Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology
2018, Vol. 7, No. 4, 333–341

© 2018 American Psychological Association
2157-3905/18/$12.00 http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spy0000118

TARGET ARTICLE

Resilience in Sports From a Dynamical Perspective

Yannick Hill, Ruud J. R. Den Hartigh, Rob R. Meijer, Peter De Jonge, and Nico W. Van Yperen
University of Groningen

On the road to excellence, it is essential to develop resilience, that is, to be able to positively adapt within the context of significant adversity. Researchers tend to agree that resilience is a complex process with a multitude of underlying variables. To stimulate research on the process of resilience, we propose the dynamical system approach that provides a theoretical perspective on mapping out and understanding how resilience unfolds over time. Furthermore, we will demonstrate how the findings of previous research on resilience in sports fit with several dynamical properties, including complexity, iterativity, and the formation of attractor states. New findings on the dynamic properties of resilience will result in in-depth knowledge about, and in the understanding of, the process of how individuals adapt to adverse events. Practitioners might benefit from this approach by being able to detect early warning signals of critical transitions (e.g., critical slowing down) and take preventive actions before breakdowns in performance occur.

Keywords: adversity, complexity, critical slowing down, dynamical systems, psychological momentum

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers.
This article is intended solely for the personal use of the individual user and is not to be disseminated broadly.

On the road to excellent performance, athletes unavoidably encounter stressful events, which they have to overcome to become successful. These events can be either sports-related or nonsports-related and range from short time scales (e.g., losing a point in a match) to long time scales (e.g., a serious injury or parental divorce; Fletcher & Hanton, 2003; Gould, Finch, & Jackson, 1993; Rees et al., 2016; Sarkar & Fletcher, 2014). In the sports literature, the process of positive adaptation within the context of significant adversity is defined as *resilience* (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012, 2013; Galli & Gonzalez, 2015). A definition of resilience that is commonly used in sports emphasizes "the role of mental processes and behavior in promoting personal assets and protecting an individual from the potential effect of negative stressors" (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012, p. 675; 2013, p. 16). This definition acknowledges both the underlying trait-like protective factors and (mental) processes, which define how one adapts to adversity (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012, 2013). In addition, the speed of the resilience process can vary across different setbacks and people over time (Carver, 1998; Egeland, Carlson, & Sroufe, 1993; Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012). Although resilience in sports and in other contexts, such as the organizational and personal domain, is generally considered as a process (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012), there are few studies in sports on the characteristics of the resilience process. Sports researchers have primarily focused on identifying protective factors, such as personality traits and psychosocial variables, to explain individual differences in resilience (Sarkar & Fletcher, 2014).

In line with the view that resilience is a complex process (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012; Galli & Vealey, 2008), we draw upon the dynamical systems approach (Kelso, 1995; Nowak & Vallacher, 1998; Van Geert, 2009), which provides tools that allow researchers to capture the properties of the resilience process. A dynamical system can be defined as a set of elements, which are in constant

This article was published Online First January 22, 2018.
Yannick Hill, Ruud J. R. Den Hartigh, Rob R. Meijer, Peter De Jonge, and Nico W. Van Yperen, Department of Psychology, University of Groningen.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Yannick Hill, Department of Psychology, University of Groningen, Grote Kruisstraat 2/1, 9712TS Groningen, the Netherlands. E-mail: y.hill@rug.nl

dynamic interactions and undergo change over time (Kelso, 1995; Nowak & Vallacher, 1998; Vallacher & Nowak, 1997; Van Geert, 1994). In the next section, we will demonstrate how the findings of previous research on resilience in sports provide a logical fit with several dynamical properties, including complexity, iterativity, and the formation of attractor states.

The Complexity of Resilience

The property of complexity entails that the explanation of a system state cannot be reduced to its constituent elements. In other words, the system is *interaction dominant*, meaning that the state of the system emerges through dynamic interactions between multiple components (Den Hartigh, Cox, & Van Geert, 2017; Van Orden, Holden, & Turvey, 2003). In terms of resilience, this would entail that a state of resilience develops through an interaction between various factors (cf. Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012; Galli & Vealey, 2008) and cannot be reduced to specific contributions of isolated explanatory components. Indications for the complexity of resilience can be derived from studies focusing on protective factors, that is, the resources protecting an individual from setbacks or helping in responding positively to adverse events. In these studies, a large number of variables have been identified that protect athletes or help them to be resilient, such as perceived social support, positive personality, motivation, confidence, and focus (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012; Sarkar & Fletcher, 2014). For example, a sport-specific study of psychosocial determinants found that swimmers who recovered from a negative performance differed from swimmers who failed to recover from a setback in perceived level of endurance, coping styles, self-concept, and social support (Mummery, Schofield, & Perry, 2004).

However, so far, no single factor or set of factors has been identified to give rise to resilience across contexts, settings, or individuals (Galli & Gonzalez, 2015; Rutter, 1981). For some variables, even opposite effects have been found. For example, although Fletcher and Sarkar (2012) found that high levels of perceived social support were positively related to resilience, Mummery and colleagues (2004) observed that resilient athletes demonstrated lower levels of perceived social support than their nonresilient counterparts.

Another indication for the complexity of the resilience process comes from the presumption that resilience is determined by the person–environment interaction (Egeland et al., 1993). Different situational demands may require different processes and facilitative responses from athletes to adapt well to a given situation (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012). For example, responses that promote positive adaptation to personal stressors (i.e., stressors related to the nonsporting, personal-life domain) might not be applicable to competitive stressors (i.e., stressors directly related to the competitive performance context) and vice versa (Sarkar & Fletcher, 2014). Therefore, scholars concluded that resilience is strongly coupled to the situational demands of the adverse event (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013; Rutter, 1981). In other words, resilience is a function of person- and environment-related explanatory variables among which complex interactions likely exist (Egeland et al., 1993; Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012, 2013, 2016; Galli & Vealey, 2008; Luthar, Cicchetti, & Becker, 2000). Indeed, sports researchers tend to agree that resilience is a complex process with a multitude of underlying variables rather than a component-driven ability. It seems to be a process that emerges from the constant interactions of the various components within the person and the environment over time (cf. Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013; Sarkar, Fletcher, & Brown, 2015).

The Iterativity of Resilience

The property of iterativity implies that a given state of the system develops out of the system's previous state and hence that any future state depends on the system's history of preceding states (Den Hartigh, Van Dijk, Steenbeek, & Van Geert, 2016; Gernigon, Vallacher, Nowak, & Conroy, 2015; Nowak & Vallacher, 1998; Vallacher, Van Geert, & Nowak, 2015; Van Geert, 1991). Therefore, a given variable can act as an effect in one moment and as a cause in the next (Vallacher & Nowak, 1997). Translated to resilience, the complex interactions among the protective factors and the environmental demands over time form an ongoing process, which determines an athlete's state of resilience through iterative steps (cf. Egeland et al., 1993; Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012, 2013, 2016; Fletcher & Scott, 2010; Seery, 2011; Seery, Holman, & Silver, 2010). To the best of our knowledge, there are currently two sport-specific studies providing clues for such an iterative pro-

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers.
This article is intended solely for the personal use of the individual user and is not to be disseminated broadly.

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers.
This article is intended solely for the personal use of the individual user and is not to be disseminated broadly.

cess, which are based on interviews with athletes who successfully overcame adversity during their careers (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012; Galli & Vealey, 2008). For example, the findings of Fletcher and Sarkar (2012) indicate that the protective factors influence challenge appraisals and metacognitions, which in turn yield facilitative responses. More specifically, all protective factors aid the facilitative interpretation of emotions, effective decision-making, reflecting, and task engagement. This, in turn, leads to increases in effort and commitment (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012). Therefore, no factor can be singled out as the main determinant for the process of adapting well to adversity, and no protective factor can be neglected. Rather, the complex interactions among all elements form the process from which successively resilience emerges (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012, 2013; Galli & Vealey, 2008).

The complex, iterative process of resilience is also likely to occur on the time scale of single matches. For example, in a tennis match, the person (the player), the environment (the opponent), and the task (i.e., playing/scoring points and the situational demands) are in constant interaction. The behaviors of players and their opponents constantly influence each other as they adapt to the changing circumstances. This means that the player and the opponent build a match history together that includes (among many other things) successes and setbacks (i.e., adverse events in the performance context). Thereby the situational demands and the protective factors constantly alter each other and adapt to the changing circumstances. Therefore, the displayable level of resilience changes in accordance with the history of these setbacks and successes. For instance, it might be easier for an athlete to demonstrate resilience when a first adverse event is encountered than if several adverse events have preceded this particular event. In accordance with this idea, the role of the history of performance patterns has been demonstrated repeatedly in studies on *psychological momentum* (PM, see also the next subsection). Positive PM describes an individual's perception of moving toward a desired goal, whereas negative PM describes an individual's perception of moving away from a desired goal (Adler, 1981; Briki, Den Hartigh, Markman, Micallef, & Gernigon, 2013; Den Hartigh, Gernigon, Van Yperen, Marin, & Van Geert, 2014; Den Hartigh, Van Geert, Van Yperen, Cox, & Gernigon, 2016; Vallerand, Colavecchio, & Pelletier, 1988). These studies showed that the impact of an adverse event, such as losing points or seconds on the opponent, is embedded in the process, that is, the athlete's performance history (Briki et al., 2013; Den Hartigh et al., 2014; Den Hartigh, Van Geert et al., 2016; Gernigon, Briki, & Eykens, 2010).

Resilience as Defining Attractor States

Attractors emerge from the iterative process of the system's underlying components, as the components adjust to each other in a self-organizing process (Nowak & Vallacher, 1998; Vallacher & Nowak, 1997; Vallacher et al., 2015). A fixed-point attractor is a relatively stable state of the system toward which it develops over time and returns to after being perturbed (Gernigon et al., 2015; Vallacher et al., 2015). This state is characterized by a recurring pattern of affect, behavior, and cognition. A metaphoric conceptualization of different attractor states usually depicts a hilly landscape over which a ball is rolling (Figure 1). Under the forces of gravity, the ball will roll into a valley (i.e., attractor state) and remain there unless an external force sets the ball into motion (i.e., a perturbation). The depth of the valley indicates the strength of the attractor. The deeper the valley, the stronger the perturbation (i.e., incidents that shake the stability of a system) needs to be to push the ball out of the valley. However, the attractor landscape may not remain stable over time (Figure 1). Repeated perturbations may cause the strength of an attractor state to decrease while simultaneously increasing the strength of another attractor state thereby changing the landscape of the attractor states (for an example in sport psychology, see Den Hartigh, Van Geert, et al., 2016).

Although never explicitly studied, indications for the existence of attractor states in resilience research comes from studies that have operationalized resilience as adapting well after experiencing a worse-than-expected performance (for examples, see Mummery et al., 2004; Seligman, Nolen-Hoeksema, Thornton, & Thornton, 1990). Resilient individuals were able to return to their previous level of performance after encountering the perturbation, whereas nonresilient athletes' negative performance was followed by another negative performance. In terms of attractor states, some individuals were able to return to their (previous) attractor state, whereas for others,




Figure 1. Hypothetical time series of an athlete's performance trajectory. The dotted circles mark the occurrence of an adverse event. Critical slowing down occurs as the athlete requires increasingly more time to recover from an adverse event, which signals a change in the attractor landscape (1, 2, and 3). The current state is represented by the ball rolling over the landscape, and the arrows indicate the direction of the perturbation. With repeated adverse events, the attractor for the high-performance level becomes weaker, whereas the attractor for the low performance level becomes stronger (2), ultimately leading to a qualitative shift in performance (3).

there was a critical transition to a lower performance level (cf. Dai, Vorselen, Korolev, & Gore, 2012; Kelso, 1995; Scheffer et al., 2012; Schöner & Kelso, 1988; van de Leemput et al., 2014). Following such a transition, it is typically difficult for the athlete to recover his or her previous performance level (Bonanno, 2004; Den Hartigh, Van Geert, et al., 2016; Gernigon et al., 2010, 2015). Furthermore, the commonly applied definition of resilience in sports also points to the protection of potential negative consequences of stressors (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012, 2013). According to Sarkar and Fletcher (2014), this definition implies that resilience is defined by an equilibrium in the level of functioning when facing an adversity (cf. Bonanno, 2004; Holling, 1973; Mancini & Bonanno, 2009).

Research on PM in sports provides additional support for the link between resilience and attractor formation (Briki et al., 2013; Den Hartigh et al., 2014; Den Hartigh, Van Geert, et al., 2016; Gernigon et al., 2010). For example, Briki et al. (2013), Den Hartigh et al. (2014), and Gernigon et al. (2010) found that negative PM is a relatively strong attractor state, meaning that it is relatively easily entered and difficult to escape from. Den Hartigh, Van Geert, et al. (2016) recently provided deeper insights into PM attractor dynamics. In a study in which participants took part in an ergometer rowing tournament spanning 4 weeks, the athletes who had lost the first three races (i.e., successive adverse events) entered negative PM more rapidly in the fourth race (i.e., decline in effort and self-efficacy), when they started losing seconds to their opponent, than the athletes who had won the previous races (Den Hartigh, Van Geert, et al., 2016). This line of research suggests that (a) adapting well to adversity (i.e., resilience) is embedded in the performance history both on a short timescale (within a single performance) and

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers.
This article is intended solely for the personal use of the individual user and is not to be disseminated broadly.

over the course of several weeks, and (b) the attractor landscape may change.

In summary, various findings across different domains of sports research point to the dynamic properties of resilience. The dynamical systems approach seems to be an appropriate framework for understanding resilience. However, this approach is not limited to descriptive support; it also yields practical implications for future research, which will be discussed later.

Measuring Resilience in the Context of Athletic Performance

A key question with regard to measuring the process of resilience in sports is: What should we measure (Sarkar & Fletcher, 2013)? Concrete recommendations in this regard can be derived from research on resilience outside the field of sport psychology. A recent article on resilience on the domain of clinical psychology has described the history-dependence and the change in the attractor landscape that arises from an iterative process, based on time-serial data (van de Leemput et al., 2014). These authors demonstrated the effect of encountering several subsequent stressors on the development of a depressive episode. More specifically, the exposure to several adverse events after another can lead to a period in which a system takes increasingly more time to demonstrate resilience, called "critical slowing down" (Dai et al., 2012; Scheffer et al., 2012). This means that the system requires increasing amounts of time to positively adapt to perturbations. A series of setbacks within a short time can reduce the displayable level of resilience so much that a single stressor (even if it has a low magnitude) can cause a person to develop a depressive episode (van de Leemput et al., 2014). Therefore, a critical transition of the stability of a system is anteceded by a period of reduced resilience (i.e., critical slowing down; Dai et al., 2012; Kelso, 1995; Scheffer et al., 2012; Schöner & Kelso, 1988; van de Leemput et al., 2014). Because this line of research provides insight into the dynamic properties of resilience, we suggest transferring it to the domain of sports.

Because the proposed complex interplay of underlying components (i.e., protective factors and environmental demands) manifests itself in the actual behavior that an athlete displays in a performance context (cf. Luthar & Cicchetti, 2000), the state of the system can be defined as the athlete's current performance level. Although adjustment to parental divorce may take several months or years and is meaningful in the time scale of an athlete's career, adapting well to a lost point in a tennis match occupies merely a few seconds and is meaningful in the time scale of a single match. Therefore, the type of adversity and the positive must occur in a meaningful time frame (Den Hartigh, Van Geert, et al., 2016).

Following the dynamical systems approach, to map out how the resilience process unfolds, individual time series (dense repeated measurements) need to be established (Araújo et al., 2015; Den Hartigh et al., 2017). Assessing multiple measurement points allows insight to be gained into how the trajectory of resilience is formed for any given adverse event or series of adverse events (cf. Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013; Sarkar & Fletcher, 2013). When the aim is to investigate the resilience process on a short time scale, during actual performance, a future research agenda should address the following issues and considerations. First, relevant measures of athletic performance should be defined, which can be measured repeatedly (preferably as continuously as possible) to compile a time series (Araújo et al., 2015). For example, for cyclists, their pace can be continuously tracked and measured. Second, the behavior of participants should stay close to their behavior in the usual sports setting, thereby optimally capturing the dynamics underlying athletic performance (Araújo et al., 2015; Davids & Araújo, 2010; Davids, Araújo, Vilar, Renshaw, & Pinder, 2013; Davids, Glazier, Araújo, & Bartlett, 2003; Pinder, Davids, Renshaw, & Araújo, 2011).

When conducting experimental studies on resilience, researchers could use, for instance, stationary bikes or rowing ergometers that can continuously collect measures of power output and allow for controlled manipulations of adverse events (Den Hartigh et al., 2014; Den Hartigh, Van Geert, et al., 2016). This could be accomplished by using software in which adverse events during performance can be manipulated. As an illustration, in studies on cycling (Briki et al., 2013) and rowing (Den Hartigh et al., 2014; Den Hartigh, Van Geert, et al., 2016), athletes were performing on ergometers. In one of the conditions, they took a comfortable lead, but then, at repeated intervals (e.g., 1 min), the athletes lost their advantage. In this way, adverse events (here, losing the lead) were sys-

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers.
This article is intended solely for the personal use of the individual user and is not to be disseminated broadly.

tematically manipulated in a controlled experimental setting. For data collection in naturalistic settings, new technological advancements, such as local position measurement systems, can be used to gather continuous performance data of naturalistic behavior (Frencken, Lemmink, & Delleman, 2010). Third, and most importantly, to measure resilience, the duration and shape of the trajectory following an adverse event with a decline in performance must be assessed (Bonanno, 2004; Carver, 1998; van de Leemput et al., 2014). Increases in the duration of time required for the resilience process after experiencing a series of adverse events (i.e., critical slowing down) can signal a critical shift in performance toward another attractor state (Figure 1). Such patterns can be detected in time-series data by using techniques such as autocorrelation or running correlations (Araújo et al., 2015). Therefore, based on intraindividual performance processes over time following several adversities, future breakdowns in resilience can be predicted (cf. van de Leemput et al., 2014).

To investigate resilience on a long time scale, longitudinal studies based on an integration of physical sensor data from wearables (such as a smartwatch) and self-report data may be used. For instance, Blaauw et al. (2016) coupled self-reported mental health variables (diary data over a period of 30 days) with physical measures (such as heart rate) collected via wearable sensors in smartwatches over the same period of time. Together, the accumulated data offered insight into the intraindividual variability of the assessed variables over time, as well as the dynamic relationships between them. Translated to an example of athletic resilience, cyclists could report a certain practice route they take every day with stable environmental conditions, which refrains from inferences that can influence the performance (Araújo et al., 2015). During this activity, sensors in wearables can collect and report various physical measures, positional measures, and completion times. This would yield objective measures of athletic performance over a longer period of time. In addition to the physical measures, self-report questionnaires on cognitions, behaviors, emotions, and the type of adversity and protective factors (Sarkar & Fletcher, 2013) over the same period of time, could be integrated to provide insight into the dynamical interactions of behavioral and psychological processes. Again, researchers can then specifically focus on periods of critical slowing down that may precede a breakdown in resilience (cf. van de Leemput et al., 2014).

Conclusion

Research on resilience in sports has increasingly focused on investigating the process that defines resilience (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2012, 2013; Galli & Vealey, 2008). To improve our understanding of this crucial concept for athletic performance, we call for using dynamical systems approach to understand resilience as an iterative process that is driven by ongoing interactions among a multitude of variables. New research designs should be tailored to measure adequate performance behavior and capture how the resilience process unfolds over time (Galli & Gonzalez, 2015). Specifically, researchers need to demonstrate the dynamic properties of resilience in individual time series in realistic performance contexts and throughout athletes' careers. We expect this research agenda to result in in-depth knowledge about, and understanding of, the process of how individuals adapt to adverse events. Furthermore, practitioners might benefit from the dynamical systems approach by being able to detect early warning signals of critical transitions (e.g., critical slowing down; Scheffer et al., 2012) and take preventive actions before breakdowns in performance occur.

References

Adler, P. (1981). *Momentum: A theory of social action*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Araújo, D., Davids, K., Diniz, A., Rocha, L., Santos, J. C., Dias, G., & Fernandes, O. (2015). Ecological dynamics of continuous and categorical decision-making: The regatta start in sailing. *European Journal of Sport Science, 15,* 195–202. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2014.928749

Blaauw, F. J., Schenk, H. M., Jeronimus, B. F., van der Krieke, L., de Jonge, P., Aiello, M., & Emerencia, A. C. (2016). Let's get Physiqual - An intuitive and generic method to combine sensor technology with ecological momentary assessments. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics, 63,* 141–149. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jbi.2016.08.001

Bonanno, G. A. (2004). Loss, trauma, and human resilience: Have we underestimated the human capacity to thrive after extremely aversive events? *American Psychologist, 59,* 20–28. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.59.1.20

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers.
This article is intended solely for the personal use of the individual user and is not to be disseminated broadly.

Briki, W., Den Hartigh, R. J., Markman, K. D., Micallef, J. P., & Gernigon, C. (2013). How psychological momentum changes in athletes during a sport competition. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 14,* 389–396. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.11.009

Carver, C. S. (1998). Resilience and thriving: Issues, models, and linkages. *Journal of Social Issues, 54,* 245–266. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1998.tb01217.x

Dai, L., Vorselen, D., Korolev, K. S., & Gore, J. (2012). Generic indicators for loss of resilience before a tipping point leading to population collapse. *Science, 336,* 1175–1177. http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1219805

Davids, K., & Araújo, D. (2010). The concept of "Organismic Asymmetry" in sport science. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, 13,* 633–640. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2010.05.002

Davids, K., Araújo, D., Vilar, L., Renshaw, I., & Pinder, R. (2013). An ecological dynamics approach to skill acquisition: Implications for development of talent in sport. *Talent Development and Excellence, 5,* 21–34.

Davids, K., Glazier, P., Araújo, D., & Bartlett, R. (2003). Movement systems as dynamical systems: The functional role of variability and its implications for sports medicine. *Sports Medicine, 33,* 245–260. http://dx.doi.org/10.2165/00007256-200333040-00001

Den Hartigh, R. J., Cox, R. F., & Van Geert, P. L. (2017). Complex versus complicated models of cognition. In L. Magnani, & T. Bertolotti (Eds.), *Springer handbook of model-based science* (pp. 657–669). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-30526-4_30

Den Hartigh, R. J., Gernigon, C., Van Yperen, N. W., Marin, L., & Van Geert, P. L. (2014). How psychological and behavioral team states change during positive and negative momentum. *PLoS ONE, 9,* e97887. http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0097887

Den Hartigh, R. J. R., Van Dijk, M. W. G., Steenbeek, H. W., & Van Geert, P. L. C. (2016). A dynamic network model to explain the development of excellent human performance. *Frontiers in Psychology, 7,* 532. http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00532

Den Hartigh, R. J., Van Geert, P. L., Van Yperen, N. W., Cox, R. F., & Gernigon, C. (2016). Psychological momentum during and across sports matches: Evidence for interconnected time scales. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 38,* 82–92. http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2015-0162

Egeland, B., Carlson, E., & Sroufe, L. A. (1993). Resilience as process. *Development and Psychopathology, 5,* 517–528. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400006131

Fletcher, D., & Hanton, S. (2003). Sources of organizational stress in elite sports performers. *The Sport Psychologist, 17,* 175–195. http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/tsp.17.2.175

Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2012). A grounded theory of psychological resilience in Olympic champions. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 13,* 669–678. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.04.007

Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2013). Psychological resilience: A review and critique of definitions, concepts, and theory. *European Psychologist, 18,* 12–23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000124

Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2016). Mental fortitude training: An evidence-based approach to developing psychological resilience for sustained success. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action, 7,* 135–157. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/21520704.2016.1255496

Fletcher, D., & Scott, M. (2010). Psychological stress in sports coaches: A review of concepts, research, and practice. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 28,* 127–137. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02640410903406208

Frencken, W. G., Lemmink, K. A., & Delleman, N. J. (2010). Soccer-specific accuracy and validity of the local position measurement (LPM) system. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, 13,* 641–645. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2010.04.003

Galli, N., & Gonzalez, S. P. (2015). Psychological resilience in sport: A review of the literature and implications for research and practice. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 13,* 243–257. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2014.946947

Galli, N., & Vealey, R. S. (2008). "Bouncing back" from adversity: Athletes' experiences of resilience. *The Sport Psychologist, 22,* 316–335. http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/tsp.22.3.316

Gernigon, C., Briki, W., & Eykens, K. (2010). The dynamics of psychological momentum in sport: The role of ongoing history of performance patterns. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 32,* 377–400. http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsep.32.3.377

Gernigon, C., Vallacher, R. R., Nowak, A., & Conroy, D. E. (2015). Rethinking approach and avoidance in achievement contexts: The perspective of dynamical systems. *Review of General Psychology, 19,* 443–457. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000055

Gould, D., Finch, L. M., & Jackson, S. A. (1993). Coping strategies used by national champion figure skaters. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and*

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers.
This article is intended solely for the personal use of the individual user and is not to be disseminated broadly.

Sport, 64, 453–468. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02701367.1993.10607599

Holling, C. S. (1973). Resilience and stability of ecological systems. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics, 4,* 1–23. http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.04.110173.000245

Kelso, J. A. S. (1995). *Dynamic patterns: The self-organization of brain and behavior*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Luthar, S. S., & Cicchetti, D. (2000). The construct of resilience: Implications for interventions and social policies. *Development and Psychopathology, 12,* 857–885. http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400004156

Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development, 71,* 543–562. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-8624.00164

Mancini, A. D., & Bonanno, G. A. (2009). Predictors and parameters of resilience to loss: Toward an individual differences model. *Journal of Personality, 77,* 1805–1832. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00601.x

Mummery, W. K., Schofield, G., & Perry, C. (2004). Bouncing back: The role of coping style, social support and self-concept in resilience of sport performance. *Athletic Insight: The Online Journal of Sport Psychology, 6,* 1–15.

Nowak, A., & Vallacher, R. R. (1998). *Dynamical social psychology*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Pinder, R. A., Davids, K., Renshaw, I., & Araújo, D. (2011). Representative learning design and functionality of research and practice in sport. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 33,* 146–155. http://dx.doi.org/10.1123/jsep.33.1.146

Rees, T., Hardy, L., Güllich, A., Abernethy, B., Côté, J., Woodman, T., . . . Warr, C. (2016). The great British medalists project: a review of current knowledge on the development of the world's best sporting talent. *Sports Medicine, 46,* 1041–1058. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40279-016-0476-2

Rutter, M. (1981). Stress, coping and development: Some issues and some questions. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 22,* 323–356. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7610.1981.tb00560.x

Sarkar, M., & Fletcher, D. (2013). How should we measure psychological resilience in sport performers? *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science, 17,* 264–280. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1091367X.2013.805141

Sarkar, M., & Fletcher, D. (2014). Psychological resilience in sport performers: A review of stressors and protective factors. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 32,* 1419–1434.

Sarkar, M., Fletcher, D., & Brown, D. J. (2015). What doesn't kill me . . .: Adversity-related experiences are vital in the development of superior Olympic performance. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, 18,* 475–479. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2014.06.010

Scheffer, M., Carpenter, S. R., Lenton, T. M., Bascompte, J., Brock, W., Dakos, V., . . . Vandermeer, J. (2012). Anticipating critical transitions. *Science, 338,* 344–348. http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.1225244

Schöner, G., & Kelso, J. A. (1988). Dynamic pattern generation in behavioral and neural systems. *Science, 239,* 1513–1520. http://dx.doi.org/10.1126/science.3281253

Seery, M. D. (2011). Resilience: A silver lining to experiencing adverse life events. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20,* 390–394. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721411424740

Seery, M. D., Holman, E. A., & Silver, R. C. (2010). Whatever does not kill us: Cumulative lifetime adversity, vulnerability, and resilience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99,* 1025–1041. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0021344

Seligman, M. E., Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Thornton, N., & Thornton, K. M. (1990). Explanatory style as a mechanism of disappointing athletic performance. *Psychological Science, 1,* 143–146. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1990.tb00084.x

Vallacher, R. R., & Nowak, A. (1997). The emergence of dynamical social psychology. *Psychological Inquiry, 8,* 73–99. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli0802_1

Vallacher, R. R., Van Geert, P., & Nowak, A. (2015). The intrinsic dynamics of psychological process. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 24,* 58–64. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0963721414551571

Vallerand, R. J., Colavecchio, P. G., & Pelletier, L. G. (1988). Psychological momentum and performance inferences: A preliminary test of the antecedents-consequences psychological momentum model. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 10,* 92–108.

van de Leemput, I. A., Wichers, M., Cramer, A. O., Borsboom, D., Tuerlinckx, F., Kuppens, P., . . . Scheffer, M. (2014). Critical slowing down as early warning for the onset and termination of depression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 111,* 87–92. http://dx.doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1312114110

Van Geert, P. (1991). A dynamic systems model of cognitive and language growth. *Psychological Review, 98,* 3–53. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.1.3

Van Geert, P. (1994). *Dynamic systems of development: Change between complexity and chaos*. New York, NY: Harvester.

Van Geert, P. (2009). Nonlinear complex dynamical

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers.
This article is intended solely for the personal use of the individual user and is not to be disseminated broadly.

systems in developmental psychology. In S. J. Guastello, M. Koopmans, & D. Pincus (Eds.), *Chaos and complexity in psychology: The theory of nonlinear dynamical systems* (pp. 242–281). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Van Orden, G. C., Holden, J. G., & Turvey, M. T. (2003). Self-organization of cognitive performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 132*, 331–350. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.132.3.331

Received March 24, 2017
Revision received November 3, 2017
Accepted November 10, 2017 ■

This document is copyrighted by the American Psychological Association or one of its allied publishers.
This article is intended solely for the personal use of the individual user and is not to be disseminated broadly.

Members of Underrepresented Groups: Reviewers for Journal Manuscripts Wanted

If you are interested in reviewing manuscripts for APA journals, the APA Publications and Communications Board would like to invite your participation. Manuscript reviewers are vital to the publications process. As a reviewer, you would gain valuable experience in publishing. The P&C Board is particularly interested in encouraging members of underrepresented groups to participate more in this process.

If you are interested in reviewing manuscripts, please write APA Journals at Reviewers@apa.org. Please note the following important points:

- To be selected as a reviewer, you must have published articles in peer-reviewed journals. The experience of publishing provides a reviewer with the basis for preparing a thorough, objective review.
- To be selected, it is critical to be a regular reader of the five to six empirical journals that are most central to the area or journal for which you would like to review. Current knowledge of recently published research provides a reviewer with the knowledge base to evaluate a new submission within the context of existing research.
- To select the appropriate reviewers for each manuscript, the editor needs detailed information. Please include with your letter your vita. In the letter, please identify which APA journal(s) you are interested in, and describe your area of expertise. Be as specific as possible. For example, "social psychology" is not sufficient—you would need to specify "social cognition" or "attitude change" as well.
- Reviewing a manuscript takes time (1–4 hours per manuscript reviewed). If you are selected to review a manuscript, be prepared to invest the necessary time to evaluate the manuscript thoroughly.

APA now has an online video course that provides guidance in reviewing manuscripts. To learn more about the course and to access the video, visit http://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/resources/review-manuscript-ce-video.aspx.