

DIMENSIONS OF THE FIVE-FACTOR PERSONALITY MODEL: IMPLICATION OF COACH BURNOUT IN TRAINING PROCESSES

Miroljub Ivanović¹, Irina Ćosić²

¹ *Serbian Academy of Innovation Sciences, Belgrade, Serbia*

² *Red Star Football Club, Belgrade, Serbia*

Abstract

The aim of this cross-sectional study was to test the predictive intensity of perceived global and socially adaptive basic personality dimensions in predicting the variability of the work burnout construct among sports coaches. The pertinent sample included 282 coaches from Serbian sports clubs (*Age* = 38.15, *SD* = 0.427). Two measuring instruments were applied via the online model: the Big Five Inventory (BFI) and Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT). The tested independent variables of global personality, with adequate standard errors of the β coefficient, explain from 17% to 28% of the total variance of the global personality dimension, while socially adaptive personalities predict from 21% to 30% of the total variability of the burnout syndrome criteria. The partial predictor conscientiousness is a negative determinant of the dependent variable of impaired cognitive functioning. In addition, the factors agreeableness and extraversion are negative determinants of the detachment criterion, extraversion is a negative determinant of the exhaustion criterion, while the predictor conscientiousness is a negative determinant of the construct of impaired cognitive functioning. The obtained scores are a relevant foundation for the operationalization of further research, as well as guidelines for further research and practical implications for coach burnout during training processes.

Keywords: *detachment, extraversion, emotional functioning, exhaustion, cognitive functioning*

INTRODUCTION

Personality dimensions and work burnout (Parental Burnout Assessment, PBA), i.e. sports coaches' exhaustion and their emotional detachment, stand out as relevant social and professional phenomena whose implications are reflected in the work efficiency of the individual and the wider work and social environment. Given the complexity of these phenomena, which in the long term result in a series of harmful consequences at the individual and social level and are generated by the interaction of various intrapersonal and environmental factors, it is important to continuously search for effective strategies for coping with burnout at work, and to create adequate models of prevention of burnout syndrome.

The term *work burnout* as a negative psychological state, which includes a range of symptoms, such as physical fatigue, emotional exhaustion and loss of motivation, was first defined by a clinical psychologist

(Freudenberger, 1974). Burnout is identified with meanings such as: "to empty someone", "to exhaust their physical and spiritual resources", "to wear them out" due to the emphasized effort to realize some unrealistic expectations, personal or set through social values. Subsequently, (Maslach et al., 1997) defines burnout as a multidimensional stress syndrome that includes mental fatigue or emotional exhaustion and negative perceptions and feelings of failure of the individual. According to this model, burnout at work is observed through three components: emotional exhaustion, cynicism or depersonalization, and inhibited personal achievement. The work burnout syndrome contains two components: emotional exhaustion and detachment. Exhaustion is interpreted as an implication of intense cognitive, affective, and physical stress, while detachment implies one's own alienation from work (Downward & Rasciute, 2014).

The working conditions of sports coaches are characteristic and relate to intensive work, lack of resources, time pressure, administrative activities, and difficulties with athletes (Stephanie et al., 2024). The

The contemporary conceptualization of personality and work burnout (Katsatasri et al., 2025) defines an exact theoretical concept, in relation to the dominant model of Maslach and associates, which is based on empirical results. At the same time, current models of personality manifest variations in personality dimensions depending on the context in which the person finds himself (Kuokkanen et al., 2025). The main criticism of the burnout model is that it is based on empirical data rather than theoretical setting (Demerouti & Bakker, 2025). Therefore, researchers (Schaufeli et al., 2020) have defined their own conceptualization of burnout syndrome. They believe that the central dimension of burnout is exhaustion – a pronounced loss of energy, which implies difficulties in the cognitive (difficulties with memory processes, attention and concentration) and emotional functioning of the person (intense emotional reactions, e.g. sadness and anger), as well as their psychological distance from work (intense aversion to work and cynicism). The aforementioned authors analyze burnout as a syndrome, which can be measured as a global construct (mean value on the scale), but it is also possible to explain the result on a partial dimension.

The five-factor model of personality – the “Big Five” includes five fundamental personality dimensions: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience (McCrae & Costa, 1987). According to the results of the study (Sarah, 2025), extraversion includes positive emotionality, sociability and assertiveness. The agreeableness factor is interpreted as a trait determined by a tendency towards altruism, obedience, gentleness and moderation. Conscientiousness is characterized by competence, goal orientation, self-discipline and methodicalness. The neuroticism dimension manifests itself in anxiety, depression, impulsivity and self-consciousness.

In the second decade of the 21st century, there is a current analysis according to which personality dimensions are differentially manifested, depending on the context in which a person exists (Riaz & Shah, 2025). According to research (Ensenberg-Diamant et al., 2025), socially adaptable personality may have a more intense predictive influence on burnout than global personality.

findings obtained in this study are primarily based on the assumption of personality as a stable construct in different spheres of functioning (Church et al., 2008).

However, in the context of sports coaching, the function of socially adaptable personality is largely unexplored.

The five-factor personality model has been shown to be predictive of burnout outcomes (Wong et al., 2025). Results of meta-analytic studies indicate a negative bivariate correlation of conscientiousness, openness, extraversion, and openness to experience with burnout, and a positive interaction of neuroticism with burnout (Rebecca & Collie, 2025). The aforementioned authors found a positive correlation between neuroticism and all three dimensions of teacher burnout (emotional exhaustion, depersonalization, and decreased personal achievement) as well as a negative correlation of extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness with all three dimensions of burnout (with the exception of a zero correlation between openness to experience and emotional exhaustion).

The results of previous research show that the dimensions: extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness to experience are supportive personality traits in burnout syndrome, while the dimension neuroticism increases the risk of this syndrome. The author (Fellers, 2025) points out that the protective effect of the extraversion trait is manifested in the fact that highly extraverted athletes perceive the work environment as more positive, and are exposed to significant social correlations through which they receive protection. In addition, coaches who are high on the agreeableness factor show better relationships with athletes due to the manifested interpersonal closeness and warmth. At the same time, they are more conscientious, more defensive and more organized, which is why they can actively transform the work environment and adapt more easily to training tasks. Coaches who achieve higher scores on the trait of openness to experience tend to perceive the difficulties they encounter in training with athletes as an opportunity for personal development. However, coaches who achieve higher scores on the neuroticism dimension tend to perceive anxiety and depression, which intensifies their emotional reactions to the negative feelings they are exposed to.

Given the fact that most previous studies on the relationship between basic personality dimensions and burnout at work have been tested in the teaching

population, and that the contribution of personality constructs in the interpretation of burnout syndrome in sports coaches is relatively unexplored, there is a real need to conduct research based on the current conceptualization of burnout in coaches who are involved in training athletes. Therefore, the aim of this research was to test the function of the dimensions of perceived global and socially adaptive personality in predicting the psychological burnout syndrome of coaches when training athletes. In accordance with theoretical concepts, previous findings and the aim of the research, three alternative hypotheses were defined: It is expected that the predictor variables (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness) are negative determinants of the criterion - coach burnout (H_1), It is assumed that the factor negative emotionality is a positive determinant of coach burnout at work (H_2), The predictive contribution of socially adaptable personality in interpreting the variability of the coach burnout construct is expected to be greater than the influence of the global level of personality (H_3).

METHODOLOGY

Participants and procedures

This cross-sectional study was conducted on a pertinent sample ($N = 282$) of participants from the Kolubara and Mačva districts. Coaches from different sports clubs in Valjevo, Šabac, Loznica and Ub were tested. The average age of the participants was 38.15 ± 0.42 years, with the age range ranging from 20 to 65 years. The criterion for selecting coaches was a minimum of three years of active work experience in a sports club, different competitive levels (top – professional athlete; average – standard athlete; recreational athlete). Sports coaches provided basic socio-demographic data (age, education, years of work experience and weekly training hours).

Data were collected in July 2025 through social networks (*Instagram, Facebook, LinkedIn groups and WhatsApp groups*), online digital platforms (*Lime Survey & Google Forms models*), which allows automatic organization, reducing the time required for analysis. Communication with participants was enabled by providing the author's e-mail. At the beginning of the research, participants were given a brief explanation of how to respond, and told they could opt out of the anonymous survey at any time without any consequences. The completed online questionnaires could not be correlated with the identity of the participants who filled them out, because instead of their names and e-mail addresses, they entered their

passwords using all available characters. Filling out the measuring instruments took between 15 and 20 minutes. The research was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Serbian Academy of Innovation Sciences in Belgrade.

Measuring instruments

The Big Five Inventory (BFI)

The BFI (Big Five Inventory – Short Form; Soto & John, 2017) questionnaire consists of 30 items of the “Big Five” personality dimensions, each with six statements, which globally examine: *extraversion* (“In life in general, I see myself as a person who is dominant, I behave like a leader”), *agreeableness* (“In life in general, I see myself as a person who is compassionate, has a good heart”), *conscientiousness* (“In life in general, I see myself as a person who is reliable, can be relied on”), *negative emotionality* (“In life in general, I see myself as a person who worries a lot”) and *openness* (“In life in general, I see myself as a person who is fascinated by art, music or literature”). Participants assess the level of agreement with each individual item on a Likert-type scale from 1 to 5 (1 = *I strongly disagree*, 5 = *I strongly agree*). The internal consistency coefficients of the Cronbach alpha dimensions on the five subscales of the examined sample are satisfactory and amount to: $\alpha_{extraversion} = 0.75$, $\alpha_{agreeableness} = 0.78$, $\alpha_{conscientiousness} = 0.76$, $\alpha_{negative\ emotionality} = 0.77$, $\alpha_{openness} = 0.73$.

The same questionnaire was used to examine the dimensions of socially adaptable personality as for measuring global personality, but with a changed reference point for each statement, in such a way that the evaluation includes the context of working with athletes: *extraversion* (“I see myself as a person who is dominant in working with athletes, behaves like a leader”), *agreeableness* (“I see myself as a person who is compassionate towards athletes, has a good heart”), *conscientiousness* (“I see myself as a person who is reliable, who athletes can count on”), *negative emotionality* (“I see myself as a person who cares a lot in working with athletes”) and *openness* (“I perceive myself as a person who is fascinated by art, music or literature in working with athletes”). Participants assess the degree of agreement with each individual item on a Likert-type scale from 1 (*I completely disagree*) to 5 (*I completely agree*). The results on individual subscales are formed as arithmetic means of assessments on the corresponding items. The obtained internal Cronbach alpha reliability coefficients of the individual dimensions are acceptable: $\alpha_{extraversion} = 0.72$, $\alpha_{agreeableness}$

= 0.76, $\alpha_{\text{conscientiousness}} = 0.85$, $\alpha_{\text{negative emotionality}} = 0.74$, $\alpha_{\text{openness}} = 0.73$.

Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT)

The BAT (Burnout Assessment Tool; Tomas et al., 2023) questionnaire is constructed from complex social relations, and includes personal perceptions of self and others through these relations. It consists of 12 items that, with 3 items each, examine four aspects of work burnout: exhaustion ("I feel mentally exhausted at my job"), mental distance ("I have difficulty finding any enthusiasm for work"), cognitive disturbances ("I have difficulty maintaining concentration at work"), and emotional functioning disorders ("I have difficulty controlling my emotions at work").

Burnout syndrome has a hierarchical structure, so the results can be interpreted according to individual dimensions or factors. The *exhaustion* dimension is defined as an excessive loss of energy that manifests itself physically and psychologically through fatigue, a feeling of weakness, a feeling of mental exhaustion and tiredness, with symptoms: lack of energy to start work, feeling exhausted after a working day, getting tired quickly and unable to relax after work. *Mental distance* implies the need for a person to mentally distance themselves from work due to an intense aversion to work. For example: a person who is mentally distanced avoids thinking about work, colleagues and everything that associates them with work. This aspect of burnout syndrome is usually manifested by an indifference and cynical attitude towards work, a deficit or lack of enthusiasm and interest in work, which is why the person usually functions mechanically at work. The *cognitive disorders* dimension refers to difficulties with memory, concentration and reduced cognitive abilities. Its symptoms are: inhibited clear thinking and learning, mental absence and indecision. The *emotional disturbance* component refers to intense emotional reactions and an overwhelming sense of emotion when

thinking about work. Characteristic symptoms include frustration, irritability, exaggerated startle response, and inability to control emotions.

Participants assess their level of agreement with each item on a Likert-type scale from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*). The result on the measuring instrument represents the average score of responses on all items, with a higher score indicating a higher degree of burnout. The internal reliability of the individual dimensions ranges from acceptable to satisfactory: $\alpha_{\text{exhaustion}} = 0.82$, $\alpha_{\text{detachment}} = 0.76$, $\alpha_{\text{impaired cognitive functioning}} = 0.77$, $\alpha_{\text{impaired emotional functioning}} = 0.60$.

Statistical data processing

First, descriptive parameters of central tendency were calculated. Then, the following parameters were taken as measures of model fit to the data: CFI (Comparative Fit Index), TLI (Tucker-Lewis Index), RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error of Approximation) and SRMR (Standardized Root Mean Square Residual). In accordance with the criteria (Hu & Bentler, 1999), CFI and TLI values above 0.90, i.e. 0.95, suggest satisfactory values, i.e. excellent, model fit to the data, while the target values for RMSEA are below 0.06, i.e. below 0.08 for SRMR. After that, bivariate correlations were calculated between the total scores on the dimensions of global and socially adaptable personality and burnout syndrome. Finally, regression analyses were conducted to examine the predictive influence of the dimensions of global and socially adaptable personality on individual dimensions of coaching burnout.

RESULTS

The basic descriptive indicators of global and socially adaptive basic personality dimensions, as well as burnout dimensions in athletes' training, are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive parameters of variables of socially adaptive personality and coach burnout

Variables	<i>Mgl</i>	<i>SDgl</i>	<i>Sk</i>	<i>Ku</i>	<i>Mkont</i>	<i>SDkont</i>
Extraversion	3.49	0.60	0.14	0.96	4.12	0.52
Agreeableness	4.02	0.47	0.92	0.15	4.44	0.46
Conscientiousness	4.10	0.55	0.34	0.83	4.56	0.63
Openness	2.68	0.54	0.26	0.26	2.05	0.36
Isrpljenost	2.69	0.68	0.89	0.77		
Distanciranost	1.95	0.73	0.47	0.38		
Impaired cognitive functioning	1.76	0.49	0.75	0.56		

Impaired emotional functioning	1.62	0.36	0.60	0.62		
--------------------------------	------	------	------	------	--	--

Annotation. gl = global; soc. ad. = socially adaptable; *M* = arithmetic mean; *SD* = standard deviation; *Sk* – skewness; *Ku* – kurtosis; Standard error value (*SE*) of indicator *Sk* is 0.14, and of *Ku* is 0.23.

Based on the empirically calculated arithmetic means in the descriptive matrix, it is observed that the participants achieve slightly higher results on the contextualized personality variables for the dimensions of extraversion, conscientiousness and agreeableness, in comparison with the dimensions of global personality. At the same time, lower estimates of the kid variable of socially adaptive negative emotionality are observed in relation to global negative emotionality. When analyzing the dimensions of the perception of

burnout at work, it is observed that the participants direct the maximum assessment to the dimension of exhaustion, and the minimum to the dimension of impaired emotional functioning. This trend of scores is consistent with the findings in the study (Gradiski et al., 2025).

The fit index values of the socially adaptive personality model are shown in Table 2

Table 2. *Socially adaptive personality fit indices to data*

Variables	$\chi^2(df)$	CFI	TLI	RMSEA	SRMR
Extraversion	15.013 (8)	0.95	0.97	0.05	0.02
Agreeableness	18.24 (8)	0.92	0.93	0.01	0.07
Conscientiousness	17.45 (8)	0.96	0.95	0.03	0.05
Negative emotionality	30.13 (8)	0.93	0.94	0.04	0.03
Openness	43.05 (8)	0.94	0.06	0.02	0.02

Legend. $\chi^2(df)$ = Chi-square test of independence and degrees of freedom; CFI = Bentler's Comparative Fit Index; TLI = Tucker-Lewis Index; RMSEA = Absolute agreement index; SRMR = Standard root mean squared residuals.

According to the authors (Cheungi et al., 2023), the obtained fit indices of the socially adaptive personality model to the data for most dimensions, except for the openness dimension, are within acceptable limits (CFI & TLI ≥ 0.90 , RMSEA ≤ 0.06 , SRMR ≤ 0.08).

Bivariate correlations between global and socially adaptive basic personality dimensions of coaches are shown in Table 3.

Table 3. *Pearson correlation coefficients between global and contextualized personality*

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Extraversion -gl.	–									
2. Agreeableness-gl.	0.10	–								
3. Conscientiousness-gl.	0.17*	0.47**	–							
4. Negative emotionality-gl.	-0.48	-0.19*	-0.36**	–						
5. Openness -gl.	0.15*	0.03	0.01	0.02	–					
6. Extraversion-soc. ad.	0.53**	0.30**	0.32**	-0.16*	0.10	–				
7. Agreeableness-druš. pril.	0.64**	0.69**	0.40**	-0.25**	-0.04	0.41**	–			

8. Conscientiousness- soc. ad.	0.09	0.46**	0.66**	-0.19	-0.05	0.44**	0.50**	–		
9. Negative emotionality- soc. ad.	-0.50**	-0.12	0.32**	0.56**	0.05	0.17*	-0.28**	-0.29**	–	
10. Openness- soc. ad.	0.20*	0.26**	0.08	0.03	0.68**	0.38**	0.19*	0.19*	0.01	–

Annotation. ** $p \leq 0,01$; * $p \leq 0,05$; gl.= global; soc. ad.= socially adaptable.

The most intense statistically significant interaction between the dimensions of global personality was manifested between the perceived variables of extraversion and negative emotionality ($r = -0.50$, $p \leq 0.01$), while in the case of socially adaptive personality, conscientiousness and agreeableness were most intensely correlated ($r = 0.47$, $p \leq 0.01$). The co-dependence between the corresponding personality dimensions ranges from $r = 0.53$ (global extraversion -

socially adaptive extraversion; $p \leq 0.01$) to $r = 0.64$, (global agreeableness - socially adaptive agreeableness; $p \leq 0.01$).

Bivariate correlations between basic personality dimensions, coach burnout, and sociodemographic variables are found in Table 4.

Table 4. Pearson correlation coefficients between dimensions of work burnout and socio-demographic variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Exhaustion	–					
2. Detachment	0.54**	–				
3. Impaired emotional functioning	0.18*	0.35**	–			
4. Impaired cognitive functioning	0.46**	0.52**	0.29**	–		
5. Years of working	0.05	0.10	0.01	0.03	–	
6. Hourly rate	-0,06	-0.08	0.04	-0.02	-0.10	–

Annotation. ** $p \leq 0,01$; * $p \leq 0,05$; gl.= global; soc. ad.= contextualized.

The observed statistically significant correlations between the dimensions of burnout at work are of low and moderate intensity, ranging from $r = 0.18$ (detachment-impaired emotional functioning) to $r = 0.54$ (detachment-exhaustion; $p \leq 0.01$). Sociodemographic variables (years of working and weekly hours of training) were not statistically

significantly correlated with the dimensions of burnout at work.

The results of the regression analyses are shown in Table 5 and Table 6. Eight regression analyses were conducted, two for each dimension of work burnout.

Table 5. Results of regression analysis for burnout syndrome with global personality predictors

Varijable	Exhaustion	Detachment	Impaired cognitive functioning	Impaired emotional functioning
Extraversion -gl.	-0.19*			
Agreeableness-g.	-0.18*	0.27**	0.30*	0.20*
Conscientiousness-gl.	0.08	0.25	-0.19*	-0.24**
Negative emotionality-gl	0.33*	0.27**	0.17*	0.05
R ²	0.32	0.26	0.16	0.17

Annotation. ** $p \leq 0.01$; * $p \leq 0.05$; gl-global; the values in the matrix cells imply standard regression coefficients (β).

In the first regression analysis (Table 5), the predictors are the basic dimensions of global personality that are statistically significantly correlated with the criterion at the bivariate level, and in the second regression in the Table, the dimensions of socially adaptive personality are analyzed. Perceived dimensions of global personality explain from 16% (impaired cognitive functioning) to 32% (exhaustion) of the total variance in the dimensions of coach burnout when training athletes. In addition, the predictor variable agreeableness is a negative, and negative emotionality is a positive predictor of exhaustion, detachment and impaired emotional functioning, detachment and negative emotionality.

The observed effect sizes for *agreeableness* range from $\beta = -0.18$ (exhaustion, $p \leq 0.05$) to $\beta = -0.27$ (detachment, $p \leq 0.01$), i.e. from $\beta = 0.30$ (impaired emotional functioning, $p \leq 0.01$) to $\beta = 0.33$ (detachment, $p \leq 0.01$) for negative emotionality. Additionally, the variable conscientiousness is a negative determinant of impaired cognitive functioning ($\beta = -0.19$, $p \leq 0.01$).

The predictor variables of socially adaptive personality in Table 6 explain from 16% (detachment) to 30% (impaired cognitive functioning) of the variability in the dimensions of burnout at work. The independent variable agreeableness is a negative, and negative emotionality a positive predictor of the criteria of exhaustion and impaired emotional functioning.

Table 6. Results of regression analysis for work burnout with predictors of socially adaptable personality

Variables	Exhaustion	Detachment	Impaired cognitive functioning	Impaired emotional functioning
Extraversion-soc. ad.	0.17*	0.17*	0.03	0.10
Agreeableness-soc. ad.	-0.19*	-0.30**	-0.40**	-0.09
Conscientiousness-soc. ad.	0.10	0.05	- 0.19*	0.29**
Negative emotionality-soc.ad.	0.30**	0.03	0.29**	0.14*
Openness-soc. ad.				
R ²	0.21	0.16	0.25	0.30

Annotation. ** $p \leq 0.01$; * $p \leq 0.05$; soc. ad. - socially adaptable; the values in the matrix cells imply standard regression coefficients (β).

The observed values of the influence of the predictor agreeableness vary in the range from $\beta = -0.18$ (exhaustion) to -0.40 (impaired emotional functioning), i.e. from $\beta = 0.30$ (exhaustion) to $\beta = 0.32$ for impaired emotional functioning for negative emotionality. In addition, the partial variables agreeableness ($\beta = -0.19$, $p \leq 0.05$) and extraversion ($\beta = -0.17$, $p \leq 0.05$) are negative determinants of the detachment criterion, the extraversion dimension is a negative predictor of exhaustion ($\beta = -0.17$, $p \leq 0.05$), while the perception of conscientiousness is a negative predictor of impaired cognitive functioning ($\beta = -0.29$, $p \leq 0.01$).

Based on the results of the multiple regression analysis, it is concluded that the tested alternative hypotheses are partially confirmed: H₁ – It is expected that the predictor variables (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness and openness) are negative

determinants of coach burnout when training athletes. H₂ – It is assumed that the factor negative emotionality is a positive determinant of coach burnout at work. H₃ – It is expected that the predictive contribution of socially adaptable personality in the interpretation of the variability of the coach burnout construct is greater than the influence of global personality.

DISCUSSION

The aim of the research was to test the predictive influence of global and socially adaptive basic personality dimensions on the components of burnout in coaches.

The co-dependence between the corresponding personality dimensions is relatively high, not exceeding 0.80, and is consistent with previous results (Lee & Chelladurai, 2018), providing additional support for the

expectation that global and socially adaptive personality manifest different variability (Corr et al., 2023; Swinney et al., 2025). Further support for the distinction between global and socially adaptive personality is provided by the findings of regressions, based on which global and socially adaptive personality models show relevant and, in certain circumstances, slightly different predictive influence.

Research into the interaction relations of the Big Five personality factors in explaining burnout in sports coaches during training processes has yielded inconsistent results. The results of the study (Cahyono et al., 2023) suggest that the predictor variables coach emotional functioning, emotional exhaustion, and impaired emotional functioning are determinants of burnout in sports coaches. Significant determinants of exhaustion and impaired emotional functioning were manifested by global and socially adaptive agreeableness (negative determinant), i.e. global and socially adaptive negative emotionality (positive determinant). The aforementioned results suggest that sports coaches who achieve higher scores on the agreeableness dimension show more trust in athletes, have greater empathy for them, and show a higher level of understanding for them, even when their behavior in training deviates from the ideal. Such dimensions are coordinated with the demands of the coaching profession, which requires understanding and support for athletes, and their personality traits represent a personal resource that protects them from burnout in training. However, coaches who achieve a higher score on the predictor of negative emotionality more often perceive negative emotions, which makes them more prone to the impact of burnout syndrome (Rebbouh et al., 2025). In addition, both models predict an approximate percentage of the variability of burnout, which indicates that the dimensions of agreeableness and negative emotionality, manifested by coaches, contribute to the generator of burnout and their emotional functioning while training athletes. On the other hand, an additional negative determinant of exhaustion and socially adaptive extraversion, but not global extraversion, are relevant predictors of the criteria of the coaching syndrome. The supporting function of socially adaptive agreeableness and extraversion is also manifested in the psychological variable of detachment, where in the global personality model significant determinants of burnout in training are negative agreeableness and positive emotionality. Since the dimensions of extraversion and agreeableness are positively correlated with the use of the “deep concept” strategy of emotional regulation, which

assumes the attempt of trainers to perceive the emotions expected of them during training processes, and that this strategy is the director of their interaction with organizational behavior (Cahyono et al., 2023). Therefore, it is possible that trainers with a higher degree of extraversion and agreeableness are more socially adaptive due to more efficient emotional regulation and minimal exhaustion, manifesting a lower level of spiritual detachment from training. In addition, according to the findings with the variable of impaired cognitive functioning, in both regression models, it is most clearly interpreted by the dimension of conscientiousness (negative correlation), but the predictive influence of the second model – contextualized personality – is somewhat higher (30 % versus 17% of the proportion of interpreted variability). Higher levels of the conscientiousness dimension have also been shown in previous studies to be a defensive factor in cognitive functioning difficulties, which is explained by the planning and reasoning characteristics that are specific to people with high levels of conscientiousness (Çelik, 2025).

The research findings have somewhat confirmed the tested alternative hypotheses, and have been interpreted in light of previous research, theoretical models, and methodological limitations of this correlation-regression study.

Finally, it should be emphasized that this is an initial study in which global personality and socially adaptive personality were tested on a sample of Serbian sports coaches. Therefore, the defined findings cannot be compared with the results of identical research on the relations between the aforementioned phenomena. However, this indicates that further research is necessary to examine the compactness of the defined results.

The conducted empirical study, with a cross-sectional design, is characterized by several *methodological limitations*, which should be analyzed when interpreting the obtained results and their application. First, the pertinent sample of participants is not representative of the entire coaching population, because it included only male participants in a limited geographical area in two administrative districts, and therefore the results cannot be generalized to all regions of Serbia. Second, the shortcoming is based on the available sample using the online data collection method, where all coaches do not have Facebook accounts and are not included in social groups. Third, due to the used method of self-perception of variables, socially desirable answers are possible, and there is a

problem that participants biasedly show the examined domains below the real level or exaggerated in order to minimize or emphasize them more, which due to non-objective perception can cause errors in the collected data, reduction of variance and correlation size, and problems in the perception of their own behavior. Then, the obtained correlations of predictors with the criterion in this study are low, so the final regression model explains a relatively minimal proportion of the variance of coach burnout in training athletes. Since the research was conducted at a single point in time, it is not possible to follow the transformations of the predictive influence of personality dimensions on coach burnout. Definitely, since the study is of correlational design, inverse relations between the examined variables are also assumed, which does not allow drawing conclusions about the causal-consequential relations of the global and socially adaptive “Big Five” personality dimensions in predicting the variability of the burnout construct during training processes in the population of sports coaches.

Despite the aforementioned methodological limitations, the results of this study have certain theoretical and practical implications, as well as information useful for practical application, especially since no research has been conducted in the Serbian-speaking area that has included all of the aforementioned predictors and coaching burnout. The scientific contribution of the work is manifested in the systematization of previous research, the construction of a regression model that provides an adequate framework for interpreting the five-factor model of basic personality “Big Five” in the coaching context of burnout. In the context of practical implications, the work enables the creation of customized interventions and prevention programs with the aim of educating coaches about the positive aspects of certain personality dimensions, to eliminate the difficulties that coaches encounter when improving the impact on coaching burnout during the training of athletes. It can also serve as a relevant starting point for the operationalization of future research that will attempt to address the aforementioned methodological challenges and further deepen the understanding of this topic in a preventive, therapeutic or supervisory context.

Given the relatively large segment of the unexplained proportion of the criterion variance, future studies,

with a longitudinal design with a minimum of three measuring points, and a larger number of participants, but also of female gender, should include valid predictor variables, e.g. perceived quality of social support, type of interventions implemented by coaches, and their attitudes towards them, other personality dimensions, locus of control, and more objective measures (interview, perception of interactions and behavior of coaches in natural conditions or statements of their family members). Such research enables understanding and generalization of the long-term effects of personality traits of the “Big Five” model in predicting burnout in the coaching population in multiple cultures. However, conclusions based on the findings obtained in a cross-sectional research design should be approached with caution, given that the instruments used in this study are applied to the Serbian population for the first time.

CONCLUSION

The conducted cross-sectional study is one of the few in which the global and socially adaptive basic dimensions of the personality of sports coaches were tested. Based on the conducted analyses, it is concluded that the measuring constructs used have satisfactory internal consistency and validity, and some guidelines for their use in future research are suggested. The main empirical findings indicate that the predictor variables (socially adaptive and global personality) statistically significantly explain the construct of coach burnout in training processes with individual dimensions, where their partial influence is to a certain extent heterogeneous, e.g. the regression model of socially adaptive personality interprets 13% more proportion of the variability of the factor of impaired cognitive functioning than the global personality model. On the other hand, adaptation of the predictor of socially adaptive personality is necessary, so that the content of the items is more significant for the training context of the coach, and so that the degree of correlation of the constructs of global and socially adaptive personality is lower than in the tested sports sample. This would enable the operationalization of multivariate analyses (e.g. hierarchical regression analysis) based on which it would be more likely to conclude about the inconsistent influence of socially adaptive personality dimensions on the perception of burnout syndrome in the sports coaching population.

REFERENCES

1. Cahyono, T., Hartono, F. V., Gani, R. A., Ahmedov, F., & Sliz, M. (2023). Coach leadership style, coach-athlete relationships, and engagement in team sports: the mediating role of athlete burnout. *J. Rev. Iberoamericana Psicol. Ejercicio Deporte*, 18, 687–692.
2. Çelik, D, O. (2025). Emotional Intelligence and Psychological Well-Being of Turkish Physical Education and Sports Athlete–Students: The Mediating Roles of Self-Efficacy and Burnout. *Behavioral Sciences*, 15(3), 314. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15030314>
3. Cheung, G.W., Cooper-Thomas, H.D., Lau, R.S., & Wang, L.C. (2023). Reporting reliability, convergent and discriminant validity with structural equation modeling: A review and best-practice recommendations. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-023-09871-y>
4. Corr, C., Atwater, C., & Stokowski, S. (2023). Ageism in recruiting: Examining the relationship between coaches' age and recruiting ability in Power-5 football. *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics Annual*, 38, 95–109.
5. Demerouti, E., & Bakker, A. B. (2025). *Revitalising burnout research*. *Work & Stress*, 39(2), 153–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2025.2473385>
6. Downward, P., & Rasciute, S. (2014). Does sport make you happy? An analysis of the well-being derived from sports participation. *International review of applied economics*, 25(3), 331–348.
7. Ensenberg-Diamant, N., Hassin, R. R., & Aviezer, H. (2025). Profound individual differences in contextualized emotion perception. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 154(5), 1236–1249. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0001692>
8. Fellers, M. L. (2025). *Examining Predictors of Athlete Burnout: A Multimodal Theoretical Approach*. (Master's thesis, Marietta College). OhioLINK Electronic Theses and Dissertations Center. http://rave.ohiolink.edu/etdc/view?acc_num=marietta1747826960948773
9. Freudenberger, H. J. (1974). Staff burnout. *Journal of Social Issues*, 30, 159–165.
10. Gradiski, I.P., Borovecki, A., Curkovic, M., García-Gómez, E., Delgado Bolton, R. C. & Vivanco, L. (2025). Factors Influencing Burnout in Croatian Medical Students: The roles of Lifelong Learning and Loneliness. *Perspectives on Medical Education's*, 14(1), 274–285. <https://doi.org/10.5334/pme.1468>
11. Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
12. Kuokkanen, J., Saarinen, M., D. J. Phipps, Korhonen, J., & Jan-Erik, R. (2025). RomarUnveiling the longitudinal reciprocal relationship between burnout and engagement among adolescent athletes in sport schools. *Journal of Adolescence*, 97, 383–394. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jad.12426>
13. Lee, Y. P., & Chelladurai, P. (2018). Emotional intelligence, emotional labor, coach burnout, job satisfaction, and turnover intention in sport leadership. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 18(4), 393–412. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2017.1406971>
14. Maslach, C., Jackson, S. E. & Leiter, M. P. (1997). Maslach Burnout Inventory: Third edition. U C. P. Zalaquett i R. J. Wood (Ur.), *Evaluating stress: A book of resources* (str. 191–218). Scarecrow Education.
15. McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1987). Validation of the five-factor model of personality across instruments and observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(1), 81–90. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.81>

16. Rebecca J., & Collie, R. (2025). Teachers' perceived social-emotional competence: a personal resource linked with well-being and turnover intentions. *Educational Psychology*, 45(3), 257–274. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01443410.2025.2466652>
17. Rebbouh, A., Necir, A., & Kenioua, M. (2025). Measuring certain personality traits of physical education teachers and their relationship to occupational stress. *Geosport for Society*, 22(1), 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.30892/gss.2204-129>
18. Riaz, S., & Shah, M. (2025). The Impact of Neuroticism and Extraversion on Deviant Workplace Behavior: The Mediating Role of Bootlegging. *Journal Of Psychology, Health And Social Challenges*, 3(1), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.63075/h8ryz306>
19. Sarah, A. D. (2025). Kecanduan internet pada remaja: peran extraversion dan fear of missing out. *Paedagogy: Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Dan Psikologi*, 5(1), 125–135. <https://doi.org/10.51878/paedagogy.v5i1.4762>
20. Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). Short and extra-short forms of the Big Five Inventory–2: The BFI-2-S and BFI-2-XS. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 68, 69–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.02.004>
21. Swinney, D., Corr, C., Stokowski, S., & Godfrey, M. (2025). Athletic ability, performance, and character: A hierarchical examination of prospective college athlete evaluation and the function of recruiting as institutional work. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, 18(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.17161/jis.v18i1.21731>
22. Tomas, J., Maslić Seršić, D., Mikac, U., Rebernjak, B., Buško, V., & De Witte, H. (2023.). Validation of the Croatian version of the short form of the Burnout Assessment Tool: Findings from a nationally representative sample. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 32(1), 40–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijsa.12447>
23. Wong C., Mohd Sani, R. M., Rahim, L. N. H., & Sor. J. B. (2025). Overtraining and burnout in young tennis athletes: implication for sports coaches. *Malaysian Journal of Sport Science and Recreation*, 21(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.24191/mjssr.v21i1.5662>