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Burnout and engagement are important psychological outcomes in sport with potential to impact athletes as well as sport parents. The present study examined associations among markers of the sport-based parent-child relationship (warmth and conflict) and parent burnout and engagement in organized youth sport. Youth sport parents ($N=214$) aged 26–66 years ($M=43.2$, $SD=6.2$) completed valid and reliable self-report assessments of study variables. Study results showcased warmth, but not conflict, in the parent–child relationship as a significant negative contributor to global burnout and a significant positive contributor to global engagement in sport parents. Results offer preliminary insight into the impact of parent–child warmth in sport on parents’ experiences of burnout and engagement. Findings have implications for future research and practice designed to promote positive psychosocial experiences for sport families.
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Youth sport is a prominent relational and developmental context for youth and their parents. As many as 44 million children and adolescents participate in organized youth sport in the United States each year (Bremer, 2012; National Council of Youth Sports 2008). Based on these nearly ubiquitous participation rates, youth sport represents one of the most prominent environments for children and adolescents to experience physical, psychological, and social development. These include such outcomes as physical fitness, motor development, motivation and the development of physical self-perceptions such as self-esteem (Barber, Eccles, & Stone, 2001; Gould & Carson, 2008; Richman & Shaffer, 2000). Social
developmental outcomes including friendship and peer acceptance also may occur as a result of youth sport participation (Smith, 1999), and have been a focus of sport and exercise psychology scholarship (Smith & McDonough, 2008). Organized sport also represents a unique environment where youth can be socialized by prominent social agents, including their parents (Greendorfer, Lewko, & Rosengren, 1996; Kremer-Sadlik & Kim, 2007). Moreover, extant research has showcased the impact of youth sport participation on psychological and emotional outcomes for sport parents, through experiences of parent–child interaction and involvement (Dorsch, Smith, & McDonough, 2009; 2015). Accordingly, organized youth sport represents an environment in which sport scientists are not only concerned with the psychological outcomes of the children and adolescents who participate, but of their parents as well.

Extant research suggests that there may be a psychosocial impact on parents who engage in the organized youth sport participation of their children via socialization processes (Dorsch et al., 2009, 2015; Holt, Tamminen, Black, Mandigo, & Fox, 2009). Building from Bandura’s (1999) concept of triadic reciprocal determinism, Dorsch and colleagues suggested that parents are socialized into the youth sport parent role via three primary mechanisms. Specifically, parents experience affective changes by developing an emotional connection to sport, by learning to employ emotional management strategies, and through their reactive emotional experiences. They experience behavioral changes through their participation and the support and sacrifice they provide/make to facilitate their children’s involvement. And finally, they experience cognitive changes with regard to their awareness, goals, and knowledge in the sport setting. Past work also suggests that fiduciary behaviors, such as transporting youth athletes to and from practices and competitions, as well as monetary investments (e.g., purchasing equipment, traveling to tournaments) are commonly reported involvement practices in youth sport parents (Eynon, Kitchen, & Semotiuk, 1980; Wiersma & Fifer, 2008). Therefore, research to date has established that being involved in youth sport has important implications for sport parents’ affective, behavioral, and cognitive outcomes. Yet, continued work is needed to enhance understanding of the parent–child relational mechanism, which may underpin parent-specific psychological outcomes.

Youth sport provides an important ecological laboratory in which parents and children interact, expressing key components of the broader parent–child relationship. Thus, the parent–child relationship is a salient one to youth sport, as parental involvement may include parenting, administrative and/or coaching roles (Weiss & Fretwell, 2005), providing many opportunities for sport-based parent–child socialization. Through an ecological lens (Bronfenbrenner, 2005; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 1998), socialization is conceptualized as a proximal process, whereby continuous interactions evoke subjective feelings such as closeness, struggle, sensitivity, and power among parents and children (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Laursen and Collins (2009) argue that researchers may gain a more distilled picture of the parent–child relationship by measuring perceptions of the relational markers of warmth and conflict. Warmth is the tendency for the parent–child relationship to be characterized by supportive, affectionate, and sensitive interactions, whereas conflict is the struggle for agency or power within the relationship (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). In sport, the link between markers of parent–child relationship quality and young athletes’ sport enjoyment and motivation have been documented.
(Dunn, Dorsch, King, & Rothlisberger, 2016; Horn & Horn, 2007; Ullrich-French & Smith, 2006). Moreover, out of sport, parent–child warmth has been shown to be adaptive, and parent–child conflict to be maladaptive, when linked to psychosocial outcomes for parents as well as children (Shanahan, McHale, Crouter, & Osgood, 2007; Shanahan, McHale, Osgood, & Crouter, 2007; Trentacosta, Criss, Shaw, Lacourse, Hyde, & Dishion, 2011). Accordingly, extant research on the parent–child relationship suggests a potential impact of this important relationship on psychological outcomes for parents in sport. Moving forward, specific examination of parent perceptions of parent–child relationship markers of warmth and conflict within the context of youth sport will benefit understanding of parents’ psychological outcomes of burnout and engagement, important psychological health outcomes for sport parents.

Both anecdotal (e.g., Nack & Munson, 2000) and empirical accounts (e.g., Green & Chalip, 1997; Harwood & Knight, 2009) suggest that parents may struggle to find a balance relative to proper involvement and psychological health and well-being in sport. An unbalanced sport involvement could result in a variety of maladaptive psychological outcomes for parents including psychological stress, strain in interpersonal relationships, and/or context-specific cognitive-affective outcomes like sport burnout or engagement. Burnout and engagement (Lonsdale, Hodge, & Jackson, 2007), a focus of the current study, represent important psychological health outcomes for sport parents, and understanding their expression in parents could enhance understanding of both adaptive and maladaptive sport-related behaviors within organized youth sport. Sport-based burnout and engagement are important psychological outcomes that have received much examination in athlete and coaching populations to date (see DeFreese, Raedeke & Smith, 2015; Eklund & Cresswell 2007 for reviews), and therefore merit specific attention in sport parent populations.

Sport-based burnout is a cognitive-affective syndrome characterized by dimensions (i.e., symptoms) of emotional and physical exhaustion, reduced accomplishment and sport devaluation. A related, yet more adaptive psychological outcome germane to sport is engagement. Engagement in sport is a psychosocial experience characterized by confidence vigor, dedication and enthusiasm (Lonsdale et al., 2007). Using stress-, commitment- and motivation-oriented theoretical conceptualizations (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Raedeke, 1997; Smith, 1986), burnout has been shown in athlete populations to be associated with perceptions of heightened psychological stress, less adaptive forms of motivation, and more optimal social interactions (e.g., Goodger, Gorely, Lavallee, & Harwood, 2007; DeFreese & Smith, 2014). In contrast, sport-based engagement has been shown to be positively associated with more optimal constellations of psychosocial outcomes (e.g., DeFreese & Smith, 2013a). Cumulatively, more adaptive social interactions (e.g., social support) have been negatively associated with burnout and positively associated with engagement among athletes, whereas less adaptive social interactions (e.g., negative social interactions, conflict) have been positively associated with burnout and negatively associated with engagement. As the social environment impacts the development of sport-based burnout among athletes, it also merits consideration among other sport-based social actors. Accordingly, the impact of the organized youth sport environment on the burnout and engagement experiences of sport parents merits targeted empirical attention.
Evidence of parent burnout has been showcased in the general parenting literature (Lindahl Norberg, 2007), suggesting burnout and engagement may be potentially important psychological outcomes for parents in the dynamic social environment of youth sport as well. Moreover, supported by extant burnout and engagement theory in sport, key social interactions within the sport environment may be associated with these outcomes in sport parent populations. Specifically, because the sport-based parent–child relationship represents a key aspect of the parent–child relationship, further understanding of adaptive (i.e., warmth) and maladaptive (i.e., conflict) markers of this relationship will unearth knowledge of youth sport parent burnout and engagement. In light of this, the present study was designed to develop initial understanding of parent engagement and burnout in organized youth sport by examining the associations of these constructs with important sport-based markers of the parent–child relationship, warmth and conflict. Study findings will have important implications for future research and intervention efforts designed to enhance the psychosocial experiences of youth sport parents and, ultimately, their children.

To address an important research gap relative to the psychological experiences of sport parents, the purpose of the present study was to examine associations among markers of the sport-based parent–child relationship and parent burnout and engagement in organized youth sport. Based on the extant sport parenting and burnout and engagement literatures, it was hypothesized that parent perceptions of warmth in the parent–child sport relationship would be negatively associated with global burnout and positively associated with global engagement perceptions. Conversely, it was hypothesized that parent perceptions of conflict in the parent–child sport relationship would be positively associated with global burnout and negatively associated with global engagement perceptions.

**Method**

**Participants**

Data were collected from a national convenience sample of 214 youth sport parents in the United States. Participants included 65 fathers and 148 mothers (1 non-specified) ranging in age from 26 to 66 years ($M = 43.2$, $SD = 6.2$). Hispanic or Latino ethnicity was affirmed by 0.9% of participants. The majority of participants self-identified as White (95.3%) with remaining participants self-identifying as Black or African-American (1.4%), more than one race (1.4%), Asian (0.5%) or offering no response (1.4%). Participants reported, on average, 2.7 children ($SD = 1.1$) under the age of 21 residing in the household, with 2.3 of them participating in organized youth sport ($SD = 0.97$). Participants estimated their family spent an average of $5,625.85 annually on organized youth sport for all children in the household.

**Design and Measures**

A cross-sectional study design was used to measure study variables. A questionnaire totaling 50 items was administered via online survey interface to measure
the variables of interest. Survey information was collected from the primary sport parent during the target child’s current competitive sport season. The survey assessed self-report demographic information along with parent perceptions of the sport-based parent–child relationship (i.e., warmth and conflict), and burnout and engagement.

**Demographics.** Participants were asked to report their gender, age, ethnicity, and race. Additionally, participants were asked to report the current number of children residing in their household as well as the number participating in organized youth sport and the estimated annual income spent on all children’s sport participation.

**Warmth.** *Parent–child warmth in sport* was assessed via parent self-reports using an 8-item, sport-adapted version of the acceptance scale of the Child’s Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI; Schwarz, Barton-Henry, & Pruzinsky, 1985). Items were modified to reflect perceptions of warmth in the parent–child sport relationship during the current season (e.g., “I tell or show my child I like her/him just the way he/she is as an athlete”) and were rated on a scale from 1 (really unlike the relationship) to 4 (really like the relationship). Internal consistency reliability of scores was $\alpha = .80$ for the current study.

**Conflict.** *Parent–child conflict in sport* was assessed via self-parent reports using a 3-item, sport adapted version of the conflict subscale from the Sport Friendship Quality Scale (SFQS; Weiss & Smith, 1999). The SFQS was contextualized to the parent–child relationship (Ullrich-French & Smith, 2006), and items were further adapted to reflect parent perceptions of parent–child conflict during the current sport season (e.g., “Me and my child have arguments about sport”). Participants rated the accuracy of the statements on a five-point scale from 1 (not at all true) to 5 (really true). Internal consistency reliability of scores was $\alpha = .87$ for the current study.

**Parent sport burnout.** Parent sport burnout perceptions were measured by adapting the Athlete Burnout Questionnaire (Raedeke & Smith, 2001; 2009) to a youth sport parent population. This measure consists of 15 self-report items assessing dimensions of emotional and physical exhaustion, reduced sense of accomplishment, and sport devaluation. Participants rated the frequency of experiencing burnout perceptions relative to their child’s current youth sport team this season on a five-point scale from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). Items were adapted to include an “as a sport parent” stem (e.g., “I’m accomplishing many worthwhile things as a sport parent.”). A global burnout score was also created by averaging scores on all items. Scores on this measure have exhibited good reliability properties and theoretically expected associations with constructs conceptually linked to burnout (Cresswell & Eklund, 2006; Raedeke & Smith, 2001; 2009; DeFreese & Smith 2013b) in athlete populations. Internal consistency reliability of scores in the current study was $\alpha = .94$ for global burnout and $\alpha = .80$ to .93 for the burnout subscales. To further address the measurement properties of adapting this previously athlete-centric measure of burnout to sport parents, a confirmation factory analysis was conducted. Results demonstrated a first-order, three-factor model to have acceptable fit to the data, $\chi^2(87) = 286.99$, $p < .001$, TLI = .88, NFI = .88, CFI = .92, RMSEA = .10 (.09–.12).
**Parent sport engagement.**  Sport parent perceived confidence, vigor, dedication, and enthusiasm were assessed by adapting the Athlete Engagement Questionnaire (AEQ; Lonsdale et al., 2007) to a youth sport parent population. Participants rated how often they experienced each of 16 items relative to their child’s current youth sport team this season. Response options fell on a five-point scale of 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). Items were adapted to include an “as a sport parent” stem (e.g., “I am enthusiastic about being a sport parent.”). A global engagement score was also created by averaging scores on all items. Support for validity of AEQ scores is found in research showing expected associations of scores with constructs theoretically linked to engagement (Hodge, Lonsdale, & Jackson, 2009; Lonsdale et al., 2007) in athlete populations. Internal consistency reliability of scores for global engagement was $\alpha = .97$ and values ranged from $\alpha = .90$ to .92 for the engagement subscales in the present study. To further address the measurement properties of adapting this previously athlete-centric measure of engagement to sport parents, a confirmation factory analysis was conducted. Results demonstrated a first-order, four-factor model to have acceptable fit to the data, $\chi^2(98) = 309.37, p < .001$, TLI = .91, NFI = .91, CFI = .93, RMSEA = .10 (.09 – .11).

**Procedure**

Procedures were approved by an institutional review board and adhered to APA ethical standards. As a first step, administrators drawn from a range of youth sport leagues across the country were contacted via E-mail to introduce the study, and to ask for permission to contact coaches in their respective leagues. Following administrator approval, coaches were E-mailed to request contact information for parents on their respective teams. Subsequent to these communications, E-mails including an embedded survey link were forwarded to parents soliciting their voluntary participation in an online survey tapping their youth sport parenting experiences. Initial E-mails were sent to administrators from 132 leagues across the United States. Twenty-two (16.7%) provided contact information for 211 coaches in their respective leagues, and 67 coaches (31.8%) ultimately provided contact information for 721 families participating on their teams. Parents from these families were E-mailed regarding study participation, and ultimately parents from 214 families (29.7%) chose to participate. Subsequent to providing informed consent, participants received general instructions and continued with the questionnaire if opting to participate. Participants were informed that no correct or incorrect answers exist and were given the option to skip any survey questions they did not feel comfortable answering.

**Data Analysis**

Preliminary data screening was performed in accordance with best practice recommendations for multivariate analysis (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). This involved examining data for potential missing values, outliers and violations of assumptions of multivariate analysis. Descriptive statistics and scale reliabilities (via Cronbach’s $\alpha$ values) were calculated for all study variables. Missing data from participants completing the entire survey were replaced for focal variables.
with values calculated via mean imputation (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted for the adapted measures of sport parent burnout and engagement. The following fit indices were used based on best practice guidelines for model fit: chi-squared goodness-of-fit ($\chi^2$), Tucker Lewis fit index (TLI), normed fit index (NFI), comparative fit index (CFI), and root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA; Kline, 2005). Two sets of multiple regression models were conducted to test specific study hypotheses of interest. For the first set, the independent variables were warmth and conflict and the dependent variables were global burnout as well as the individual burnout dimensions of emotional and physical exhaustion, reduced accomplishment, and sport devaluation. For the second set, the independent variables were also warmth and conflict and the dependent variables were global engagement and the individual engagement dimensions of confidence, vigor, dedication, and enthusiasm. All analyses were conducted using SPSS 23.0 and the associated Amos 23.0 structural equation modeling add-on.

Results

Preliminary Data Screening

A review of skewness and kurtosis values as well as pairwise scatterplots for all study variables revealed no violations of the assumptions of multivariate analysis. Study variables exhibited a proportion of missing data from completed surveys, which was determined to be random and no greater than 7.5% for any one focal variable. Accordingly, this relatively small amount of missing data was mean imputed (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Review of Mahalanobis distance values revealed two potential multivariate outliers based on the constellation of scores on parent–child relationship variables. Due to potentially adverse effects on multivariate analyses (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013), results were examined with and without these cases. No differences in study analyses were observed when these cases were removed; therefore, we opted to retain both cases in the final analyses, which are based on the 214 valid cases sampled.

Descriptive Statistics

Means, standard deviations and bivariate correlations for study variables are presented in Table 1. Burnout and engagement means and standard deviations were similar to those reported in previous literature with athletes and coaches. Participants reported relatively high warmth and low conflict relative to response set options of study measures. Further, participants also reported low-to-moderate perceptions of global and dimensional burnout and moderate-to-high levels of global and dimensional engagement relative to response set options of the burnout and engagement measures, respectively. The majority of bivariate correlations among study variables were statistically significant ($p < .05$). The only non-significant correlations involved conflict, which was not found to exhibit a significant bivariate correlation with the burnout dimension of devaluation, global engagement or any engagement dimensions.
Table 1  Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables (N = 214)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Warmth</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Conflict</td>
<td>−.45</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Global Burnout</td>
<td>−.31</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Exhaustion</td>
<td>−.18</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Reduced Accomplishment</td>
<td>−.37</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Devaluation</td>
<td>−.30</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Global Engagement</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>−.10*</td>
<td>−.72</td>
<td>−.52</td>
<td>−.75</td>
<td>−.67</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Confidence</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>−.11*</td>
<td>−.61</td>
<td>−.45</td>
<td>−.68</td>
<td>−.52</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Vigor</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>−.11*</td>
<td>−.68</td>
<td>−.52</td>
<td>−.71</td>
<td>−.61</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Dedication</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>−.58</td>
<td>−.37</td>
<td>−.61</td>
<td>−.58</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Enthusiasm</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>−.12*</td>
<td>−.75</td>
<td>−.53</td>
<td>−.75</td>
<td>−.72</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All correlations except those noted were p < .05; Cronbach’s α values are listed along the diagonal and italicized.
Regression Analyses

The associations of warmth and conflict with youth sport parent burnout and engagement, respectively, were examined using multiple linear regression (see Tables 2 and 3). For burnout, lower warmth (but not conflict) was found to be significantly associated with higher global burnout, reduced accomplishment, and devaluation scores in these respective analyses. This association approached significance for exhaustion ($p = .068$). In total, parent–child relationship markers accounted for 10%, 14%, and 9% of the variance in global burnout, reduced accomplishment, and devaluation, respectively. For engagement, higher warmth was found to be significantly associated with higher global engagement, confidence, vigor, dedication, and enthusiasm scores in these respective analyses. Conflict was the only significant, albeit positive, contributor to the engagement dimension of dedication. In total, parent–child relationship markers accounted for 17%, 17%, 11%, 13% and 15% of the variance in global engagement, confidence, vigor, dedication and enthusiasm, respectively.

Table 2  Linear Regression Analyses Assessing the Associations of Warmth and Conflict With Burnout Variables ($N = 214$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Global Burnout</th>
<th>Exhaustion</th>
<th>Reduced Accomplishment</th>
<th>Devaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F_{(2,211)}$

- Warmth: $-52^{***}$, $-30^{***}$, $-30$, $-14$, $-57^{***}$, $-35^{***}$, $-69^{***}$, $-32^{***}$
- Conflict: $0.04$, $0.03$, $0.14$, $0.09$, $0.04$, $0.04$, $-0.07$, $-0.05$

Total $R^2$: $0.10^{***}$, $0.04^{*}$, $0.14^{***}$, $0.09^{***}$

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Table 3  Linear Regression Analyses Assessing the Associations of Warmth and Conflict with Engagement Variables ($N = 214$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predictor Variable</th>
<th>Global Engagement</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Vigor</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>Enthusiasm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$F_{(2,211)}$

- Warmth: $0.79^{***}$, $0.44^{***}$, $0.84^{***}$, $0.45^{***}$, $0.74^{***}$, $0.36^{***}$, $0.80^{***}$, $0.41^{***}$, $0.76^{***}$, $0.41^{***}$
- Conflict: $0.13$, $0.11$, $0.11$, $0.09$, $0.07$, $0.05$, $0.25^{*}$, $0.19^{*}$, $0.08$, $0.06$

Total $R^2$: $0.17^{***}$, $0.17^{***}$, $0.11^{***}$, $0.13^{***}$, $0.15^{***}$

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$. 
Discussion

The present study concomitantly examined warmth and conflict as antecedents of youth sport parents’ perceptions of burnout and engagement during a single youth sport season. Study results highlight the associations of warmth (but not conflict) with global sport parent burnout and engagement. Additionally, study results showcase dimensional differences (i.e., exhaustion, dedication) in sport parents’ burnout and engagement experiences relative to warmth and conflict. Results provide preliminary evidence that the parent–child sport relationship is salient to parents’ experiences of burnout and engagement and inform research and practice.

Study results provide important insight into the association of parent–children warmth with parental outcomes of sport burnout and engagement. Supporting the first hypothesis, parent–child warmth was highlighted as a significant, negative antecedent of global burnout and a significant, positive antecedent of athlete engagement perceptions in the current sample. These findings are consistent with the broader knowledge base on the positive impact of adaptive parent–child interactions on the psychological health and well-being of parents themselves (Shanahan, McHale, Crouter, & Osgood, 2007; Shanahan, McHale, Osgood, & Crouter, 2007; Trentacosta et al., 2011). Findings are also consistent with the previously established knowledge base on the association of positive social interactions with other sport-based social actors (e.g., social support) to athlete burnout and engagement perceptions (e.g., Cresswell 2009; DeFreese & Smith, 2014; Udry, Gould, Bridges, & Tuffey, 1997). These results substantively contribute to the knowledge base on parent burnout and engagement in sport by providing initial evidence that the warmth with which the parent–child sport relationship is imbued is an important relational contributor to parents’ sport-based psychological outcomes.

Results relative to warmth were similar for dimensional burnout and engagement with the exception of the burnout dimension of emotional and physical exhaustion. Though the association trended in the same positive direction, exhaustion was not found to be significantly associated with parent–child warmth. This is not entirely surprising based on previous burnout research and theory in sport. Specifically, in many cases exhaustion symptoms have been found to be associated differently (or not at all) with key sport-based social antecedents of burnout for athletes (e.g., DeFreese & Smith, 2014). Thus, it is not entirely surprising to see a similar association in a sport parent population. Importantly, we do not think it appropriate to entirely dismiss any potential association of emotional and physical exhaustion with sport-based parent–child warmth. Rather, future studies should attempt to replicate this finding while also considering potential moderating variables (e.g., perceived stress, sport motivation) that may unearth a potentially more complex and/or indirect association of sport parent perceptions of parent–child warmth and sport exhaustion. This represents a potentially fruitful future research direction for sport scientists.

Study findings did not support an association between parent–child conflict and global burnout or engagement in sport. Thus, the second study hypothesis was not supported and parent perceptions of parent–child conflict were not salient social antecedents of either parent burnout or engagement perceptions in sport in the sport parents sampled. This finding was somewhat surprising given the extant parenting and burnout/engagement literatures, both of which suggest conflict may
be associated with less adaptive outcomes for parents in a variety of contexts germane to both parents and children (e.g., Dorsch, Smith, & Dotterer, 2016; Smith, Gustafsson, & Hassmén, 2010). Future research should attempt to replicate this non-significant finding in sport parent samples across a range of developmental levels and using additional markers of negative social interactions in tandem with conflict (e.g., negative social interactions, unwanted or intrusive behaviors). This future work would have important implications to both theory and practice. For example, it could inform the design of interventions that could improve parent–child relationships in the popular family context of organized youth sport, which has potential to catalyze negative social interactions between parents and children beyond the sport environment as well.

Dimensional findings for burnout and engagement were also examined. Overall, the associations of relational variables with burnout and engagement dimensions were similar to global (i.e., aggregate score) findings with the exception of the engagement dimension of dedication. Dedication exhibited a significant, though modest, positive association with sport-based conflict. This finding suggests a potentially curious link between parent–child conflict and parent dedication in youth sport. One potential reason for this association may be that sport parents believe some extent of conflict with their children is a requisite of being an invested and engaged sport parent. Thus, relative to engagement, the parents sampled may not view relational conflict to be entirely maladaptive explaining, to some degree, this positive association. Notably, this finding is somewhat speculative and merits future examination in larger youth sport parent samples to determine if the positive association represents a relatively common experience for youth sport parents. Qualitative research could also be conducted to target parent and child perceptions of the potentially adaptive role of parent–child conflict in sport via interview or focus group methodologies.

Measurement implications of study findings for the psychological constructs of sport parent burnout and engagement also merit discussion. Descriptive statistics, confirmatory factor analyses, and internal consistency reliability scores for both adapted (to sport parents) sport burnout and engagement measures showcased the potential utility of these measures for use in future empirical work. Accordingly, study results provide preliminary evidence that these adapted burnout and engagement measures represent an acceptable (but with room for improvement based on model fit) means to assess these meaningful psychological constructs in youth sport parent populations. Accordingly, future measurement development in this area is needed, as continued measurement adaptations may further aid in the understanding of sport parents’ psychological outcomes as a result of the participation of their children. Specifically, future work in this area would benefit from further validation of burnout and engagement measures within larger and more diverse samples of youth sport parents. We are optimistic, based on the psychometric properties of the measures in the current study, that the present adaptations represent a good launching point for such future work.

Study findings have conceptual implications for the study of sport parent burnout and engagement. Specifically, study results contribute to theoretical understanding of parent–child warmth as a key social antecedent of both sport parent burnout and engagement. Social factors are germane to stress- and motivation-oriented theories, which promote understanding of athlete burnout.
and engagement. Accordingly, parent–child warmth should be considered as a key antecedent within these theories in future studies examining these psychological outcomes for sport parents. Though theory building and testing in this population will involve many future studies, the present study represents a seminal step in categorizing and explaining these burnout and engagement experiences in sport parent populations. Moving forward, researchers should also consider adopting a family theory lens (see Cox & Paley, 2003; Smith & Hamon, 2012) to further understand the impact of the parent–child relationship on the psychosocial outcomes experienced by sport parents via mixed methods designs.

Beyond conceptual implications and future research directives, the present work has implications for practitioners working to improve the youth sporting experiencing for both parents and their children. Study results can be used to inform the continued development of evidence-based programming for sport parents (see Dorsch, Dunn, King, & Osai, 2014). Such efforts, which are designed to offer parents “best practices” in their sport-based interactions with their children, while providing them strategies to improve relationships in the sport setting, have been shown to be effective in youth sport settings (Dorsch, King, Dunn, Osai, & Tulane, 2017). Moving forward, this work could benefit from targeting an increase in parent–child warmth in the sport context as a means to promote parental engagement and deter burnout within youth sport. As research groups have already developed detailed educational programming designed for sport parents, the addition of modules addressing parent engagement and burnout specifically could further enhance the mission of sport psychology practitioners, coaches, and administrators. Cumulatively, well-designed and evaluated parent interventions will aid administrators in creating positive sport environments for parents as well as promoting and maintaining youth sport participation rates along with healthy parental involvement.

Several study limitations warrant consideration and should inform future research efforts. First, study variables assessed the parent–child relationship from only the perspective of the parent; future studies could attempt to triangulate this information by assessing child perceptions of this relationship to better understand if children experience parental child warmth and conflict in the same manner. Accordingly, such work could be couched in a family systems framework, and could maintain a dual focus on both parent and athlete burnout and engagement. Second, as previously discussed, this is an early foray into the measurement of sport parent burnout and engagement. Though current study results suggest these constructs are germane to the sport parent experience, this study was exploratory in nature and researchers should continue to examine the associated reliability, validity and psychometric properties of these psychological constructs within sport parent populations. Third, although data were collected from a national convenience sample of youth sport parents from across the United States, respondents generally represented Caucasian, upper-middle class, suburban, two-parent families. Given that these parents typically have the time and resources to support their children’s youth sport participation (Dorsch et al., 2009), there remains a need to better understand sport parent experiences of burnout and engagement in larger and more diverse samples. Because parent involvement may be influenced by factors such as education, income, cultural expectations, and family structure (Fredricks & Eccles, 2004), future research should be specifically designed to understand the
burnout and engagement experiences of sport parents (and families) in racial and ethnic groups beyond the majority White, non-Hispanic sample of the present study. Finally, replication of study findings within longitudinal research designs with a more equal gender distribution of sport parents will further researchers’ developmental knowledge of relationships among parents’ sport-based social experiences and psychosocial outcomes and allow for important gender comparisons.

Despite these limitations, the current study provides a meaningful contribution to the literature on sport-based burnout and engagement – constructs previously examined primarily in athlete populations – by highlighting relational antecedents of these psychological outcomes in youth sport parents. Specifically, it highlights the importance of warmth in the parent–child sport relationship to both global burnout and engagement perceptions. Cumulatively, this affords greater understanding of how youth sport parents experience burnout and engagement in the context of their relationships with their participating child athletes. This study informs future research and educational interventions targeted toward improving the youth sport experience for both sport parents and their children. Ultimately, further understanding of sport parent burnout and engagement will substantively add to sport and exercise psychology theory and practice.
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