan, Taoyuan City, Taiwan

20 Tel: 886-937148789

21 Email: [fjudragon@ntsu.edu.tw](mailto:fjudragon@ntsu.edu.tw)

22

23

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13

### **Abstract**

Experiential avoidance, the attempt to avoid negative experiences, can prevent athletes from reaching their goals. To mitigate this tendency, the authors offer a relational approach and propose that dispositional gratitude and perceived autonomy support from coaches will have an interaction effect in mitigating experiential avoidance. Time-lagged data from 140 athletes were analyzed. Dispositional gratitude and perceived coach autonomy support had a significant interaction effect on predicting experiential avoidance when Time 1 experiential avoidance was controlled. Those high in dispositional gratitude and perceived coach autonomy support decreased their experiential avoidance over time. Implications and application for experiential avoidance and gratitude are discussed.

Keywords: gratitude, experiential avoidance, autonomy, support, coaches

# 1 **When does dispositional gratitude help athletes move away from experiential avoidance?**

## 2 **The moderating role of perceived autonomy support from coaches**

3 In order to achieve better performance, athletes need to train intensively to enhance their  
4 physical and psychological strength. As the process is psychologically challenging and  
5 physically uncomfortable due to inevitable physical pain and psychological stress (Gagné &  
6 Blanchard, 2007), athletes need to overcome experiential avoidance which refers to an attempt to  
7 escape, avoid, or modify the forms or frequency of uncomfortable experiences, such as negative  
8 thoughts (e.g., “I might fail in this game”), unpleasant emotions (e.g., anxiety when facing a  
9 highly skillful competitor), and bodily sensations (e.g., tremors), in order to achieve their goals  
10 (Hayes, Wilson, Gifford, Follette, & Strosahl, 1996). Mitigating experiential avoidance is  
11 important for athletes because it can lead individuals to take actions that deviate from their goals  
12 (Hayes et al., 1996), such as practicing less or devoting less effort to the sport, and thus bringing  
13 negative consequences to their performance and well-being (Bond et al., 2011).

14 Birrer, Röthlin, and Morgan (2012) and Gardner and Moore (2012) indicated that a  
15 mindfulness-based intervention can help reduce experiential avoidance in athletes. This is  
16 because mindfulness emphasizes non-judgmental awareness that encourages the acceptance of  
17 one's internal state. Nevertheless, in addition to the cognitive approach via a mindfulness-based  
18 intervention, it is also possible to mitigate experiential avoidance via a relational approach. As  
19 being supported by others has been theorized and found to help individuals confront negative  
20 feelings and be resilient (Bowlby, 1988), we suggest that athletes will reduce experiential  
21 avoidance when they perceive and appreciate support from others. This relational approach is  
22 different from the mindfulness-based approach or acceptance and commitment therapy (Hayes,  
23 Pistorello, & Levin, 2012), which relies on an individual's non-judgmental awareness, because it

1 emphasizes that an individual has to cope with and thus embrace negative experiences.  
2 Empirically, in a longitudinal study conducted over six years focusing on the parenting  
3 environments of children with a mean age of 12, Williams, Ciarrochi, and Heaven (2012)  
4 indicated that parenting behavior characterized by lower levels of warmth and high control  
5 results in higher experiential avoidance, while parenting behavior characterized by acceptance,  
6 responsiveness, and the flexible discussion of rules leads to lower experiential avoidance over  
7 time. Their finding suggests that mitigating experiential avoidance via a relational approach is  
8 possible. Therefore, the aim of this study is to examine the use of a relational approach for  
9 supporting athletes to mitigate their experiential avoidance.

10 In this study, we specifically examined an interaction effect between athletes' dispositional  
11 gratitude and perceived autonomy support from coaches in predicting changes in experiential  
12 avoidance. As we will elaborate shortly, we propose that in order to feel supported and to  
13 embrace support, athletes should first have a tendency to see and appreciate the care and help  
14 provided by others, represented by one's dispositional gratitude or a "general tendency to  
15 recognize and respond with grateful emotion to the roles of other people's benevolence in the  
16 positive experiences and outcomes that one obtains" (McCullough, Emmons, & Tsang, 2002, p.  
17 112). Then, when grateful athletes do perceive support from others, they are more likely to  
18 embrace the support and utilize the resources to face negative experiences. In other words, we  
19 suggest that only athletes who have higher dispositional gratitude and also perceive support from  
20 others are more likely to have a strong sense of support to help them overcome experiential  
21 avoidance. As coaches play an important role in athletes' training and career development, we  
22 focused on coaches' autonomy support in this study. To test our hypothesis, we assessed  
23 athletes' experiential avoidance at two times within a five-month interval, and we examined the

1 interaction effect of dispositional gratitude and perceived coaches' autonomy support in  
2 predicting athletes' changes in experiential avoidance. Below, we provide arguments to support  
3 our hypotheses.

#### 4 **Hypothesis development**

5 The importance of gratitude in athletes' lives has been recognized. For example, Carl  
6 Lewis, a track and field athlete, mentioned that showing gratitude toward his competitors is a  
7 part of his competition repertoire (Lewis & Marx, 1990). Research on gratitude in athletes has  
8 indicated that those who are high in dispositional gratitude and trust their coaches tend to have  
9 higher self-esteem (Chen & Wu, 2014), perceive higher social support from coaches and  
10 teammates, and have better subjective well-being (Chen, 2013). In addition, grateful athletes are  
11 more satisfied with life because they perceive their teammates' coherence (Chen, Kee, & Chen,  
12 2015).

13 Here, we argue that dispositional gratitude helps athletes decrease their experiential  
14 avoidance, especially when they perceive higher support from others. First, as those higher in  
15 dispositional gratitude are more attentive to the benefits provided by others (Chen, 2013; Wood,  
16 Maltby, Gillett, Linley, & Joseph, 2008), they are more likely to use resources or support from  
17 others to overcome negative experiences when approaching their goals. For example, in a  
18 nationwide longitudinal study, grateful individuals were found to cope better with financial strain  
19 than others (Krause, 2009), which could be due to their ability to use available resources. Second,  
20 individuals higher in dispositional gratitude tend to see everything as a gift in their grateful  
21 worldviews (McCullough et al., 2002) and thus tend to see negative thoughts and unpressured  
22 emotions as an indication of the need for improvement and development. Similarly, Lambert,  
23 Graham, Fincham, and Stillman (2009) found that dispositional gratitude is significantly related

1 to positive reframing, a concept that refers to perceiving in a positive light something that was  
2 previously viewed as negative.

3         With these two main characteristics, when perceiving autonomy support from coaches,  
4 grateful athletes are more likely to rely on coaches' support to overcome negative experiences  
5 and to see those uncomfortable experiences as opportunities for development. We specifically  
6 focus on coaches' autonomy support, or "the attitude and practices of a person or a broader  
7 social context that facilitate the target individual's self-organization and self-regulation of  
8 actions and experience" (Ryan & Deci, 2008, p. 188), because autonomy support provides  
9 unconditional positive regard (Deci & Ryan, 1987; Ryan, Huta, & Deci, 2008) that allow athletes  
10 to rely on such support to overcome obstacles as they strive for goal achievement. In other words,  
11 by showing autonomy support, coaches can be regarded as secure attachment figures (Bowlby,  
12 1988) who encourage athletes to explore and embrace experiences that can facilitate  
13 development.

14         Coaches' autonomy support is important for grateful athletes to reduce experiential  
15 avoidance because grateful athletes are more likely to embrace negative experiences when they  
16 can rely on coaches' support without pressure to fulfill specific requirements and worry about  
17 evaluative judgment from their coaches. Moreover, in such a supportive condition, grateful  
18 athletes tend to see themselves as beneficiaries of their coaches and thus feel affirmed, esteemed,  
19 and valued (McCullough et al., 2002), which helps them build their psychological strength and  
20 thus tolerate negative experiences in their pursuit of excellence. We do not expect grateful  
21 athletes to reduce their experiential avoidance if autonomy support from coaches is low because  
22 without perceiving support from coaches, it is unlikely that grateful athletes will build a sense of  
23 support and embrace negative experiences.





1 complete measurements assessing perceived coach autonomy support (moderator) and  
2 experiential avoidance again.

### 3 **Measurements**

4       **Dispositional gratitude.** In the current study, the Gratitude Questionnaire-Taiwan (GQ-T)  
5 was used to assess dispositional gratitude. This version was translated from the Gratitude  
6 Questionnaire (GQ; McCullough et al., 2002) and validated by Chen, Chen, Kee, and Tsai  
7 (2009). Sample items are “I have so much in life to be thankful for” and “If I had to list  
8 everything that I felt grateful for, it would be a very long list.” Participants indicated their  
9 responses on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).  
10 The original version of GQ has six items. Its validity was established by McCullough et al. (2002)  
11 with four studies. In the first study, they developed and selected six items for assessing gratitude  
12 in an exploratory factor analysis and validated the single factor structure in a confirmatory factor  
13 analysis. In terms of convergent and discriminant validity, GQ was positively associated with  
14 gratitude reported by informants and was also associated with but not equivalent to spirituality,  
15 positive affect, well-being, prosocial traits and behaviors and big-five personalities. The same  
16 results were replicated in a large nonstudent sample in their Study 2. Furthermore, GQ was  
17 negatively associated with envy and materialistic attitudes in Study 3. These associations were  
18 also obtained after controlling for neuroticism/negative affectivity, extraversion/positive  
19 affectivity, and agreeableness (Study 4). In terms of validity of the GQ-T, results of confirmatory  
20 factor analysis with two independent samples supported one factor structure but indicated that  
21 only five items have significant factor loadings. Therefore, only five items were used in the GQ-  
22 T. The GQ-T was positively correlated with, but not equivalent to, concepts such as happiness ( $r$   
23 = .31,  $p < .001$ ), optimism ( $r = .28$ ,  $p < .001$ ), agreeableness ( $r = .42$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and extraversion ( $r$

1 = 11,  $p < .01$ ), which is similar to McCullough et al.'s (2002) finding. To date, the GQ-T has  
2 been widely used in the general population (Lin, 2013; Loo, Tsai, Raylu, & Oei, 2014) and in  
3 athlete samples (Chen, 2013; Chen & Wu, 2014) in Taiwan.

4       **Experiential avoidance.** The seven-item Acceptance and Action Questionnaire-II (AAQ-II)  
5 developed by Bond et al. (2011) was used to measure athletes' experiential avoidance. Chang,  
6 Chi, Lin, and Ye (in press) validated the Chinese version of AAQ-II. First, confirmatory factor  
7 analysis was performed with 154 undergraduate students, with the original Item 6 eliminated  
8 because of poor factor loading. The remaining six items demonstrated a satisfactory fit,  $\chi^2(9) =$   
9 17.98, CFI = .98, NNFI = .96, RMSEA = .077, SRMR = .046. In addition, the test-retest  
10 reliability within a 10-month interval was high ( $r = .65, p < .01$ ). Second, factor invariance was  
11 conducted and supported across an athlete sample ( $N = 170$ ) and an undergraduate student  
12 sample ( $N = 154$ ). Third, the nomological validity was examined with an athlete sample ( $N = 76$ ).  
13 We found that AAQ-II scores significantly negatively correlated with positive emotion ( $r = -.37,$   
14  $p < .001$ ). Moreover, the AAQ-II scores significantly related to negative emotion ( $r = .67, p$   
15  $< .001$ ) and depression ( $r = .70, p < .001$ ). The internal consistency was .81, .82, and .78 for the  
16 pilot studies, respectively. Overall, the reliability, factorial validity, factor invariance, and  
17 nomological validity of the AAQ-II across the athlete and student samples were supported.  
18 Sample items are "I'm afraid of my feelings" and "Emotions cause problems in my life."  
19 Participants indicated their responses on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly*  
20 *disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

21       **Perceived coaches' autonomy support.** The Sport Climate Questionnaire (SCQ)  
22 developed by Deci (2001) has been used to measure perceived autonomy support from coaches  
23 (Adie, Duda, & Ntoumanis, 2012; Jöesaar, Hein, & Hagger, 2012). The short version contains

1 six items (e.g., "I feel that my coach provides me choices and options" and "I feel understood by  
2 my coach") and was used to increase the response rate. In a previous study, Jøesaar et al. (2012)  
3 reported that the short version of SCQ satisfactorily predicted validity (Time 1 perceived coach  
4 autonomy support significantly predicted Time 2 task-involving after controlling for the Time 1  
5 task-involving) and reliability (the Cronbach's  $\alpha$  was .80 at Time 1 and .81 at Time 2).  
6 Participants indicated their responses on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly*  
7 *disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) in our study.

## 8 **Results**

9 The means, standard deviations, and correlations for the variables are presented in Table 1.  
10 Perceived coach autonomy support was positively related to gratitude ( $r = .20, p < .05$ ). In  
11 addition, experiential avoidance at Time 1 was also positively correlated with experiential  
12 avoidance at Time 2 ( $r = .61, p < .01$ ). In terms of change in experiential avoidance in the  
13 sample as a whole, the results of a paired-samples  $t$ -test indicated that experiential avoidance at  
14 Time 1 ( $M = 3.75, SD = 1.21$ ) was not significantly different from experiential avoidance at  
15 Time 2 ( $M = 3.83, SD = 1.05$ ) ( $t = -.10, ns$ ). Therefore, athletes in our sample, as a whole, did not  
16 change their mean level of experiential avoidance over time. As our research focused on change  
17 in an athlete's experiential avoidance relative to other athletes, rather than on the mean-level  
18 change of the sample, the null finding on the mean-level change did not prevent us from  
19 performing analysis to test our hypothesis. For details about the different types of change, please  
20 refer to Caspi, Roberts, and Shiner (2005).

21 Because our research variables are all continuous variables, we created product terms of  
22 gratitude and perceived coach autonomy support and used these product terms to examine the  
23 interaction effect between gratitude and perceived autonomy support from coaches. This is an

1 appropriate and better approach than a dichotomous one (i.e., split sample into groups based on  
2 their scores on research variables) for testing an interaction effect of continuous variables  
3 (DeCoster, Iselin, & Gallucci, 2009; MacCallum, Zhang, Preacher, & Rucker, 2002).  
4 Dispositional gratitude and perceived coach autonomy support were standardized  $((X-M)/SD)$   
5 prior to the construction for the interaction terms (dispositional gratitude x perceived coach  
6 autonomy support). This standardization procedure prevents a multicollinearity problem  
7 resulting from a high correlation between the first-order terms and the interaction terms (Jaccard  
8 & Turrisi, 2003). Following the suggestion of Cohen, Cohen, West, and Aiken (2003), we  
9 conducted a series of regression analyses to examine the proposed interaction effect. Table 2  
10 presents the results of these analyses.

11 In Model 1, experiential avoidance at Time 1 was first included to predict experiential  
12 avoidance at Time 2, and its effect was significant ( $b = .65, p < .001$ ). When experiential  
13 avoidance at Time 1 was used to predict experiential avoidance at Time 2, the left variances that  
14 cannot be explained by experiential avoidance at Time 1 can be regarded as changes from Time  
15 1 to Time 2. In Model 2, we additionally included the main effects of dispositional gratitude and  
16 perceived coaches' autonomy support and found that neither gratitude ( $b = -.07, ns$ ) nor  
17 perceived coaches' autonomy support ( $b = .03, ns$ ) significantly predicted experiential avoidance  
18 at Time 2 after controlling for the experiential avoidance at Time 1. In Model 3, we further  
19 included the interaction term between dispositional gratitude and perceived coaches' autonomy  
20 support. We found this interaction term to be significant ( $b = -.18, p < .05$ ) and that it explained  
21 an additional 2% of the variance of experiential avoidance at Time 2 after controlling for  
22 experiential avoidance at Time 1.

23 Based on the suggestion of Aiken and West (1996), we presented an interaction plot in

1 Figure 1 by using one standard deviation above and below the means of perceived coaches'  
2 autonomy support and gratitude values to indicate higher and lower perceived coaches'  
3 autonomy support and gratitude levels. The results of simple slope analyses (Dawson & Richter,  
4 2006) revealed that dispositional gratitude had a negative predictive effect on experiential  
5 avoidance at Time 2 when perceived coaches' autonomy support was high (one standard  
6 deviation above the mean;  $b = -.29, p < .05, t = -2.36$ ), but it did not have a significant predictive  
7 effect when perceived coaches' autonomy support was low (one standard deviation below the  
8 mean;  $b = .10, ns, t = .91$ ). This finding reveals that those high in dispositional gratitude  
9 decreased their experiential avoidance over time only when they perceived higher autonomy  
10 support from coaches.

11

12

-----  
Insert Table 1, Table 2, and Figure 1 here  
-----

13

14

15

### Discussion

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

In this study, we offered a relational perspective on mitigating athletes' experiential avoidance over time and found that when perceiving higher autonomy support from coaches, grateful athletes decrease their tendencies of experiential avoidance over time. Our study brings several contributions. First, different from the mindfulness-based approach, we offer a relational perspective to understand how to mitigate athletes' experiential avoidance. Second, our study extends the scope of the psychological consequences of gratitude in athlete research. In contrast to previous research focusing on athletes' well-being, such as life satisfaction and burnout (Chen

1 & Kee, 2008), our examination suggests that gratitude brings a relational function in shaping  
2 one's willingness to appreciate and embrace negative experiences.

3 In other words, gratitude not only brings pleasant feelings (McCullough et al., 2002), such  
4 as higher life satisfaction, but also may help athletes see undesirable experiences in a positive  
5 light (Jia, Tong, & Lee, 2014; Lambert, Fincham, & Stillman, 2011). Finally, consistent with  
6 Chen and Wu (2014), we show that coaches play an important role in facilitating the beneficial  
7 effect of gratitude for athletes, suggesting that supportive coaches are crucial for grateful athletes  
8 to enjoy athletic lives. Below, we elaborate on these contributions and their implications.

### 9 **A Relational Approach to Mitigate Experiential Avoidance**

10 Our study extends previous research by investigating factors that help mitigate experiential  
11 avoidance over time. Experiential avoidance has been found to be detrimental to one's well-  
12 being (e.g., Panayiotou et al., 2015; Wilson, Wilhelm, & Hartmann, 2014), and in order to  
13 mitigate its negative impact, intervention studies have been conducted to understand how one  
14 can effectively deal with the negative consequences of experiential avoidance (Hann &  
15 McCracken, 2014; Swain, Hancock, Dixon, & Bowman, 2015). In contrast to this reactive  
16 approach, which aims to mitigate the link between experiential avoidance and its negative  
17 outcomes, we adopted a proactive approach to examine whether we can help individuals directly  
18 reduce their tendencies of experiential avoidance. In addition to the mindfulness-based  
19 intervention—a cognitive approach that has been found to be useful for mitigating experiential  
20 avoidance over time for athletes such as Birrer et al. (2012) and Gardner and Moore (2012)—our  
21 results support a relational approach to achieve the same goal. This relational approach  
22 encourages athletes to appreciate and rely on coaches' autonomy support to cope with and thus  
23 embrace negative experiences, which is different from the mindfulness-based approach that

1 encourages athletes to accept their internal states. Likewise, our proposed relational approach can  
2 also be regarded as a resource-based approach because if athletes have resources to cope with  
3 inevitable negative experiences for improvement, they are more likely to reduce attempts to  
4 escape, avoid, or modify the forms or frequency of uncomfortable experiences.

### 5 **Psychological Consequence of Gratitude**

6 By examining the effect of dispositional gratitude, our study also extends research on  
7 gratitude in athlete studies by advancing our understanding of the psychological consequences of  
8 gratitude. Dispositional gratitude has been linked to athletes' well-being, such as higher team  
9 satisfaction, life satisfaction, and lower burnout (Chen, 2013; Chen & Kee, 2008). In contrast to  
10 a direct focus on those well-being outcomes, the focus of this study on change in experiential  
11 avoidance suggests a psychological mechanism for explaining how dispositional gratitude can  
12 influence athletes' well-being, especially when support from others is available and perceived.  
13 As experiential avoidance has been theorized and found to influence one's well-being (e.g.,  
14 Panayiotou et al., 2015; Wilson et al., 2014), it is likely that dispositional gratitude can have an  
15 influence on one's well-being via its function of shaping the tendency of experiential avoidance.  
16 In other words, our examination of experiential avoidance provides a different account for  
17 understanding the link between dispositional gratitude and athletes' well-being. Future studies  
18 are needed to empirically corroborate this idea.

### 19 **The Moderating Role of Perceived Coach Autonomy Support**

20 Finally, we found that dispositional gratitude did not have a main effect on mitigating  
21 experiential avoidance, suggesting that gratitude did not exert its effect on experiential avoidance  
22 independently. Yet, its significant interaction effect with perceived coaches' autonomy support  
23 highlights the phenomenon that perceived coaches' autonomy support is essential for evoking the

1 positive function of gratitude in mitigating experiential avoidance. This finding is similar to the  
2 results reported by Chen and Wu (2014). In a longitudinal study focusing on the growth of  
3 athletes' self-esteem over time, they found that dispositional gratitude did not have a main effect  
4 of enhancing athletes' self esteem but had significance when athletes had trustworthy  
5 relationships with their coaches. Both their studies and our research indicate the important role of  
6 coaches in facilitating the positive functions of gratitude for athletes.

### 7 **Practical Implications**

8 Our finding has practical implications for how to help athletes overcome a tendency of  
9 experiential avoidance. Current results of interaction specifically indicates that only for those  
10 high in dispositional gratitude, having perceived coaches' autonomy support can help them  
11 decrease experiential avoidance, This suggests that coaches should be aware that not all athletes  
12 will benefit from having autonomy support, and thus, they should know their athletes well in  
13 order to provide appropriate support. Moreover, coaches should be aware that autonomy support  
14 can help decrease experiential avoidance. In other words, coaches need to offer their support to  
15 facilitate athletes' autonomy, rather than providing support in a manner that may threaten  
16 athletes' sense of determination. As reported by Haerens, Aelterman, Vansteenkiste, Soenens,  
17 and Van Petegem (2015), providing support in a controlling manner can actually have a negative  
18 influence on individuals, such as by causing poor quality of motivation.

19 For those low in dispositional gratitude, our research did not inform how to help them  
20 overcome experiential avoidance. One approach that could be adopted, however, is to encourage  
21 those people more grateful so as to evoke a positive function of gratitude, with autonomy support,  
22 to mitigate experiential avoidance. The effectiveness of gratitude intervention has been  
23 demonstrated in previous studies. For example, Emmons and McCullough (2003) simply asked



1 participants to count their blessings in daily life to enhance the well-being of individuals  
2 suffering from chronic diseases. Nevertheless, whether this intervention approach is effective for  
3 athletes low in dispositional gratitude, and especially those exhibiting experiential avoidance,  
4 should be empirically examined. Another possibility is to explore whether those low in  
5 dispositional gratitude need different forms of support to overcome experiential avoidance. For  
6 example, providing support that can fulfill their need for relatedness may help them embrace  
7 negative experiences and overcome experiential avoidance, as they may need such support to  
8 feel that they will be well taken care of when encountering negative experiences. More studies  
9 are thus needed to understand how to help those low in dispositional gratitude overcome  
10 experiential avoidance.

### 11 **Limitations and Conclusion**

12 Despite making valuable contributions, our study also has several limitations. First, we only  
13 focused on coaches' support in this study. As previous studies have consistently reported the role  
14 of significant others in supporting athletes' positive development (e.g., Jõesaar et al., 2012;  
15 Jowett & Timson-Katchis, 2005), future studies are encouraged to examine whether and how  
16 family members can help athletes mitigate experiential avoidance. Second, the types of support  
17 can be extended. We only focused on autonomy support in this study and did not include support  
18 for competence or relatedness needs, which have been emphasized in self-determination theory,  
19 as basic human needs. Future studies can expand on the sources and dimensions of support to  
20 fully understand the role of support in shaping experiential avoidance. Third, the measures are all  
21 self-reported, which can bring common method bias (Lindell & Whitney, 2001) and result in an  
22 overestimation of the coefficients. Informant ratings can be used to overcome common method  
23 bias in the future. Nevertheless, common method bias should not threaten our findings because if

1 common method bias is stronger, it is unlikely to obtain an interaction effect between variables  
2 (Siemsen, Roth, & Oliveira, 2009). Fourth, we did not consider variables such as injury history,  
3 time in season, success, or failure experience in this study, as they may influence one's  
4 experiential avoidance and the function of coach support in facing negative events. These  
5 variables should be taken into account in future research. In addition, we only measured  
6 perceived coaches' autonomy support at Time 2 with the aim of mitigating common method  
7 variance so that participants could report having more coach support right after completing the  
8 gratitude questionnaire. However, athletes actually can change their perceptions of their coaches'  
9 autonomy support over time, and our research model did not fully consider such dynamics in a  
10 longitudinal process, which should be taken into account in the future. Moreover, we did not  
11 explore the issue of time in this study. Five months was used as the only interval to examine  
12 change in experiential avoidance, but there was no specific guidance for when this change would  
13 be more likely to occur. Therefore, more studies are required to examine the effect of time.

14 Finally, in this study, we focused only on how to decrease experiential avoidance. Although  
15 we did not have direct evidence to support the idea that experiential avoidance would result in  
16 meaningful and measurable behavior changes in sports, research has indicated that experiential  
17 avoidance was related to determinants that have been found to influence athletic performance,  
18 such as emotion regulation (De la cruz, et al., 2013), depressive symptoms (Panayiotou, et al.,  
19 2015), and coping strategies (Kashdan, et al., 2006). In other words, experiential avoidance may  
20 exert its effect on athletic performance via multiple pathways. More studies are required to  
21 empirically examine whether and how experiential avoidance can influence athletic performance  
22 and whether decreasing experiential avoidance can help improve athletic performance.

1           In conclusion, discomfort is inevitable for athletes on their paths to excellence. Those who  
2 cannot tolerate such inevitable negative experiences are more vulnerable in goal pursuit. To  
3 understand how to mitigate experiential avoidance in athletes or to make them embrace  
4 inevitable negative experiences, we examined the role of dispositional gratitude and perceived  
5 coaches' autonomy support in mitigating experiential avoidance over time, and we found that  
6 having higher gratitude and perceived coaches' autonomy support are critical factors in  
7 decreasing athletes' experiential avoidance.

8

## References

- 1  
2 Adie, J. W., Duda, J. L., & Ntoumanis, N. (2012). Perceived coach-autonomy support, basic  
3 need satisfaction and the well- and ill-being of elite youth soccer players: A longitudinal  
4 investigation. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 13*, 51-59. doi:  
5 org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2011.07.008
- 6 Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1996). *Multiple regression: Testing and interpreting interaction*.  
7 Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- 8 Birrer, D., Röthlin, P., & Morgan, G. (2012). Mindfulness to enhance athletic performance:  
9 Theoretical considerations and possible impact mechanisms. *Mindfulness, 3*, 235-246.  
10 doi:10.1007/s12671-012-0109-2
- 11 Bond, F. W., Hayes, S. C., Baer, R. A., Carpenter, K. M., Guenole, N., Orcutt, H. K., . . . Zettle,  
12 R. D. (2011). Preliminary psychometric properties of the Acceptance and Action  
13 Questionnaire–II: A revised measure of psychological inflexibility and experiential  
14 avoidance. *Behavior Therapy, 42*, 676-688. doi:10.1016/j.beth.2011.03.007
- 15 Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base : Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*.  
16 New York: Basic Books.
- 17 Caspi, A., Roberts, B. W., & Shiner, R. L. (2005). Personality development: Stability and  
18 change. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 453-484.
- 19 Chang, W., Chi, L., Lin, S.-H., & Ye, Y.-C. (in press). Psychometric properties of the  
20 Acceptance and Action Questionnaire - II for Taiwanese college students and elite  
21 athletes. *Current Psychology*. doi:10.1007/s12144-015-9395-x

- 1 Chen, L. H. (2013). Gratitude and adolescent athletes' well-being: The multiple mediating roles  
2 of perceived social support from coaches and teammates. *Social Indicators Research*,  
3 *114*, 273-285. doi:10.1007/s11205-012-0145-2
- 4 Chen, L. H., Chen, M.-Y., Kee, Y. H., & Tsai, Y.-M. (2009). Validation of the Gratitude  
5 Questionnaire (GQ) in Taiwanese undergraduate students. *Journal of Happiness Studies*,  
6 *10*, 655-664. doi:10.1007/s10902-008-9112-7
- 7 Chen, L. H., & Kee, Y. H. (2008). Gratitude and adolescent athletes' well-being. *Social*  
8 *Indicators Research*, *89*, 361-373. doi:10.1007/s11205-008-9237-4
- 9 Chen, L. H., Kee, Y. H., & Chen, M.-Y. (2015). Why grateful adolescent athletes are more  
10 satisfied with their life: The mediating role of perceived team cohesion. *Social Indicators*  
11 *Research*, *124*, 463-476. doi:10.1007/s11205-014-0798-0
- 12 Chen, L. H., & Wu, C.-H. (2014). Gratitude enhances change in athletes' self-esteem: The  
13 moderating role of trust in coach. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *26*, 349-362.  
14 doi:10.1080/10413200.2014.889255
- 15 Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). *Applied multiple regression/correlation*  
16 *analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3 ed.): Hillsdale: Erlbaum.
- 17 Cronbach, L. J., & Furby, L. (1970). How we should measure "change": Or should we?  
18 *Psychological Bulletin*, *74*, 68-80.
- 19 Dawson, J. F., & Richter, A. W. (2006). Probing three-way interactions in moderated multiple  
20 regression: Development and application of a slope difference test. *Journal of Applied*  
21 *Psychology*, *91*, 917-926.

- 1 de la Cruz, L. F., Landau, D., Iervolino, A. C., Santo, S., Pertusa, A., Singh, S., & Mataix-Cols,  
2 D. (2013). Experiential avoidance and emotion regulation difficulties in hoarding  
3 disorder. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 27*, 204-209.
- 4 Deci, E. L. (2001). The sport climate questionnaire. Retrieved March 11, 2006 from.  
5 [http://www.psych.rochester.edu/SDT/measures/auton\\_sport.html](http://www.psych.rochester.edu/SDT/measures/auton_sport.html).
- 6 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1987). The support of autonomy and the control of behavior.  
7 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 1024-1037.
- 8 DeCoster, J., Iselin, A.-M. R., & Gallucci, M. (2009). A conceptual and empirical examination  
9 of justifications for dichotomization. *Psychological Methods, 14*, 349-366.
- 10 Emmons, R. A., & McCullough, M. E. (2003). Counting blessings versus burdens: An  
11 experimental investigation of gratitude and subjective well-being in daily life. *Journal of*  
12 *Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 377-389. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.84.2.377
- 13 Gagné, M., & Blanchard, C. (2007). Self-determination theory and well-being in athletes. In M.  
14 S. Hagger & N. L. D. Chatzisarantis (Eds.), *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in*  
15 *exercise and sport* (pp. 243-254). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- 16 Gardner, F. L., & Moore, Z. E. (2012). Mindfulness and acceptance models in sport psychology:  
17 A decade of basic and applied scientific advancements. *Canadian Psychology, 53*, 309-  
18 318. doi:10.1037/a0030220
- 19 Haerens, L., Aelterman, N., Vansteenkiste, M., Soenens, B., & Van Petegem, S. (2015). Do  
20 perceived autonomy-supportive and controlling teaching relate to physical education  
21 students' motivational experiences through unique pathways? Distinguishing between the  
22 bright and dark side of motivation. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 16*, 26-36.  
23 doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.08.013

- 1 Hann, K. E. J., & McCracken, L. M. (2014). A systematic review of randomized controlled trials  
2 of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy for adults with chronic pain: Outcome domains,  
3 design quality, and efficacy. *Journal of Contextual Behavioral Science, 3*, 217-227. doi:  
4 org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2014.10.001
- 5 Hayes, S. C., Pistorello, J., & Levin, M. E. (2012). Acceptance and Commitment Therapy as a  
6 unified model of behavior change. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 40*, 976-1002.  
7 doi:10.1177/0011000012460836
- 8 Hayes, S. C., Wilson, K. G., Gifford, E. V., Follette, V. M., & Strosahl, K. (1996). Experimental  
9 avoidance and behavioral disorders: a functional dimensional approach to diagnosis and  
10 treatment. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*, 1152-1168.
- 11 Jaccard, J., & Turrisi, R. (2003). *Interaction effects in multiple regression* (2nd ed.). Thousand  
12 Oaks, Calif.: Sage Publications.
- 13 Jia, L., Tong, E. M. W., & Lee, L. N. (2014). Psychological "Gel" to bind individuals' goal  
14 pursuit: Gratitude facilitates goal contagion. *Emotion, 14*, 748-760.
- 15 Jõesaar, H., Hein, V., & Hagger, M. S. (2012). Youth athletes' perception of autonomy support  
16 from the coach, peer motivational climate and intrinsic motivation in sport setting: One-  
17 year effects. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 13*, 257-262. doi:  
18 org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2011.12.001
- 19 Jowett, S., & Timson-Katchis, M. (2005). Social networks in sport: Parental influence on the  
20 coach-athlete relationship. *The Sport Psychologist, 19*, 267-287.
- 21 Kashdan, T. B., Barrios, V., Forsyth, J. P., & Steger, M. F. (2006). Experiential avoidance as a  
22 generalized psychological vulnerability: Comparisons with coping and emotion  
23 regulation strategies. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 44*, 1301-1320.

- 1 Krause, N. (2009). Religious involvement, gratitude, and change in depressive symptoms over  
2 time. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion, 19*, 155-172.  
3 doi:10.1080/10508610902880204
- 4 Lambert, N. M., Fincham, F. D., & Stillman, T. F. (2011). Gratitude and depressive symptoms:  
5 The role of positive reframing and positive emotion. *Cognition and Emotion, 26*, 615-  
6 633.
- 7 Lambert, N. M., Graham, S. M., Fincham, F. D., & Stillman, T. F. (2009). A changed  
8 perspective: How gratitude can affect sense of coherence through positive reframing. *The*  
9 *Journal of Positive Psychology, 4*, 461-470. doi:10.1080/17439760903157182
- 10 Lewis, C., & Marx, J. (1990). *Inside track: My professional life in amateur track and field*. New  
11 York: Simon and Schuster.
- 12 Lin, C.-C. (2013). A higher-order gratitude uniquely predicts subjective well-being: Incremental  
13 validity above the personality and a single gratitude. *Social Indicators Research, 119*,  
14 909-924. doi:10.1007/s11205-013-0518-1
- 15 Lindell, M. K., & Whitney, D. J. (2001). Accounting for common method variance in cross-  
16 sectional research designs. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 114-121.
- 17 Loo, J. M. Y., Tsai, J.-S., Raylu, N., & Oei, T. P. S. (2014). Gratitude, hope, mindfulness and  
18 personal-growth initiative: Buffers or risk factors for problem gambling? *PLoS ONE*,  
19 9(2), e83889. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0083889
- 20 MacCallum, R. C., Zhang, S., Preacher, K. J., & Rucker, D. D. (2002). On the practice of  
21 dichotomization of quantitative variables. *Psychological Methods, 7*, 19-40.



- 1 McCullough, M. E., Emmons, R. A., & Tsang, J.-A. (2002). The grateful disposition: A  
2 conceptual and empirical topography. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82,  
3 112-127. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.82.1.112
- 4 Panayiotou, G., Leonidou, C., Constantinou, E., Hart, J., Rinehart, K. L., Sy, J. T., &  
5 Björgvinsson, T. (2015). Do alexithymic individuals avoid their feelings? Experiential  
6 avoidance mediates the association between alexithymia, psychosomatic, and depressive  
7 symptoms in a community and a clinical sample. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 56, 206-  
8 216. doi:org/10.1016/j.comppsy.2014.09.006
- 9 Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2008). A self-determination theory approach to psychotherapy: The  
10 motivational basis for effective change. *Canadian Psychology*, 49, 186-193.
- 11 Ryan, R. M., Huta, V., & Deci, E. L. (2008). Living well: A self-determination theory  
12 perspective on eudaimonia. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9, 139-170.  
13 doi:10.1007/s10902-006-9023-4
- 14 Siemsen, E., Roth, A., & Oliveira, P. (2009). Common method bias in regression models with  
15 linear, quadratic, and interaction effects. *Organizational Research Methods*, 13, 456-476.  
16 doi:10.1177/1094428109351241
- 17 Swain, J., Hancock, K., Dixon, A., & Bowman, J. (2015). Acceptance and Commitment Therapy  
18 for children: A systematic review of intervention studies. *Journal of Contextual*  
19 *Behavioral Science*, 4, 73-82. doi:org/10.1016/j.jcbs.2015.02.001
- 20 Williams, K. E., Ciarrochi, J., & Heaven, P. C. L. (2012). Inflexible parents, inflexible kids: a 6-  
21 year longitudinal study of parenting style and the development of psychological  
22 flexibility in adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 41, 1053-1066.

- 1 Wilson, A. C., Wilhelm, S., & Hartmann, A. S. (2014). Experiential avoidance in body  
2           dysmorphic disorder. *Body Image, 11*, 380-383. doi: org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2014.06.006
- 3 Wood, A. M., Maltby, J., Gillett, R., Linley, P. A., & Joseph, S. (2008). The role of gratitude in  
4           the development of social support, stress, and depression: Two longitudinal studies.  
5           *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*, 854-871. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2007.11.003

## 6 Table 1

7 *Correlation Matrix for Research Constructs*

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	$\alpha$	1	2	3	4
1. Dispositional gratitude	6.06	0.94	.83	1.00			
2. Perceived coach autonomy support	4.40	1.41	.93	.20*	1.00		
3. Experiential avoidance at Time 1	3.75	1.21	.82	-.08	.08	1.00	
4. Experiential avoidance at Time 2	3.84	1.05	.78	-.11	.06	.61**	1.00

8 \* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .01$

9 Table 2

10 *Hierarchical Regression in Predicting Athletes' Experiential Avoidance at Time 2*

	Experiential avoidance Time 2		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Constant	3.83	3.84	3.88
Experiential avoidance at Time 1	.65/.61***	.64/.61***	.64/.60***
Dispositional gratitude		-.07/.07	-.09/-.08
Perceived Coach Autonomy support		.03/.03	.04/.04
Interaction term			-.18/-.15*
$R^2$	.38	.38	.40
$F$	83.44***	27.99***	22.79***
$\Delta F$		.54	4.82*

11 \* $p < .05$ ; \*\*\* $p < .001$ 

12 Note: Unstandardized (left) and standardized regression coefficients are reported.

13

**Figure Captions**

14 *Figure 1*

15 Simple regression lines predicting change in experiential avoidance.

