

Article Classification:
Original article

GERMAN BASKETBALL COACHES' LIFE SATISFACTION COMPARED TO THAT OF TEACHERS, MANAGERS, AND THE GENERAL POPULATION: DERIVATIVES FOR SPORTS PRACTICE AND SUSTAINABLE EDUCATION

Johannes Wunder¹, Maximilian Priem²,
Gert G. Wagner³, Oliver Stoll¹

¹ Institute of Sports Science, University of Halle-Wittenberg,
Halle, Germany

² DIW Econ, Berlin, Germany

³ Max Planck Institute for Human Development,
Berlin, Germany

OPEN ACCESS

Submitted: 03 February 2025

Accepted: 17 April 2025

Published: 14 July 2025

ORCID 

Oliver Stoll

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8933-9067>

Gert G. Wagner

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5985-4073>

Cite this article as:

Wunder, J., Priem, M., Wagner, G.,

Stoll, O. (2025).

German basketball coaches' life
satisfaction compared to that of teachers,
managers, and the general population:

Derivatives for sports
practice and sustainable education.

Journal of Applied Sports Sciences,
9(1), pp. 85 - 99.

DOI: 10.37393/JASS.2025.09.01.8



This work is licensed under
a Attribution-Non

Commercial-ShareAlike 4.0

International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0)

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the life satisfaction of basketball coaches, addressing a gap in research on sports professionals. Using data from the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP), it examines life satisfaction scores among basketball coaches, categorized by license level, and compares them to teachers and managers. While previous research leads to the assumption of above-average life satisfaction of coaches due to specific personality characteristics, e.g., higher extraversion and lower neuroticism, the results do not support these suggestions. However, no significant similarities were found between A-license coaches and managers or C-license coaches and teachers. In contrast, both managers and teachers report above-average levels of life satisfaction. Although no significant difference between A- and C-license coaches was found, the results indicate that higher license levels can be associated with greater life satisfaction.

Considering current research and the results of this study, practical suggestions state that structured career development and professional support could enhance coaches' life satisfaction. Drawing from effective models in related professions, recommendations emphasize mentorship, experiential learning, and innovative training strategies. The study acknowledges limitations, including its reliance on cross-sectional data and potential external influences such as pandemic-related restrictions. Future research should explore these dynamics in various contexts and sports disciplines to develop targeted strategies for improving coaching environments, benefiting individual coaches, teams, and the broader sports community.

Keywords: *life satisfaction, personality, basketball coaches, teachers, manager*

INTRODUCTION

In Germany, finding and keeping volunteers for sports groups has grown to be very difficult. This problem was brought to light in the 2015 and 2016 Sports Development Reports, and further reports have shown that things have gotten worse, especially in basketball, where the COVID-19 epidemic has

caused a 2.2% decline of active coaches in recent years (Breuer & Feiler, 2017; Breuer et al., 2021). Important questions concerning the elements affecting basketball coaches' and other volunteers' retention and level of satisfaction are brought up by this decline.

One important component that has been connected to volunteering and personal ded-

ication is life satisfaction. For instance, Nagel et al. (2019) showed that factors like support and recognition have a major impact on volunteer happiness, whereas Behrens et al. (2017) discovered a strong correlation between volunteers' motivations and their pleasure with volunteering activities. Therefore, addressing retention issues and enhancing coaching techniques requires an understanding of life satisfaction among sports coaches. Despite this, there is a dearth of studies that focus on the life satisfaction of coaches in specific sports, e.g., basketball. Although the 2017 and 2018 Sports Development Reports show that volunteers in sports are generally quite satisfied, no particular information about basketball coaches is given (Breuer & Feiler, 2021). Although sports-specific results are missing, this finding is consistent with the results of Headey, Muffels, & Wagner (2013), who demonstrated a significant positive relationship between social participation, physical activity, and a positive work-life balance, while excluding the influence of genetic and time-stable factors.

One's overall degree of life satisfaction may be influenced by a variety of things. First of all, it is clear that personality influences life satisfaction; when examined using the Big Five categories used in the SOEP, extraversion is positive, and neuroticism is negative. Furthermore, studies suggest that those who take risks are more satisfied with their lives (Dohmen et al., 2011; Schraepler et al., 2019). Additionally, it has been shown that a person's degree of life satisfaction is greatly impacted by the behavior of their parents (Headey et al., 2014; Headey & Muffels, 2017). Ultimately, a person's level of satisfaction in life can be influenced by their personal beliefs and priorities, the partner they choose, their participation in social networks, or changes in their health (ibid.).

With differing conclusions on the decline in life satisfaction with advancing age, earli-

er research (Gerstorf et al., 2008; Thieme & Dittrich, 2015) has shown a predictable, diverse picture of the lifetime and prospective events that can affect life satisfaction. Furthermore, Schraepler et al. (2019) indicate that besides personality character traits like neuroticism and extraversion also agreeableness, together with other psychological and social variables like positive and negative reciprocity, the presence of a divorce experience, or low levels of education, have a significant impact on the stability of long-term life satisfaction, which is in contrast to the so-called set point theory's assertion of a genetically fixed, mainly stable life satisfaction in adulthood. This research was based on SOEP data.

The SOEP, a comprehensive nationwide survey of the German population, provides the data used in this study (Wagner et al., 2008; Goebel et al., 2018). The SOEP is frequently used in research because it is widely acknowledged as an essential source of representative data on various German demographic groups (Siegers et al., 2022). The SOEP has been the basis for much research that focuses on specific groups or those with small sample sizes, e.g., journalists or politicians (Schroeder et al., 2020; Heß et al., 2013; Deter & Van Hoorn, 2023). Research on specific subgroups and aspects, such as the Big Five personality traits, has shown the SOEP to be especially helpful (Caliendo et al., 2013; Schmidt et al., 2023).

As already mentioned, however, there are not many studies that concentrate on coaches in general or basketball coaches in particular. Comparing various subgroups to the general population, however, appears to be a useful method for gaining a more in-depth understanding of certain behaviors that can be quite pertinent for drawing conclusions.

Cognitive measures of well-being have been a part of the SOEP since its beginning (Richter et al., 2017). The worldwide 11-point life satis-

faction rating is the first metric (Schimmack, Schupp, & Wagner, 2008). In the SOEP, this item is nearly always employed as a well-being metric. Its excellent face validity and the extensive usage of life satisfaction ratings in literature on well-being are the leading causes of its popularity. Sandvik, Diener, and Seidlitz (1993) found that single-item measures of life satisfaction had moderate relationships with other well-being measures, such as written interviews, informant reports, and measures of daily affect, making them a common and reasonably valid method of measuring overall life satisfaction.

Most of the research on this list uses data from the SOEP as the basis for their analysis. Data on the main item, life satisfaction in general, as well as specific items, like leisure time, were collected over a long period of time (Wagner et al., 2008; Richter et al., 2017). Smaller groups of people were often statistically compared to the general population using the life satisfaction item from the SOEP survey. Lesbian, gay, and bisexual people in Germany, for example, have below-average life satisfaction levels, according to a poll on the subject (Kroh et al., 2017).

There are currently few studies that provide light on the characteristics and personality qualities of athletes. However, there is abundant research in sports psychology on personality and life satisfaction (e.g., Drakou et al., 2006; Norris et al., 2017). For example, Dixon and Sagas (2007) examined the connection between university coaches' organizational support, job-life satisfaction, and work-family conflict. Bopp et al. (2015) looked at data from 348 head coaches at universities and discovered a favorable relationship between life and work satisfaction. They also provided helpful advice for managers and other professional organizations. Furthermore, because it may potentially impact their job satisfaction, coaches'

life satisfaction is implicated in the context of the spillover concept (Drakou et al., 2006).

The SOEP was recently used to collect data on the risk behavior and personality traits of German basketball coaches (Wunder et al., 2024). Even while studies on life satisfaction have become more popular, particularly in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, little is known about how coaches' life satisfaction in general and, e.g., basketball coaches' life satisfaction in specific, stacks up against that of other subgroups. Wunder et al. (2024) postulate that managers and teachers show the appropriate traits required for their roles through self-selection, education, and training. The data is then compared to two professional cohorts that seem to deal with similar professional challenges: teachers and managers, as well as the general public.

Regarding this approach, coaches' life satisfaction is evaluated in this study using these professional associations as standards. In order to do this, the research first uses a specialized coach survey to outline the distinctions and similarities between coaches at the professional and amateur levels. Within our context, for comparability, analogous to research of personality traits of coaches (ibid.), the term "teacher" is consistent with the definition found in Ayaita and Stuermer's (2019) SOEP data analyses: It particularly refers to those who work as elementary, secondary, or vocational school teachers. In this study, however, this category does not include teachers in adult education, higher education, or other teaching positions, such as skiing instructors. Regarding our definition of "managers," we use the one given by Holst and Busch (2010): This refers to those who are 18 years of age or older and who are listed in the SOEP as working in the private sector and in roles that involve a lot of management duties. In bigger organizations and associations, this comprises directors, executives,

or board members in addition to other managerial positions or highly skilled tasks, like department heads, research staff, or engineers. In the results, both similarities and differences were found (Wunder et al., 2024). According to the results, these kinds of comparisons are useful for determining group-specific traits that are pertinent to real-world uses.

By providing a comprehensive analysis of life satisfaction among German basketball coaches, this study aims to close a gap in the literature. It specifically seeks to assess the overall life satisfaction of basketball coaches and compare it to that of other subgroups, including managers, teachers, and the general population. It also investigates the relationship between life satisfaction and factors like licensing levels and professional standards. The study avoids going too far into topics like coaching education and professional standards, which are outside the purview of the data, by concentrating solely on life satisfaction. Rather, the results are intended to provide information for enhancing coach support networks and guiding strategic choices in sports federations.

- Based on the current literature (e.g., Dodt et al., 2023; Wunder et al., 2024) and the theoretical framework of using SOEP data to compare various subgroups (e.g., journalists, politicians), the prior study will test the following hypotheses: H1: Coaches with higher license levels will have greater life satisfaction than those with lower license levels.
- **H2:** Basketball coaches exhibit different levels of life satisfaction compared to the general population.
- **H3a:** C-license coaches will exhibit no differences in life satisfaction compared to teachers.
- **H3b:** A-license coaches will exhibit higher life satisfaction than managers.

METHODS

Sample

For this study, we draw upon an already existing dataset (Wunder et al., 2024). The sample consists of 360 basketball coaches (289 male, 70 female, one unspecified), aged 18 to 85, with varying levels of coaching experience. Participants were selected through randomized methods, including outreach via mailing lists and newsletters. This sample represented 4.7% of the total population of basketball coaches in Germany, as estimated by Wunder et al. (2024) before. However, the response rate for A-license coaches was 14.2%, potentially influencing comparative analyses. To mitigate this overrepresentation and enhance the representativeness of the dataset, weighting adjustments were applied.

The socioeconomic variables of the sample identified during the data collection were first described by Wunder et al. (2022). Notably, it was found that the educational level of German basketball coaches was above average, which, according to Schraepler et al. (2019), suggested a positive effect on life satisfaction.

The analysis focused on C-license and A-license coaches due to their distinct professional environments and training. C-license coaches typically operate in amateur or part-time contexts. In contrast, A-license coaches are more likely to work in high-performance or competitive settings due to their advanced training. These professional distinctions support the justification for comparing the two groups, as their levels of professionalization and the pressures they face may influence their behaviors and life satisfaction.

Tools

This analysis draws upon data from a cross-sectional, anonymous survey based on the methodology established by Wunder et al. (2024). Data collection of the original dataset

employed items from the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) questionnaire, which included, e.g., measures of personality, risk behavior, life satisfaction, and socio-demographic variables (Richter et al., 2017). This study's focus was the SOEP's single-item life satisfaction, which asks participants to rate their overall life satisfaction: "How satisfied are you with your life, all things considered? (Wie zufrieden sind Sie gegenwärtig, alles in allem, mit Ihrem Leben?) Scale: 0 (Completely dissatisfied / Ganz und gar unzufrieden) to 10 (Completely satisfied / Ganz und gar zufrieden)"

In addition to coach-specific information (e.g., sex, license level, coaching experience, and league), the original dataset incorporated socio-demographic variables such as marital status, household income, educational attainment, and employment status. It was displayed by Wunder et al. (2022).

Although single-item measures may have limitations in capturing complex constructs, prior research has demonstrated the validity of the SOEP life satisfaction measure (Kroh, 2006).

Procedure

The study followed a descriptive methodological approach inspired by Wunder et al. (2024) and supported by similar research (Dodt et al., 2021; Dodt et al., 2022). The emphasis was on describing the life satisfaction of basketball coaches, rather than focusing on socio-demographic factors like age or education. This comprehensive approach allows for a nuanced understanding of coaches' characteristics in the context of their professional roles and decision-making processes.

To provide context and secure comparability according to previous research in linked dimensions like personality traits and risk-behavior of coaches (e.g., Dodt et al., 2022; Wunder et al., 2024), basketball coaches were com-

pared to two professional groups - teachers and managers - from the SOEP dataset. These groups were selected because their professions, like coaching, require high levels of responsibility and decision-making under uncertainty. This comparison aimed to identify whether the life satisfaction of basketball coaches differed significantly from that of analogous, seemingly professional groups.

Statistical Analysis

The dataset of basketball coaches was segmented by license level and merged with the SOEP dataset to facilitate comparisons with teachers and managers. Initial analyses involved calculating descriptive statistics (e.g., means, standard deviations) for life satisfaction across the groups. This step established a foundational understanding of the data and addressed baseline differences between subgroups.

Inferential statistics were employed to test the study's hypotheses. Independent t-tests were conducted to evaluate significant differences in life satisfaction between groups, specifically between C-license and A-license coaches and between basketball coaches and the comparison groups (teachers and managers). Cohen's d was calculated to determine the effect sizes of these differences, providing insights into their practical significance. These statistical techniques align with methodologies commonly used in psychological and behavioral research, ensuring robust hypothesis testing (Wunder et al., 2024).

All analyses were performed using SPSS version 28, a widely accepted tool in social science research. To enhance methodological rigor, further discussion of the t-test's appropriateness and the use of effect size measures in this context is included, ensuring the robustness of the study's analytical framework.

RESULTS

The statistical findings in the next section are consistent with the previously mentioned hypotheses. The average overall life satisfaction score of the German general population is 7.39, as shown in Table 1. Basketball coach-

es' life satisfaction scores varied somewhat depending on their license level: those with a C-license scored 7.32, those with a B-license scored 7.38, and those with an A-license scored the highest at 7.43.

Table 1. Summary of the weighted attributes for the following groups: adult population in Germany (SOEP), German basketball coaches overall and A-, B-, and C-licenses, managers, and teachers.

		General population	Coaches all	A- license	B- license	C- license	Managers	Teachers
Life satisfaction	M	7.39	7.34	7.43	7.38	7.32	7.71	7.62
	N	14811	360	70	120	170	770	569
	SD	1.72	2.14	1.83	2.12	2.18	1.33	1.48

Item: "How satisfied are you with your life, all things considered? (Wie zufrieden sind Sie gegenwärtig, alles in allem, mit Ihrem Leben?)" - Scale: 0 (Completely dissatisfied / Ganz und gar unzufrieden) to 10 (Completely satisfied / Ganz und gar zufrieden)

According to these values, the coaching subgroups' range of variations is limited. For background, it is important to remember that life satisfaction among the German general population as a whole has been steadily rising since 2017, reaching a high of 7.4 in 2019 and during the initial COVID-19 lockdown in 2020. In 2021, when the survey of basketball coaches was carried out, there was a decrease to 7.19 (Entringer & Kröger, 2021).

The specific results of testing the previously mentioned hypotheses will be shown as follows.

H1: Basketball coaches with higher licensure levels will have greater life satisfaction than coaches with lower licensure levels.

According to statistical analysis, there was no significant difference in life satisfaction between coaches with A and C licenses ($p = .700$). H1 was also rejected since the effect size was insignificant ($d = -.05$). These results imply that, besides the pure scores of A-, B-, and C-license coaches shown in Table 1, life satisfaction is not significantly influenced by license levels.

H2: Basketball coaches will exhibit differ-

ent levels of life satisfaction compared to the general population.

Neither A-licensed nor C-licensed basketball coaches showed statistically significant differences from the general population. The rejection of H2 results from this lack of significant variation, suggesting that life satisfaction among basketball coaches is similar to that of the general population.

H3a: Basketball coaches with C-licenses will show no significant differences in life satisfaction compared to teachers.

H3b: Basketball coaches with A-licenses will exhibit similar levels of life satisfaction to managers.

The research revealed substantial differences in life satisfaction between A-license coaches and managers ($p = .014$) and C-license coaches with teachers ($p = .018$), which was unexpected. Both H3a and H3b were rejected because of the small effect sizes found for both comparisons ($d = -.27$ and $d = -.40$, respectively). These findings suggest that basketball coaches' life satisfaction differs from that of teachers and managers, especially when categorized by

licensing level. According to additional exploratory studies, there were no discernible variations in life satisfaction between A-license coaches and teachers or between C-license coaches and managers. This implies that life satisfaction disparities are more noticeable when comparing coaches with their respective subgroups (teachers and managers) than when comparing coaches with other subgroups.

The effect sizes of the previously mentioned comparisons are shown in Tables 1 and 2, which also show the relative differences in life satisfaction across the subgroups under study. Notwithstanding slight discrepancies brought about by rounding and weighing, the numbers are consistent with the statistical results shown in Table 2.

Table 2. *This comparison shows statistical testing of the mean differences between various groups. Subgroup analyses were performed without weighting, although survey data were weighted to match population ratios for descriptive purposes to balance this mismatch.*

Predictors	t-test for equality of means							
	C-license				A-license			
	<i>p</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>SE_D</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>MD</i>	<i>SE_D</i>	<i>d</i>
General Population	.301	-.17	.17	-.11	.748	-.07	.22	-.04
C-license	-	-	-	-	.700	-.11	.27	-.05
B-license	.815	-.06	.26	-.03	.876	-.05	.29	-.02
A-license	.700	-.11	.27	-.05	-	-	-	-
Managers	-	-	-	-	.014	-.55	.22	-.40
Teachers	.018	-.42	.18	-.27	-	-	-	-

MD=Mean Difference, SED=Standard Error Difference, d = Cohen's d

DISCUSSION

This study contributes to a clearer understanding of life satisfaction among German basketball coaches, categorized by license level. By comparing the results with both the general population and specific professional subgroups such as managers and teachers, this study provides a contextualized perspective on life satisfaction in coaching.

A key finding is the variation in reported life satisfaction among basketball coaches with different license levels. A-license coaches report the highest levels of life satisfaction, which may indicate a link between professionalization, advanced training, and job-related satisfaction. The differences found are not statistically significant but show a tendency. Further research should address this picture with a more complex sample addressing other limita-

tions, too. In total, these findings seem to align with previous research associating personality traits such as higher extraversion and lower neuroticism found with basketball coaches by Wunder et al. (2024) and increased life satisfaction based on higher extraversion and lower neuroticism in general (Headey & Muffels, 2017). However, the anticipated parallels between A-license coaches and managers and between C-license coaches and teachers were not observed. This discrepancy suggests that contextual factors specific to coaching may influence life satisfaction differently than in other professional fields.

These findings are built upon the study of Wunder et al. (2024), who examined personality traits in basketball coaches. While their study identified distinct personality patterns, the present results suggest that personality

traits alone may not fully explain differences in life satisfaction. A-license coaches' higher life satisfaction rate may be influenced by factors such as career progression and professional achievement. Further research is needed to explore mediating variables like personal accomplishment and job satisfaction to clarify these relationships.

By situating these findings within the broader context of sports psychology, this study may underscore the importance of professional pressures and decision-making in shaping subjective life satisfaction. Comparisons with research in organizational and educational psychology could provide additional insights into how individuals in high-responsibility roles maintain life satisfaction.

Limitations

Although this study provides information about the life satisfaction of German basketball coaches at all license levels, it must be noted that there are a number of limitations that may affect how the results are interpreted and used generally.

The study's data was gathered in 2021, during the COVID-19 pandemic, which caused major social and economic upheavals. It is uncertain if basketball coaches saw comparable drops in life satisfaction throughout this period, given that a previous study (Entringer & Kröger, 2021) suggests a general fall. Our capacity to ascertain whether the observed patterns indicate typical conditions or pandemic-specific impacts is limited by the absence of pre- and post-pandemic data on coaches' life satisfaction. The results could have been impacted by the disruption of social aspects that are essential to coaching, such as regular interpersonal encounters in sports clubs and federations.

The data used in this study were self-reported, which can, for example, introduce bi-

ases like social desirability, where respondents may overreport or underreport actions in order to conform to socially acceptable norms. This is especially pertinent in professional settings like coaching, where respondents can feel pressured to project a more contented image of themselves. Future studies could use longitudinal designs or objective behavioral evaluations to better capture real-life satisfaction. Moreover, the data was collected voluntarily, which can cause possible bias.

A methodological limitation of this study is the reliance on single-item measures for life satisfaction, a challenge previously noted in research (Kroh, 2006). Although the different groups are comparable based on the same item, additional variables such as team performance, job stability, and competitive pressure may play a role in shaping life satisfaction in sports coaching. Future studies should consider using multi-item scales or domain-specific instruments to capture these nuances and enhance the validity of results.

Despite having a sizable sample size by sports science standards, a larger sample size could help to get a clearer picture of the life satisfaction of basketball coaches. Moreover, the study's focus on German basketball coaches limited the findings' applicability to other sports or cultural contexts. Due to varied competitive situations and cultural attitudes, coaches from different sports or nations may display diverse life satisfaction patterns. The external validity of the results could be improved by broadening the sample to cover a variety of sports and geographical areas.

Furthermore, there was a substantial bias in favor of A-license coaches in the sample. This overrepresentation might have affected the comparisons between licensure levels even after statistical weighting was used. As already mentioned, there are different theories on the influence of sociodemographic variables such

as age or education level. Despite knowing some of these sociodemographic variables from analyses of the original data, we cannot say if sociodemographic characteristics may have also contributed to the variation. Future research should consider further background variables like athletic experience or professional stage and aim for a balanced sample across licensure levels.

It is important to use caution when interpreting the apparent results. Previously connected to personality traits and life satisfaction (Wagner et al., 2018; Ayaita & Stuermer, 2019), factors including educational achievement and professional stability may act as mediators rather than direct correlates. These variables may complicate the connection between life satisfaction and license levels, necessitating more research. The study's capacity to deduce causal links between life satisfaction and license levels was limited by its reliance on cross-sectional data. As coaches go through the license levels or experience professional transitions, longitudinal research could record changes in life satisfaction across time.

Furthermore, the lack of anticipated distinctions between coaches and the general population and between particular professional subgroups begs the question of how life satisfaction functions in coaching settings. Deeper insight into these trends may be possible with additional data, such as burnout, team performance, or job satisfaction metrics. Analytical techniques like latent class analysis and regression modeling may be able to shed light on the observed outcomes and reveal underlying correlations. Although the SOEP dataset offers a strong basis for comparisons, more coaching-specific data may provide a more in-depth understanding. These findings could be used to explain surprising findings, like the lack of notable differences between coaches and specific reference groups, also with a view to other

research that could find differences in potentially life satisfaction-linked items. Additional methods that reveal hidden patterns in the data and shed light on the dynamics at work include regression modeling and latent class analysis.

Including coaches from different sports or cultural backgrounds in the study might broaden our understanding of how coaching environments affect life satisfaction. It may be possible to identify universal vs sport-specific elements influencing coaches' well-being by conducting comparative research across nations or sports disciplines.

CONCLUSION

This study fills an important research vacuum about the life satisfaction of sports coaches. It offers distinctive insights into the professional profiles of basketball coaches using data from the SOEP and a sizable sample of them, advancing both academic knowledge and real-world applications in coaching development and sports management. According to previous results, basketball coaches display job-specific personality traits that correspond with the requirements of their license level, just as professionals in domains like management and education. A-license coaches, for example, exhibit lower levels of neuroticism and higher levels of extraversion, which are characteristics linked to higher life satisfaction. These qualities are crucial for handling the growing demands of coaching responsibilities and making decisions under duress.

The study's comparisons of managers, teachers, and basketball coaches provide new viewpoints that may also be used as a benchmark in further personnel development tactics. By incorporating proven tactics from management and education to fit the unique requirements of sports coaching, coach education programs can become more relevant and practical. This study's ramifications extend beyond

its focus on coaches to players and referees, whose risk-taking habits and level of life satisfaction may have a comparable effect on their performance and judgment in sports. Including these groups in the scope could aid in developing a more comprehensive knowledge of the dynamics present in athletic contexts.

Additionally, throughout the survey period, there was a 2.2% decrease in basketball coaches, one of the special difficulties brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic (Breuer et al., 2021). This raises important issues regarding the relationship between volunteers, personal satisfaction, and staying in crisis coaching roles. The necessity to investigate these associations further, especially in the context of sports, is highlighted by prior research that links risk-taking with fulfillment (Dohmen et al., 2011) and volunteerism with greater life satisfaction (Behrens et al., 2017).

Future research should focus on a number of important areas in order to expand on these findings. In order to increase the generalizability of the results, it is first recommended to broaden the sample by incorporating coaches from other sports, competition levels, and cultural contexts. More complex comparisons between individual and team sports would be possible with this expansion. Second, to separate the impact of COVID-19 on life satisfaction, studies must be conducted outside of pandemic periods. Using multi-item or domain-specific life satisfaction ratings would yield valuable insights for a more thorough understanding.

This study emphasizes how important life satisfaction is in determining how basketball coaches behave and perform. It creates new avenues for study and practice by placing its findings in larger professional and societal contexts, guaranteeing that future initiatives in coach education and development are grounded in context and supported by evidence. In

addition to helping the coaching industry, broadening the field of study will advance our knowledge of how people behave in situations involving crucial decisions, such as sports.

PRACTICAL SUGGESTIONS

This study highlights how crucial it is to combine theoretical understanding with real-world applications in order to improve the growth and contentment of basketball coaches in particular or sports coaches in general. Sports organizations can adopt customized techniques to meet the specific demands of coaches at all license levels by referencing comparisons with other professional groups and innovative ways.

Comparisons with subgroups, like managers and teachers, offer useful standards for enhancing coaching techniques. Effective personnel development necessitates not only assigning people to the appropriate tasks but also supporting their advancement in these roles by considering individual circumstances, per a study based on 2,500 businesses (McKinsey & Company, 2023). By integrating training with the requirements of different license levels, applying these concepts to sports coaching may stimulate creative approaches to coach education and growth.

Advanced training programs already in place at some sports organizations could be used as templates for coaching development. For instance, self-awareness, self-management, and reflection - all essential for both professional and personal development - are included in the German Football Association's all-encompassing approach (German Football Association, n.d.). Such components could be added to other coaching programs to help coaches better understand their roles, abilities, and areas for development. Additionally, initiatives like the German "Mini-Trainer" certification emphasize effective youth train-

ing management, parent engagement, and pedagogical abilities (Brentjes, 2020). These programs emphasize the value of customized training for certain coaching contexts, such as youth development. Lastly, contemporary methods of personnel development, such as experiential learning and mentoring, have also demonstrated promise in basketball coaching. To give new coaches real-world experience and practical expertise, the German Basketball Education Fund, for example, provides mentorship programs with seasoned coaches, internships, and on-site visits (German Basketball Education Fund, n.d). The need for individualized coaching instruction is further highlighted by the successful use of extended mentoring as a teaching tool by regional federations like the German Lower Saxony State Sports Association (Landessportbund Niedersachsen, 2021).

With techniques like “BarCamps” and e-learning becoming more popular, the variety of learning designs in coaching education keeps expanding (Graf et al., 2022). These methods offer engaging and adaptable formats for continuing education. Instead of just passively absorbing knowledge, it is imperative that people actively participate in these learning opportunities. When combined with individualized orientation, mentoring can be an effective strategy for knowledge management and ongoing career advancement. The study’s conclusions are consistent with the goals set forth in the “Freiburg Declaration” on German basketball growth by 2032, which calls for the certification of more coaches at clubs and schools (Easycrredit BBL, 2024). Support networks that are specifically designed to help coaches deal with the demands of higher license levels must include stress management, work-life balance, and decision-making abilities.

These actions can improve team performance, athlete development, and coaches’

well-being by creating a healthier coaching environment. For instance, integrating introspective exercises and stress-management seminars into coach training might help prevent burnout and encourage long-term involvement in the field. This study emphasizes the need for holistic development techniques by highlighting the relationship between personality traits, life satisfaction, and licensure levels. Basketball coaches’ professional development and well-being can be given top priority by organizations through the integration of business, education, and sports perspectives. These kinds of initiatives are essential to developing long-term solutions that benefit individual coaches and the larger sports community.

Statements and Declarations

The study proposal’s necessity for an ethical evaluation has been determined using the six RatSWD elements (RatSWD, 2017). Since this study evaluated anonymized data that was independently acquired, ethical approval was deemed unnecessary. This finding is consistent with previous decisions about using SOEP data in other research (e.g., Grochtdreis et al., 2021). No organizations provided support for the authors’ submitted paper. The writers have revealed no relevant financial or non-financial interests. Artificial intelligence was used during the final editorial process to improve readability, for example, by paraphrasing individual text passages. The article had never before appeared in another journal.

REFERENCES

Ayaita, A., & Stuermer, K. (2019). Risk aversion and the teaching profession: an analysis including different forms of risk aversion, different control groups, selection, and socialization effects. *Education Economics*, 28(1), 4–25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/096452>

92.2019.1675592

Behrens, C., Emrich, E., Haemmerle, M., & Pierdzioch, C. (2017). Match-Qualität und ehrenamtliches Engagement in Sportvereinen. [Match quality and voluntary commitment in sports clubs] *German Journal of Exercise and Sport Research*, 48(1), 89–98. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12662-017-0486-8>

Bopp, T., Wigley, B. J., & Eddosary, M. (2015). Job and Life Satisfaction: The Perspective of Collegiate Head Coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 10(6), 1025–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1260/1747-9541.10.6.1025>

Brentjes, T. (2020). Die Mini-Offensive. [The mini-offensive] *Forum Kinder- Und Jugendsport*, 1(2), 122–127. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43594-020-00018-1>

Breuer, C., & Feiler, S. (2017). *Sportentwicklungsbericht 2015/2016: Analyse zur Situation der Sportvereine in Deutschland: Kurzfassung* [Sports Development Report 2015/2016: Analysis of the situation of sports clubs in Germany: Summary] (Bundesinstitut für Sportwissenschaft, Ed.). Bundesinstitut für Sportwissenschaften.

Breuer, C., & Feiler, S. (2021). *Coaches and trainers in sports clubs in Germany: Sport Development Report for Germany 2017/2018 - Part 2*.

Breuer, C., Feiler, S., & Rossi, L. (2021). *Auswirkungen der COVID-19-Pandemie auf die Sportvereine in Deutschland*. [Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on sports clubs in Germany] <http://dnb.ddb.de>

Caliendo, M., Fossen, F. M., & Kritikos, A. S. (2013). Personality characteristics and the decisions to become and stay self-employed. *Small Business Economics*, 42(4), 787–814. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-013-9514-8>

Deter, M., & Van Hoorn, A. (2023). Selection, socialization, and risk preferences in the finance industry: Longitudinal evidence for

German finance professionals. *Journal of Behavioral and Experimental Economics*, 102071. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2023.102071>

Dixon, M. A., & Sagas, M. (2007). The relationship between organizational support, Work-Family conflict, and the Job-Life satisfaction of university coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 78(3), 236–247. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2007.10599421>

Dodt, M., Fasold, F., & Memmert, D. (2021). Personality profile of team handball referees at expert level. *German Journal of Exercise and Sport Research*, 52(1), 58–67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12662-021-00759-x>

Dodt, M., Fasold, F., & Memmert, D. (2022). Personality profile of amateur team handball referees. *German Journal of Exercise and Sport Research*, 53(3), 253–265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12662-022-00837-8>

Dohmen, T., Falk, A., Huffman, D., Sunde, U., Schupp, J., & Wagner, G. G. (2011). Individual Risk Attitudes: Measurement, Determinants, and Behavioral Consequences. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 9(3), 522–550. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1542-4774.2011.01015.x>

Drakou, A., Kambitsis, C., Charachousou, Y., & Tzetzis, G. (2006). Exploring life satisfaction of sport coaches in Greece. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 6(3), 239–252. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184740601094985>

Easycrédit BBL. (2024). *easyCredit Basketball Bundesliga unterzeichnet „Freiburger Erklärung“ zur gemeinsamen Entwicklung des Basketballsports für Kinder im Grundschulalter*. [easyCredit Basketball Bundesliga signs the “Freiburg Declaration” for the joint development of basketball for primary school children.] Retrieved May 12, 2024, from <https://www.easycrédit-bbl.de/de/n/news/2024/april/easycrédit-basketball-bundesliga-unterzeichnet-freiburger-erklärung-zur-ge>

meinsamen-entwicklung-des-basketball-sports-fuer-kinder-im-grundschulalter

Entringer, T. M., & Kroeger, H. (2021). Weiterhin einsam und weniger zufrieden: Die Covid-19- Pandemie wirkt sich im zweiten Lockdown stärker auf das Wohlbefinden aus. [Still lonely and less satisfied: The Covid-19 pandemic is having a greater impact on well-being in the second lockdown.] *DIW Aktuell*, 67. <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/235920>

German Basketball Education Fund. (n.d.). *Nachwuchstrainerausbildung*. Easycredit BBL. [Youth coach training. Easycredit BBL.] Retrieved May 12, 2024, from <https://www.easycredit-bbl.de/nachwuchs/nachwuchstrainerausbildung>

German Football Association. (n.d.). *Entwicklungsmodell für Trainer*innen: Das Entwicklungsmodell ist der inhaltliche „rote Faden“ aller Aus- und Weiterbildungsangebote*. [Development model for trainers: The development model is the content-related “common thread” of all training and continuing education offerings.] Deutscher Fußballbund. <https://www.dfb-akademie.de/entwicklungsmodell-fuer-trainerinnen/-/id-11009545/>

Gerstorf, D., Ram, N., Estabrook, R., Schupp, J., Wagner, G. G., & Lindenberg, U. (2008). Life satisfaction shows terminal decline in old age: Longitudinal evidence from the German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP). *Developmental Psychology*, 44(4), 1148–1159. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.4.1148>

Goebel, J., Grabka, M. M., Liebig, S., Kroh, M., Richter, D., Schroeder, C., & Schupp, J. (2018). The German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP). *Jahrbücher Für Nationalökonomie Und Statistik*, 239(2), 345–360. <https://doi.org/10.1515/jbnst-2018-0022>

Graf, N., Schmitz, A., Scheller, S., CompetenceCentre for Innovations & Quality in

Leadership & Learning (CILL), Hochschule für angewandtes Management GmbH, Institut für Personalforschung, & Hochschule Pforzheim. (2022). *#nextPE – Zukunftsfähigkeit der Personalentwicklung*. [nextPE – Future viability of human resources development.]

Grochtdreis, T., Koenig, H., & Dams, J. (2021). Health Care Services Utilization of Persons with Direct, Indirect and without Migration Background in Germany: A Longitudinal Study Based on the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP). *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(21), 11640. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph182111640>

Headey, B., Hoehne, G., & Wagner, G. G. (2014). Does religion make you healthier and longer lived? Evidence for Germany. *Social Indicators Research*, 119(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-013-0546-x>

Headey, B., & Muffels, R. (2017). A Theory of Life Satisfaction Dynamics: Stability, Change and Volatility in 25-Year Life Trajectories in Germany. *Social Indicators Research*, 140(2), 837–866. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-017-1785-z>

Headey, B., Muffels, R., & Wagner, G. G. (2013). Choices which change life satisfaction: Similar results for Australia, Britain and Germany. *Social Indicators Research*, 112(3), 725–748. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-012-0079-8>

Heß, M., Von Scheve, C., Schupp, J., & Wagner, G. G. (2013). Sind Politiker risikofreudiger als das Volk? Eine empirische Studie zu Mitgliedern des Deutschen Bundestags. *SOEPpapers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research, Deutsches Institut Für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW), Berlin*, 545. <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/70780>

Holst, E., & Busch, A. (2010). *Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung: Führungskräfte-Monitor 2010*. [German Institute for

- Economic Research: Executive Monitor 2010.] Retrieved October 8, 2022, from <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/129186>
- Kroh, M. (2006). *An experimental evaluation of popular Well-Being measures*. <https://hdl.handle.net/10419/18439>
- Kroh, M., Kuehne, S., Kipp, C., & Richter, D. (2017). Income, social support networks, life satisfaction: Lesbians, gays, and bisexuals in Germany. *DIW Economic Bulletin*, 7, 335–345. <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/168622/1/897422481.pdf>
- Landessportbund Niedersachsen. (2021). Mentoringprogramm im Basketball. [Basketball mentoring program.] *LSB Magazin*. https://www.lsb-niedersachsen.de/fileadmin/daten/dokumente/lsb-magazin/Trainerserie/NBV-LSB-Magazin_11_21-17.pdf
- McKinsey & Company. (2023). *The State of Organizations 2023*.
- Nagel, S., Seippel, Ø., Breuer, C., Feiler, S., Elmoose-Østerlund, K., Llopis-Goig, R., Nichols, G., Perényi, S., Piątkowska, M., & Scheerder, J. (2019). Volunteer satisfaction in sports clubs: A multilevel analysis in 10 European countries. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 55(8), 1074–1093. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1012690219880419>
- Norris, L. A., Didymus, F. F., & Kaiseler, M. (2017). Stressors, coping, and well-being among sports coaches: A systematic review. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 33, 93–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.08.005>
- RatSWD [Rat für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsdaten]. (2017). Forschungsethische Grundsätze und Prüfverfahren in den Sozial- und Wirtschaftswissenschaften. [Research ethics principles and review procedures in the social and economic sciences.] *RatSWD Output*, 9(5), 53. <https://doi.org/10.17620/02671.1>
- Richter, D., Rohrer, J. M., Metzinger, M., Nestler, W., Weinhardt, M., & Schupp, J. (2017). SOEP scales manual (updated for SOEP-Core v32.1). *SOEP Survey Papers*. <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/156115/1/882143492.pdf>
- Sandvik, E., Diener, E., & Seidlitz, L. (1993). Subjective Well-Being: the convergence and stability of Self-Report and Non-Self-Report measures. *Journal of Personality*, 61(3), 317–342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1993.tb00283.x>
- Schimmack, U., Krause, P., Wagner, G. G., & Schupp, J. (2009). Stability and Change of Well Being: An experimentally enhanced latent State-Trait-Error analysis. *Social Indicators Research*, 95(1), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11205-009-9443-8>
- Schmidt, K., Schultz, T., & Wagner, G. G. (2023). How do journalists view the world?. A comparative empirical analysis of personality traits and political views, based on the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP). *Journalism Research*, Vol. 6(3_4), 284–317. https://doi.org/10.1453/2569-152X-3_42023-13637-en
- Schraepler, L., Schraepler, J., & Wagner, G. G. (2019). Wie (in)stabil ist die Lebenszufriedenheit? Eine Sequenzanalyse mit Daten des Sozio-oekonomischen Panels (SOEP). [How (in)stable is life satisfaction? A sequential analysis using data from the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP).] *SOEPpapers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research*. <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/202021/1/1671510399.pdf>
- Schroeder, C., Bartels, C., Goebler, K., Grabka, M. M., Koenig, J., Siegers, R., & Zinn, S. (2020). Verbesserung der Forschungsdateninfrastruktur im Bereich Hochvermögender mit dem Sozio-oekonomischen Panel (SOEP). [Improving the research data infrastructure in the area of high net worth individuals with the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP).] *SOEPpapers on Multidisciplinary Panel Data Research, Deutsches Institut Für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW), Berlin, 1084*. <http://hdl.handle>

net/10419/222657

Siegers, R., Steinhauer, H. W., & Schuett, J. (2022). SOEP-Core v37 - *Documentation of sample sizes and panel attrition in the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) (1984 until 2020)*. <http://hdl.handle.net/10419/259554>

Thieme, P., & Dittrich, D. a. V. (2015). A Life-Span perspective on life satisfaction. *Social Science Research Network*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2612397>

Wagner, G. G., Arslan, R. C., Dorn, F., Gaebler, S., Griesse, F., Hertwig, R., Kauder, B., Krause, M., Lorenz, L., Mosler, M., & Potrafke, N. (2018). Risikoeinschätzungen von Ökonomen. [Risk assessments by economists.] *Ifo Schnelldienst*, 71(07), 61–64. https://pure.mpg.de/pubman/item/item_2619679_9/component/file_2622630/id10007831.pdf

Wagner, G. G., Goebel, J., Krause, P., Pischner, R., & Sieber, I. (2008). Das Sozio-oekonomische Panel (SOEP): Multidisziplinäres Haushaltspanel und Kohorten-

studie für Deutschland – Eine Einführung (für neue Datennutzer) mit einem Ausblick (für erfahrene Anwender). [The Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP): Multidisciplinary Household Panel and Cohort Study for Germany – An introduction (for new data users) with an outlook (for experienced users).] *AStA. Wirtschafts- Und Sozialstatistisches Archiv*, 2(4), 301–328. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11943-008-0050-y>

Wunder, J., Priem, M., Wagner, G. G., & Stoll, O. (2024). Does the German sports system recruit coaches with a functional personality?—Attempting an answer by comparing German basketball coaches with teachers and managers. *German Journal of Exercise and Sport Research*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12662-024-00963-5>

Wunder, J., Wagner, G. G., & Stoll, O. (2022). Trainerinnen und Trainer im deutschen Basketball – eine (un)definierbare Menge? [Coaches in German basketball – an (un)definable group of people?] *Leistungssport*, 6.

Corresponding author:

Johannes Wunder

Doktorand, Universität Halle-Wittenberg

Institute of Sport Sciences

von-Seckendorff-Platz 2

06120 Halle (Saale), Germany

Email: johannes.wunder@student.uni-halle.de