



Article scientifique

Article

2011

Published version

Open Access

This is the published version of the publication, made available in accordance with the publisher's policy.

From teacher to friend: the evolving nature of the coach-athlete relationship

Antonini Philippe, Roberta; Sagar, S. Sam; Huguet, Sophie; Paquet, Yvan; Jowett, Sophia

How to cite

ANTONINI PHILIPPE, Roberta et al. From teacher to friend: the evolving nature of the coach-athlete relationship. In: International journal of sport psychology, 2011, vol. 42, n° 1, p. 1–23.

This publication URL: <https://archive-ouverte.unige.ch/unige:25992>

From Teacher to Friend: The Evolving Nature of the Coach-Athlete Relationship

ROBERTA ANTONINI PHILIPPE*, SAM S. SAGAR**, SOPHIE HUGUET,
YVAN PAQUET, and SOPHIA JOWETT*****

(*)*Swiss Federal Institute of Sport Magglingen, Switzerland*

(**) *Leeds Metropolitan University, United Kingdom*

(***) *Université Henri Poincaré Nancy, France*

(****) *University of Reunion, DIMPS, E.A.4075, France*

(*****) *Loughborough University, United Kingdom*

OBJECTIVES: *The aim of the present study was to explore the nature and development of the coach-athlete relationship from the perspective of both an athlete and a coach.*

METHOD: *Two coaches (1 female and 1 male; aged 42 and 48, respectively) and eight elite level swimmers (competing at international level; 4 females and 4 males; M_{age} 18.6 years, $SD = 3.1$ years) from the Swiss National Swimming team were interviewed individually. Interviews ranged between 60 and 90 minutes and were audio-recorded. The athletes and their respective coaches had been working together for an average of 3.5 years.*

RESULTS: *Data analysis revealed that the coach-athlete relationship gradually evolved over time, and that three specific dimensions operated in the development of this relationship: (1) developing bonds; (2) developing co-operation; and, (3) power relation.*

CONCLUSIONS: *The coach-athlete relationship occurs naturally and evolves over time. This evolution in the relationship is beneficial to the athlete's personal growth, mental strength, and athletic development. The study enhances knowledge and has theoretical and practical implications for the coach-athlete dyad.*

KEY WORDS: Athlete, Coach, Interpersonal Interaction, Power Relationship, Swimming.

A key relationship in the sport domain is between coaches and their athletes. The coach-athlete relationship is influential in many athletes' lives and plays a significant role in young athletes' social and athletic development (Jowett, 2005; Smith & Smoll, 2007). Harmonious coach-athlete relation-

For correspondence: Roberta Antonini-Philippe, Swiss Federal Institute of Sport, Magglingen, 532 Magglingen, Switzerland (e-mail: roberta.antonini@nyon.ch)

ships have been shown to have positive effect on athletes' performance, perceived satisfaction, and psychological well-being (e.g., Antonini-Philippe & Seiler, 2006; Jowett & Cockerill, 2003; Jowett & Frost, 2007). Over the past thirty years, a great deal of conceptual and empirical research has examined issues pertaining to coach leadership (e.g., Chelladurai & Saleh, 1978; Riemer & Toon, 2001) and coach behaviour (e.g., Smith, Smoll, & Hunt, 1977; Cumming, Smith, & Smoll, 2006). Less research attention has been given to the nature of the interpersonal relationships between coaches and their athletes. This, therefore, is the focus of the present study.

Current research on coach-athlete relationship quality considers this relationship to be a complex phenomenon that influences and is influenced by numerous variables (see Jowett & Poczwardowski, 2007). Findings generally show that the quality of the coach-athlete relationship is associated with athletes' perceptions of satisfaction with training and performance (Jowett & Nezelek, *in press*), coach-created motivational climate (Olympiou, Jowett, & Duda, 2008), achievement goals and intrinsic motivation (Adie & Jowett, *in press*), empathic accuracy (Lorimer & Jowett, 2009), passion for sport (Lafrenière, Jowett, Vallerand, Donahue, & Lorimer, 2008), team cohesion (Jowett & Chaundy, 2004), collective efficacy (Jowett, Shanmugam, & Caccoulis, *in press*), physical self-concept (Jowett, 2008a), self-control and fear of failure (Sagar & Jowett, 2010a), and interpersonal communication (Sagar & Jowett, 2010b). Several models of coach-athlete relationship have been proposed in the last decade. Three contemporary models are discussed below.

Contemporary Models of Coach-Athlete Relationship

Acknowledging that the study of coach-athlete relationship has not been the subject of sufficient research, Wylleman (2000) proposed a conceptual model to delineate important aspects that define this relationship. Accordingly, the aspects that define the relationship include: (a) an acceptance-rejection dimension, which refers to the positive or negative attitudes that coaches and athletes may adopt toward their relationship, and during their interactions; (b) a dominance-submission dimension, which refers to adopting a strong or weak position toward one another; and, (c) a social-emotional dimension, which refers to taking an interpersonal and emotional stance toward one another. Although the model attempts to explain the reciprocal behaviour between coaches and athletes, its limitation is the lack of explanation of when, how, and why these behaviours occur in the coach-athlete relationship (Jowett, 2007). For example, can both the coach and the athlete

adopt a dominant or submissive stance? If so, at what specific situations? Moreover, how do the three aspects or dimensions of the relationship inter-relate? Subsequently, with limited empirical evidence and theoretical details, this model appears to provide limited explanations on the nature of the coach-athlete relationship.

Another model of the coach-athlete relationship was proposed by Poczwadowski and colleagues (Poczwadowski, Barott, & Peregoy, 2002; Poczwadowski, Henschen, & Barott, 2002) following two qualitative studies. The results of these studies defined the coach-athlete relationship as a repeated pattern of mutual care and support between the athlete and coach. Moreover, the model identifies three phases in the development of the coach-athlete relationship: (a) the pre-relational phase, which also includes the beginning stage; (b) the transition and conclusion phase; and, (c) the post-relational phase. This model posits that the coach and the athlete influence one another on professional and personal levels. This suggestion was later supported by Jowett and Poczwadowski (2007) who stated that “athletes’ performance enhancement and psychological well-being are in the centre of the coach-athlete relationship” (p. 4).

A third conceptual model was developed by Jowett and colleagues (Jowett, 2007a; Jowett & Cockerill, 2003; Jowett & Ntoumanis, 2004). This model has gathered the most research momentum in the coach-athlete relationship literature over the last decade. The model is known as the 3+1Cs (see Jowett, 2007a, 2007b) and defines the coach-athlete relationship as a situation in which coaches and athletes’ Closeness, Commitment, and Complementarity are Co-orientated. The model initially proposed three dimensions in the coach-athlete relationship: closeness, co-orientation, and complementarity (see Jowett & Meek, 2000). The fourth dimension, commitment, was added to the model subsequently (see Jowett & Ntoumanis, 2004; Jowett, 2006, 2009). Closeness is defined as an affective or emotional interdependence that encompasses relational properties such as liking, trusting, and respecting one another. Commitment is defined as the intention of athletes and coaches to maintain the athletic relationship overtime and, thereby, to maximise its outcomes. Complementarity refers to interpersonal behaviours of co-operation and affiliation that are underlined by mutual responsiveness, friendliness, and acceptance. Co-orientation refers to coach and athlete having a degree of perceptual congruence or common ground whereby they think, feel, and/or behave in a similar or corresponding fashion.

Although we acknowledge the important contribution that these models have made to the field of coach-athlete relationship, in the present study, we applied Nitsch and Hackfort’s (1984) model of social relations. This model

appears to share a number of features with the models outlined above and, thus, ostensibly integrates important aspects of interpersonal relationships such as power, affiliation, and co-operation. The Nitsch and Hackfort's (1984) model describes three distinct dimensions in social relations: (a) the *bond* dimension, which is defined through sympathy and antipathy; (b) the *power* dimension, which is defined through authority and accountability; and, (c) the *co-operation* dimension, which is defined through task distribution. Conflicts between members in social interaction result from differences in one or more of these dimensions. Relationships are based on sustaining agreement between members (which is not explicit but rather implicit) on both intentional and instrumental aspects. The intentional aspect refers to the mutual agreement and acceptance of goals and purposes of the social interaction process. The instrumental aspect refers to the conditions under which the interaction takes place. Each of these aspects of social interaction encompasses two sub-categories. The intentional aspect encompasses the interaction purpose (which relates to the intended effect of the interaction) and the interaction themes (which relate to the types of interaction). The instrumental aspect encompasses the social interaction principles (which provide a normative framework for the interaction) and the interaction rules (which define and limit the interaction within the boundaries of the interaction rules). This conceptualisation of social relations provided the theoretical framework for the present study.

Despite the potential usefulness of Nitsch and Hackfort's (1984) model of social relations in the study of the coach-athlete relationship and in enhancing knowledge on this relationship, to our knowledge only one sport-related study has used it to date. That is, Seiler, Kevesligeti, and Valley (1999) applied Nitsch and Hackfort's model to investigate the social relations between coaches (males and females) and their female athletes. This interview based-study revealed that social relations included both intentional (i.e., social interaction purpose and themes) and instrumental aspects (i.e., social interaction principles and rules). Mutual agreement and acceptance of goals were found to be important and enhancing components of the coach-athlete relationship. In contrast, discrepancies in the expectations of the coaches and their athletes were found to be potential obstacles for performance improvement. Accordingly, applying the Nitsch and Hackfort's (1984) model of social relations in further research that examines the coach-athlete relationship can help generate new knowledge as well as integrate and consolidate existing knowledge. Poczwadowski, Barott, and Jowett (2006) proposed that the field of interpersonal relationships in sport would benefit from applying diverse theoretical and conceptual models.

The Present Study

The present study sought to extend knowledge on the coach-athlete interpersonal relationship by applying Nitsch and Hackfort's (1984) model of social relations. Although this model has received sparse attention from researchers in the sport domain, it is relevant and can potentially provide a useful framework for studying the coach-athlete relationship and, thereby, extend knowledge. The coach-athlete relationship is central to the process of coaching as well as to the psychosocial and physical development of the athlete (Jowett, 2005; 2007a) and, therefore, is an important area of investigation. A better understanding of this complex phenomenon has both a practical and theoretical value. For example, it can highlight the content of power relation or balance within the coach-athlete dyad, and how power associates with both the intensity and type of bonds the coach and the athlete develop. Moreover, it can reveal the manner to which co-operation transpires in the dyad and what its links are with the power manifested and bonds developed between the coach and the athlete. Accordingly, the aim of the present study was to explore the nature and the development of coach-athlete relationship from the perspective of the athlete and the coach.

We employed a qualitative methodology because it can offer valuable insight into the coach-athlete relationship and an understanding of its nature and its evolutionary development. Specifically, we adopted social constructionist epistemology because it allowed us to explore the process of the development of the relationship as well as the experiences and their meaning for the participants. The basic tenet of this theoretical perspective is that people ascribe meaning and construct knowledge through their interactions with the world (Schwandt, 2003). Social interactions take place in such a way that people are continually interpreting the meaning of their environment (which includes the actions of others) and act on the basis of this ascribed meaning. Language is at the core of social interaction and it creates meaning and, consequently, reality. Accordingly, adopting a social constructionist theoretical framework is especially useful for studying meaning construction in the coach-athlete relationship because both parties are acting in the relationship where meanings (regarding the self and others) are co-constructed in the process of the relationship (Bugental & Johnston, 2000). Examining how athletes and coaches construct meaning and interpret their interactions and experiences in the course of their working together can offer an insight both into the nature of their relationship and the processes of its development. Finally, interviews with coaches and athletes offer flexibility and freedom to explore their relationship, which is a dynamic process, as well as their working experiences from their perspectives and, thus, can lend a valuable depth of understanding of the coach-athlete relationship.

Method

PARTICIPANTS

Eight swimmers (4 females, 4 males; $M_{\text{age}} 18.6$ years, $SD = 3.1$ years) and their two coaches (1 female, 1 male; aged 42 and 48 years, respectively) from the Swiss National Swimming team volunteered to participate in the study. They were selected for the present study because of their high level of expertise as well as the length of time that they had been working together. The athletes and their respective coaches had been working together for an average of 3.5 years, and were spending an average of 9.5 hours per week working together. The athletes were members of the national team and competed at the national and international levels and, thus, were considered to be top level swimmers. Similarly, their coaches were also considered to be highly experienced top level coaches. We considered these participants to be relevant case studies, fitting the aims of the present study and likely to provide rich data that would be of interest and value to the study, leading to saturation (Curtis, Smith, & Washburn, 2000; Morse, 1995). Moreover, conducting in-depth interviews with the participants can yield a quality of data that extract meaning.

In order to protect the participants' identities, we refer to the athletes in this article by the letter "A" followed by an identity number from 1 to 8 (i.e., A1-A8; A1, A2, A4, and A6 were the male swimmers, and A3, A5, A7, and A8 were the female swimmers). Similarly, we refer to the coaches by the letter "C" followed by an identity number (i.e., C1 the male coach, and C2 the female coach). The coach-athlete dyads (i.e., the partnership between coach and athlete as a whole) are formed as follows: athletes 1 to 4 (i.e., A1-A4) form a dyad with coach 1 (i.e., C1) and athletes 5-8 (i.e., A5-A8) form a dyad with coach 2 (i.e., C2).

PROCEDURES

After obtaining a university ethical approval for the study and the permission of the Swiss National Swimming association, swimmers and coaches were approached at their training centre. They were asked if they would volunteer for the study, and were informed of its aims (to examine the nature of the coach-athlete relationship) and procedures, its confidential and anonymous nature. Participants signed a consent form for their participation and a time was arranged for a pre-interview meeting. The aim of this meeting was to meet the participants individually in a more personal manner than the initial meeting (i.e., when they were asked to volunteer for the study), and to build rapport (Arskey & Knight, 1999). The meeting also provided an opportunity to explain the aim of the study to the participants, to answer their questions regarding the study and the interview, to discuss any concerns that they might have about participating in the interview, and to arrange a mutually convenient time for the interview.

DATA COLLECTION

Interviews were conducted in a quiet room located in the swimming centre where the Swiss national swimming team trained over a weekend. Only the participant and the researcher (i.e., the first author) were present during the interview. Each interview lasted 60-90 minutes and was audio-recorded with the interviewee's consent.

THE INTERVIEW

A semi-structured interview was conducted individually with each participant to allow them to relate to their own experiences in a free and open manner, and to disclose more information than perhaps they would disclose in a focus group interview (Sagar, Bush, Jowett, 2010; Sagar & Lavallee, 2010). A pre-designed interview guide was used as a flexible framework and was based on key questions most pertinent to the study. The order of topics and questioning were free to vary within the natural flow of the conversation, and related issues that were thought to be important by the participants were allowed to surface. The interview guide was divided into four sections, along with pre- and post-interview sections. The pre-interview section aimed to reiterate the study aims and procedures, to reassure the participants of confidentiality and anonymity, and to orient them to the interview process and make them feel comfortable to disclose information (Arksey & Knight, 1999).

The first section of the interview sought to ascertain background and demographic information about the participants. For example, athletes and coaches were asked how they got into the sport, how long they had been working together, and how much time they spent with each other per week. The athletes were also asked how long they had been competing, and the coaches were asked how long they had been coaching. The second part of the interview comprised questions about their early and present relationship, addressing the following five issues: (1) the nature of their relationship (e.g., "Describe your relationship with your coach/swimmer when you started working together/and now"); (2) their feelings towards one another (e.g., "Describe the feelings you have for your coach/swimmer when you started working together/and now"); (3) their roles in the relationship (e.g., "Describe how you view your own role in the relationship with your coach/swimmer when you started working together/and now"); (4) decisions making regarding training and competition (e.g., "Explain how objectives and goals were set up, and how decisions were made, when you started working together/and now"); and, (5) the nature of their conversations (e.g., "Tell me what you talked about when you were together when you started working together/and now"). Finally, they were asked to summarise the changes that had occurred in the relationship, which they had described during the interview, over the years of their working together (i.e., their feelings towards each other, roles, decision making, and the nature of conversations).

The post-interview section offered both parties (i.e., the researcher and the participant) an opportunity to clarify and refine aspects of the interview. It also allowed the participants the opportunity to talk about issues that were raised in the interview and to "let go" of any emotions that in-depth interviews can evoke (King, 1996); thereby providing closure on the experience and ensuring that the participants left the interview in a positive frame of mind.

Switzerland is a bi-lingual country, therefore, participants were offered the choice to be interviewed either in French or German. Five athletes and one coach (i.e., A1, A3, A4, A7, and C1) preferred to be interviewed in German, and the others (i.e., A2, A5, A6, A8, and C2) preferred French. All interviews were conducted by the first author, who is fluent in both languages.

DATA ANALYSIS

The interviews were transcribed verbatim in their original language by the first and third authors (both are fluent in French and German), and then inductively and deductively

analysed using the principles of thematic analysis (Smith, 1995) to identify meaning units and common themes and categories; meaning units were raw-data quotes that were taken from the interview transcripts that had common meaning and captured a distinct concept (Tesch, 1990). These meaning units were coded and then organised into a hierarchical structure, resulting in higher- and lower-order themes. The inductive process revealed salient themes and concepts in the data and determined the relation between them and how they reflected the phenomena studied. Constant comparison of codes for similarities and differences enabled us to categorise the data. This process helped us to interpret the data and develop an explanation of the issue under investigation and to construct subthemes. It also served a form of trustworthiness (in that we were constantly re-affirming the meanings of the categories). The deductive aspect of the analysis was based on the three dimensions of social interactions proposed by Nitsch and Hackfort's (1984) model (i.e., power, co-operation, and bond).

Trustworthiness of data. We employed several techniques to ensure the trustworthiness and credibility of the data. First, we conducted member checks by giving each participant a transcript of their interview to verify its accuracy and a written summary of the emerging data themes. All participants agreed with our interpretations and reported being able to relate to their own experiences when reading their interview transcripts and summaries. Second, we established trustworthiness of the analytical process through an audit trail, which is a record of the development of the analysis process, and that allowed us to verify rigour and to minimise interpretive bias (Patton, 2002). Finally, we took a collaborative approach in the process of data analysis to reduce interpretive bias. Two members of the research team (i.e., the first and third author) independently identified and coded meaning units in each of the interview transcript and, subsequently, engaged in several reflective discussions to ensure agreement in the process of interpretation and coding of themes. This ensured coding reliability (inter-rater reliability) and minimised interpretive bias (Patton, 2002). The process of reflection and verification between the researchers continued until all themes were agreed and verified, after which the final themes and categories were established.

The data were collected in French and German and analysed in the original language by the first and third authors, who are fluent in these languages as well as in English. Subsequently, they translated into English the meaning units (i.e., the raw-data quotes) that were taken from the interview transcripts and the final themes and categories that had been established. The translation was validated (i.e., authenticated) by a colleague who is also fluent in all the three languages. Where discrepancies in translation occurred, the translation was amended until the three translators were satisfied that the English version captured the words and meanings of the participants.

Results

Data analyses revealed three dimensions in the coach-athlete relationship: developing bonds, developing co-operation, and power relation. We present each dimension separately below, including its higher- and lower-order themes. Summaries of the dimensions and themes are presented in Tables I-IV. Additionally, direct quotes from the participants are shared to illustrate the meanings of particular themes.

DIMENSION 1: DEVELOPING BONDS

This dimension illustrates that the coach-athlete relationship is a dynamic process that evolves from a functional relationship, whereby the coach takes the role of a teacher/instructor, to one that is more personal in nature, whereby the coach engages with the athlete on a more personal level and they develop a bond (see Table I). This evolution in the nature of the relationship appears to involve two aspects: affect and behaviour. Affect relates to the gradual development of interpersonal feelings between the coach and the athlete and the growth of confidence, appreciation, and respect for one another. This in turn leads to the development of friendship, bond, and even love and affection between them. Thus, it appears that their relationship gradually evolves from an activity-based type of relationship to a more personal type that involves feelings and a bond between them. For example, coach 1 explained: “At the beginning, I saw him as just a good swimmer that I appreciated for his technical qualities, but over time deeper feelings emerged”. Similarly, coach 2 revealed: “He (*her athlete*) often comes to our house for dinner... We exchange text messages almost every day”. These statements illustrate that the coach-athlete relation gradually became more personal, and the athlete occupied an important place in the coach’s life and, possibly, vice versa. Thus, the coach’s role gradually changed from a teacher of performance-related skills to a friend. This growth in friendship and feelings towards one another appears to be salient in the development of the coach-athlete relationship.

Behaviour emerged from the data as the second aspect in the evolving nature of the coach-athlete relationship. This relates to athletes initially having to adapt their behaviour to fit with their coach’s requirements, which are

TABLE I
Summary of themes in Dimention1: Developing bonds

Themes	Dependence	Interdependence	Raw Data Examples
Affect	Confidence	Friendship	“The respect I had for him has changed into a kind of feeling of love and friendship and going out together. Over time, we became much closer to each other” (A1)
	Admiration Appreciation	Love	
Behaviour	Adaptation	Complementarity	“At the beginning I had to adapt to his behaviour and his style... It took time for us to get to know each other, and then it was no longer a need for us to adapt to each other because we complemented one another” (A3).

based on the coach's knowledge and expertise. For example, athlete 4 revealed, "He is the one with the knowledge that will help me to improve my swimming skills, so in the beginning I just had to listen and adapt to him". As the athletes gradually developed performance skills and became more knowledgeable in their sport, however, they seemed to need their coaches less for their professional expertise and more for their friendship, support, and personal closeness. This is illustrated by athlete 2's statement, "Even though I know I can train on my own, I still need him, he has become an integral part of my life". Thus, their relationship seems gradually to evolve and develop into a close and personal relationship of friendship in which they complement one another.

DIMENSION 2: DEVELOPING CO-OPERATION

This dimension shows that the coach-athlete relationship develops through co-operation and collaboration (see Table II). It evolves over time, from being prescriptive, whereby all decisions and activities are set and directed by the coach, to becoming collaborative in nature, whereby activities and decisions are shared and made jointly by the coach and the athlete. Evidence for this was provided both by the coaches and the athletes. The athletes emphasised the value to the relationship of the coaches' good and effective communication and listening skills. They perceived the ideal coach

TABLE II
Summary of themes in Dimension 2: Developing co-operation

Themes	Dependence	Interdependence	Raw Data Examples
Communication	Monologue	Dialogue	"With time, we gradually began to have a dialogue between us, and it was no longer just a one-way communication!" (A8)
Goals/ Objectives	Set by coach	Joint decisions	"It's much more motivating for me now that we decide on the season's goals and objectives together" (A1)
Tasks/ activities	Set by coach	Set by athlete	"Now I'm more motivated because I don't just comply with what he sets for me to do. Now I decide myself what tasks to perform" (A3)
Support/ Assistance	Verbal exchange	Joint problem solving	"When we have a problem now, he helps me to solve it. But in the early days, when we started together, he didn't" (A6)
Change in goals	Follow instructions	Matured understanding	"Now I know and understand why we do certain drills and things. So the goal has changed. Its no longer for me just to do what he tells me to do, but it's for me to understand <i>why</i> I do these things" (A6).

as having the capacity to listen and engage with the athlete because this could increase and improve co-operation between the coach and the athlete. This, they believed, would enhance the quality of their relationship, with the athlete and the coach acting together as a cohesive team, based on dialogue and sharing, and the joint development of ideas and decision-making; thereby enhancing the athlete's performance and skills, and ultimately achieving success in the their sporting pursuit.

Both coaches and athletes reported that the content of their conversations with each other had changed over times. They revealed that at the beginning of their relationship their conversations revolved predominantly around issues relating to performance skills and improvement (e.g., technical instructions, advice on performance execution). As the relationship progressed, however, conversations increasingly related to more personal issues. For example, Athlete 5 stated,

“He (*coach*) always told us (*swimming team*) what to do. We were very rarely allowed to give our opinion... Now the situation is reverse, now we take an active part in the exchange. We have a dialogue, conversations not just about swimming but about lots of other things”.

The coaches also discussed the change in the content of their conversations. They explained that at the beginning of the relationship conversations were exclusively about issues of performance and technical skills. The coaches set goals and objectives for the athletes and provided them with instructions on tasks and training drills that they wanted them to carry out; these were based on the coaches' knowledge and expertise and aimed at improving the athletes' skills, knowledge, and performance. In turn, the athletes had to comply and accept the coach-imposed tasks, activities and decisions, and to follow their instructions without giving their views or opinions. This, however, changed gradually over the years of their working together, and as the athletes became more experienced and knowledgeable the coaches invited them to express their opinions on training- and performance-related issues, and to contribute to decision making. The coaches integrated the athletes' opinions and knowledge into their own when working together on matters such as designing the work schedule, setting goals and objectives, and making decisions. Thus, these became joint activities. This is illustrated by coach 2's statement, “Now I increasingly involve my swimmers in the achievement of the goals and tasks they have to perform and in decision making. There is now more co-operation between us, which is important”. This was indorsed by the athlete of this coach who said, “Things

have changed a lot over time. She no longer decides what results and swimming times I must achieve in the course of the season. I now play an integral part in the planning and decision making" (A6).

It seems that taking part in decision making with the coach made the athletes value the tasks/activities more and feel autonomous. Tasks that, early on in the relationship, were decided and imposed by the coach, had gradually become tasks that were agreed upon jointly and, as such, were valued more by the athlete. Athlete 7 explained, "It's motivating because I decide myself what I must do and what I want to do! (*stating with pride*) I am no longer doing what the coach wants, but what I want. Of-course, it is always in accordance with the objectives that we have set together". Thus, it seems that this change in the relationship had a positive impact on the athletes as it gave them a sense of autonomy in decision making, and elicited feelings of joy and pride, and boosted their motivation.

Another aspect of the coach-athlete relationship relates to the coach's provision of support and assistance to the athlete. The swimmers revealed that at the beginning of the relationship verbal exchanges took place only on performance-related matters and the athlete had to resolve problems on their own. This changed gradually over time and problem solving became a joint effort with the coach's help. This was explained by athlete 8,

"Only now my coach helps me to solve my problems. In the past, our discussions were far more superficial, just about training... but as time went by, we started to also talk about my problems.... I'm grateful to him because it helps me to know now what I need to do".

The final theme in the dimension of developing co-operation is change in goals. This refers to the athletes gradually learning and maturing in terms of the nature of the tasks that they undertake and the goals that they set for themselves as their responsibility increases over time. This phase is characterised by the athletes' growing knowledge and understanding of the activity (both the physical and the psychological aspects), so that when they learn a new skill they have a better understanding of its purpose. This was explained by athlete 6, "Before, I just did what the coach told me because I had to even if I didn't understand why I was doing it. But now I understand what I'm doing, and the reason for doing the task". Similarly, coach 1 explained, "Athletes can only do something effectively when they understand it clearly". Thus, the athletes' increased knowledge and understanding of the activity enhanced their ability to execute the task. This increased knowledge and understanding came from the increased responsibility and autonomy that the

coach gradually gave them as their relationship evolved and developed over time, and as the athlete's knowledge increased.

DIMENSION 3: POWER RELATION

This dimension illustrates how the power relation in the coach-athlete dyad gradually changed over time. Data analysis revealed that coaches' roles and behaviours changed from autocratic to supportive, while, concurrently, athletes changed from being dependent on their coaches to becoming autonomous. This dimension encompasses two higher-order themes: the role of the coach, and the role of the athlete in the relationship.

The role of the coach in the relationship encompasses three facets: expert role, organisational role, and leadership role (see Table III). Over time, this role evolved from an autocratic style of leadership to a more supportive role that offered athletes more freedom and flexibility in their relationship with the coach. Although coaches retained their expert role in the relationship, they no longer imposed their authority in the way they did at the beginning of the relationship. Coach 1 explained,

“At the beginning, I used to give the swimmers orders on how they should swim. However, as time went by I realised that this was pointless... because they need to be able to express themselves as they wish and, above all, in ways that they feel are right for them.... I have learnt that swimmers need to be able to express their feelings in the water. That's the only way they will swim well”.

The coaches' organisational and leadership roles have also changed over time, from imposing their wishes and decisions on the athletes, to seeking the athletes' opinions and taking their wishes into account when making performance- and organisation-related decisions. Thus, decision making became a

TABLE III
Summary of the theme 'the role of the coach' in Dimension 3: Power relation

Themes	Dependence	Interdependence	Raw Data Examples
Expert role	Imposed	Free choice	“I had to swim the way he wanted, but now I can choose” (A1)
Organisational role	Imposed	Joint decisions	“At training camp, she decided who I should share a room with. Now, she takes my opinion into account” (A3)
Leadership role	Imposed	Joint decisions	“He used to decide everything, and sometimes it was I hard for me to accept. Now I have a say in the matter which is much nicer” (A8).

shared and joint effort in the relationship rather than one imposed by the coach. This was explained by Coach 2, “Over time, I started to give my swimmers more freedom and autonomy. I involved them in decisions relating to organisation of various things”. Both of the coaches that were interviewed stated that the nature of their roles had evolved over time, whereby they were no longer just about helping the athlete to learn, progress, and improve performance – which entails planning, supervising, training, and managing the tasks associated with organising training sessions and competitions – but were also about them focusing on the athlete as the person. As such, they gradually began to take into account the personality and character of each individual athlete as well as their particular needs, expectations, goals, and ambitions.

The role of the athlete in the relationship also appears to evolve over time whereby they become less dependent on their coach and more independent and autonomous (see Table IV). In the course of this transition, as well as their personal growth and development and mental strength, the athletes’ technical knowledge/expertise and responsibility also increased. The athletes progressed from being dependant on their coaches’ technical expertise to becoming more autonomous, as their level of knowledge and expertise had increased. This was explained by athlete 3, “Now I know how I should swim and what I need to do. I have the knowledge that I gained over the years. From a technical point of view, I think I have nothing more to learn”. Thus, it appears that possessing technical knowledge gave athletes the sense of mastery, independence, and freedom in the relationship. It also gave them the feeling of psychological growth and development, whereby they felt con-

TABLE IV
Summary of the theme ‘the role of the athlete’ in Dimension 3: Power relation

Themes	Dependence	Interdependence	Raw Data Examples
Knowledge	Dependence	Independence	“At the beginning, I swam the way he wanted me. But I have greatly improved my swimming style and techniques and now I feel I’m expert in what I do, and I no longer need his help. I’m independent now” (A2)
Mental strength	Lack of Confidence	Confidence	“I always needed him to be with me present at competitions, and to motivate me. This was important for me. But during the last few years, I achieved some good performances without him being there with me” (A2)
Responsibility	Compliance	Control	“My role was to do everything he asked of me to do. Now, I’m the one who decides, I make my own decisions” (A1).

fidant and self-motivated instead of dependent on their coach to motivate them. This was explained by athlete 1, "Now, if my coach is not with me in the competition, it does not matter because I know what I need to do and I have lots of drive and determination. Now I know how to motivate myself and don't need him to be with me to motivate me".

The athletes' responsibility for their own performance and actions also increased over this transition period as they moved from being obedient and compliant with their coaches' instructions, wishes, and decisions, to gradually becoming more autonomous. Becoming autonomous meant that the athletes had to take responsibility for their decisions, actions, and personal development; for example, "If I do something, it is because I have decided to do it, and the outcome is my responsibility" (A2). Overall, the findings show that the evolution and the gradual change in the power relation in the coach-athlete dyad had a positive impact on the athletes' personal growth and mental strength as well as on their development as athletes.

Discussion

The present study applied Nitsch and Hackfort's (1984) model of social relations to examine the nature and the development of the coach-athlete relationship from both the perspective of the athlete and the coach. In accordance with this model, our findings support the three dimensions that define the nature and development of coach-athlete relationships: developing bonds, developing co-operation, and power relation. The coach-athlete relationship seems to have evolved from a functional activity-based type of relationship, where the coach acts as the teacher and provides instructions, to a personal-based type of relationship, where interpersonal feelings, friendship relations and affective bonds developed between them. Thus, a personal relationship emerged over time between the coach and the athlete. This gradual evolution in the coach-athlete relationship had positive impact on the athletes' personal growth and mental strength as well as on their development as athletes.

The development of bonds in the coach-athlete relationship has been discussed previously in the literature. From a conceptual point of view, researchers have emphasised the role of affective ties, such reciprocal feelings of trust, respect, appreciation, valuing, and caring, as defining characteristics of coach-athlete relationships (e.g., Jowett, 2007a, 2007b; Poczwarski et al., 2002). In other words, such reciprocal feelings form an important dimension of the quality of the relationship and, in turn, highlight

the intensity of the bonds between a coach and an athlete. From an empirical point of view, researchers have shown that caring and supportive relationships between coaches and their athletes can enhance athletes' motivation (Jowett & Adie, in press), physical self-concept (Jowett, 2008a), task and social cohesion (Jowett & Chaundy, 2004), perceived satisfaction (Jowett & Nezlek, in press), and overall performance and psychological well-being (Jowett & Cockerill, 2003). In some cases, the emergence of bonds and personal relations between coaches and athletes has been found to move beyond the professional sphere and into the private sphere where athletes considered their coaches to be a friend or a mentor and not merely a coach (e.g., Antonini-Philippe & Seiler, 2006; Bloom, Durand-Bush, Schinke, & Salmela, 1998; Jowett & Cockerill, 2003; Poczwadowski et al., 2002). The coaches in the present study believed that it is important for coaches to move beyond their role of a teacher and form close and personal relations with their athletes.

The development of a social relationship between the coach and the athlete that encompasses bond and feelings for one another has been referred to in the literature as "human relationship" (e.g., Bloom et al., 1998; Jowett, 2005; Jowett & Cockerill, 2003). Thus, a relationship that reflects a personal and humanistic side of coaching whereby the coach cares about the athlete's needs, welfare, interests, wishes, and preferences. Our findings show that the social relationship or the human relationship between the coach and the athlete is a salient aspect of the coach-athlete dyad because it facilitates and enhances the professional relationship (which is concerned with performance enhancement). The athletes emphasised the value of coaches' social and communicative skills both to the relationship quality as well as to the athlete's learning and progression. They perceived coaches' interpersonal qualities such as the capacity to motivate and encourage, provide support, listen, and help solve problem, to be important attributes that are key for coach-athlete relationship quality and for the development of the athlete. Thus, coaches' capacity to provide expert knowledge together with good social or interpersonal qualities can facilitate the development of harmonious and successful relationships (Jowett, 2005; Rhind & Jowett, in press). This accords with previous research that reported that swimmers perceived coaches' social competence and effective communication skills to be as valuable as their capacity to provide expert knowledge (Antonini-Philippe & Seiler, 2006). Others proposed that coaches' social competence and effective communication skills can contribute to harmonious coach-athlete relationship and, subsequently, to the athlete's success in sport (Gould, Guinan, Greenleaf, Medbery, & Peterson, 1999). These findings have important

implications for coach education as they illustrate the importance for coaches to possess not only expert knowledge (i.e., technical, tactical, and physical knowledge), but also social interpersonal qualities.

Developing co-operation in the relationship refers to the gradual change of the coach's and the athlete's roles. Our findings show that over time their roles had gradually changed as activities began to be discussed between them and decisions were being made jointly, and not exclusively by the coach. This appears to be a salient change in the relationship as the coaches and the athletes perceived that it had contributed to a sense of cohesion or belongingness and a better working environment and personal relationships between them. This change also offered the athletes freedom to choose activities and make decisions and, thereby, to feel more independent and autonomous and more motivated. Thus, developing co-operation in the relationship contributed to the athletes' sense of autonomy, enhanced their motivation, promoted the relationship quality with their coaches, and, subsequently, their personal growth and athletic progression and development. This finding accords with Seiler et al.'s (1999) finding that shared decisions in the coach-athlete relationship have the capacity not only to enhance the quality of the relationship but also the athlete's performance and overall well-being.

This aspect of co-operation also reflects the dimension of Complementarity in the 3+1Cs model (Jowett, 2007a), whereby Complementarity encompasses on one hand the affiliation (e.g., by being friendly) that exists in the coach-athlete relationship, and on the other the adaptability (e.g., by being responsive) that each member in the relationship has to consider. The relationship cannot grow and develop in a harmonious and stable manner, unless dyad members are sensitive and responsive to the needs of the other (Jowett, 2007b). This progressive nature of co-operation also reflects Poczwadowski et al.'s (2002) framework that posits that coaches and athletes develop a relationship that can be differentiated on two levels: instructional (pure technical aspect), and social-psychological (pure affective aspect). These synergies between the conceptual models consolidate the defining aspects of this key relationship in context and time. Moreover, the findings of the present study allude to the importance that theoretical frameworks such as self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000) may have in examining issues that relate to the quality and process of relationships. Such a theory may explain how a sense of autonomy is born out of coach-athlete relationship and interaction and, in turn, affect such important factors as motivation.

Researchers have suggested that when coaches and athletes co-operate closely in the course of their working together to achieve their goals and

objectives, the rules of their engagement and interaction become more flexible and, subsequently, the power relation or balance in the coach-athlete dyad changes (Gould et al., 1999). Indeed, our findings show that coaches' roles evolved over time from autocratic styles of leadership to more supportive roles that offered the athletes more freedom and flexibility in their relationship with the coaches. Although the coaches retained their expert role in the relationship, they no longer imposed their authority, but gradually began to seek their athletes' opinions and consider their wishes when making organisational- and performance-related decisions. Thus, decision making became a joint effort in the relationship rather than imposed by the coach. Accordingly, the nature of the coach's role evolved over time from providing expertise and helping the athlete to learn, progress, and improve performance, to a supportive role that focused also on the athlete's needs, wishes, expectations, goals, and ambitions.

The role of the athlete in the relationship also evolved over time. Gradually, as the athletes gained technical knowledge and expertise, they moved from being obedient and compliant (to their coaches' instructions, wishes, and decisions), and dependant on their coaches' technical expertise, to becoming more autonomous and less dependent. At the same time, their responsibility for their performance, behaviours and actions (e.g., self-motivating, attending training) also increased. Thus, becoming autonomous meant that the athletes had to take responsibility for their decisions, actions, and personal development. Accordingly, this change in the nature of the coach-athlete relationship contributed to the athlete's personal growth, athletic development, and mental strength. To our knowledge, there has been no study that has explored in a systematic way changes in the power relations within the coach-athlete relationship or coach leadership literatures. The issue of power relation and co-operation may closely be linked to the notion of adaptability whereby coaches and athletes are sensitive and responsive to each other's needs (Jowett, 2007b). Hence, at the early stages of the coach-athlete relationship, coaches on the whole appear to be the sole orchestrators or directors of training, and gradually, as the relationship and its members grow and begin to understand each other's strengths, the interactions between them appear to become more equally distributed whereby at times the coach directing and the athletes executing and at other times the athlete directing and the coach following. This shifting of power relation has been reported also in familial coach-athlete relationships (e.g., Jowett, 2008b; Jowett, Timson-Katchis, & Adams, 2007).

Respecting each others' role facilitated a reciprocal relationship between the coaches and their athletes. Both the coaches and the athletes viewed the

role of the coach as an advisor and the role of the athlete as a listener. That is, the athletes listened to the coaches' advice, while at the same time making their own decisions on how to carry out tasks adequately and taking responsibility for themselves and their actions. Thus, the coach was perceived as providing advice rather than giving instructions or commands. The athletes appeared to help their coaches carry out their duties and responsibilities while, at the same time, the coaches helped their athletes carry out theirs. Researchers have asserted that the coach's role in making the athlete feel and become a responsible member in the relationship is paramount; this is more likely to occur when coaches employ an athlete-centred approach (Bloom et al., 1998; Gould et al., 1999; Jowett, 2005; Poczwadowski et al., 2002).

Finally, the use of Nitsch and Hackfort's (1984) model in the present study has proved beneficial. It provided an alternative conceptual framework in which to examine the evolving nature and the coach-athlete relationship. Future research may consider extending our study by applying this model to examine the impact of each of its three dimensions of social relations – developing bond, developing cooperation, and power relation – on salient factors such as athletes' motivation, performance, and satisfaction. Such research will benefit from a cross-sectional design and particularly from a longitudinally design. Nitsch and Hackfort's (1984) social relations model appeared to map well the relational aspects that define coach-athlete relationships, and generated consistent information with previous studies that have examined the quality of coach-athlete relationships. Guided by this model, the findings of the present study contributed to consolidate and diversify existing knowledge in the field of interpersonal relationships in sport.

LIMITATION AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Although the study offers valuable findings, its limitations must be acknowledged. First some of the information the participants provided was retrospective and relied upon recall of their early relationship, which can be subject to memory bias. Second, the study focused exclusively on swimmers and coaches at the elite level of the sport and, as such, does not inform us about the nature of the coach-athlete relationship in other sports (e.g., team sports) and at other levels (e.g., school level competition, recreational level). Nevertheless, the strength of the present study is in its contribution to knowledge and its theoretical and practical implications for the coach-athlete dyad. The findings enhance understanding of the nature of the dynamically evolving coach-athlete relationship, thus, contributing to theorists as well as

to coaches and practitioners who are researching and working in the sport domain.

Given our finding that the coach plays a key role in the athlete's personal growth, mental strength, and athletic development, further research on the coach-athlete relationship will be valuable. Especially, researchers should investigate the nature of the coach-athlete relationship in different sports and at different levels of competition. They should also examine the relationships of coaches with young children and adolescent athletes. Finally, it will be beneficial to examine the nature and quality of the relationships between coaches with different levels of expertise (i.e., coaching at the non-elite level such as at school and recreational levels) and their athletes, and to ascertain how the relationships are influenced by the different levels of coach expertise.

Conclusions

It is important to emphasise that the promotion of harmonious and stable coach-athlete relationship requires change, development, and progression. As coaches and athletes grow and develop, so must their relationships. Relationships are not static entities but are dynamic and continually evolving. Relationship members who are sensitive to the changing needs of the other members are more likely to respond appropriately and, hence, to allow the relationship to flourish. The findings of the present study highlight that the evolution in the coach-athlete relationship is beneficial to the athlete's personal growth, mental strength, and athletic development. These findings have theoretical and practical implications for the coach-athlete dyad. Accordingly, the study enhances knowledge both on theoretical and practical levels.

REFERENCES

- Adie, J., & Jowett, S. (in press). Athletes' meta-perceptions of the coach-athlete relationship, multiple achievement goals and intrinsic motivation among track and field athletes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*.
- Antonini-Phillips, R., & Seiler, R. (2006). Closeness, co-orientation and complementarity in coach-athlete relationships: What male swimmers say about their male coaches. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 7, 159-171.
- Arskey, H., & Knight, P. (1999). *Interviewing for social sciences*. London: Sage.
- Bloom, G. A., Durand-Bush, N., Schinke, R. J., & Salmela, J. H. (1998). The importance of the mentoring in the development of coaches and athletes. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 29, 267-281.

- Bugental, D. B., & Johnston, C. (2000). Parental and child cognitions in the context of the family. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51, 315-344.
- Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1978). Preferred leadership in sport. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Science*, 3, 85-97.
- Cumming, S. P., Smith, R. E., & Smoll, F. L. (2006). Athlete perceived coaching behaviours: Relating two measurement traditions. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 28, 205-213.
- Curtis, S., Gesler, W., Smith, G., & Washburn, S. (2000). Approaches to sampling and case selection in qualitative research: Examples in the geography of health. *Social Science and Medicine*, 50, 1001-1014.
- Gould, D., Guinan, D., Greenleaf, C., Medbery, R., & Peterson, K. (1999). Factors affecting Olympic performance: Perceptions of athletes and coaches from more and less successful teams. *The Sport Psychologist*, 13, 371-394.
- Jowett, S. (2005). On enhancing and repairing the coach-athlete relationship. In S. Jowett, & M. V. Jones (Eds.), *Psychology of sport coaching*. Sport and Exercise Psychology Division (pp. 14-26). Leicester: The British Psychological Society.
- Jowett, S. (2006). Interpersonal and structural features of Greek coach-athlete dyads performing in individual sports. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 18, 69-81.
- Jowett, S. (2007a). Coach-athlete relationships ignite groupness. In M. Beauchamp & M. Eys (Eds.), *Group Dynamics Advances in Sport and Exercise Psychology* (pp. 63-77). New York: Routledge.
- Jowett, S. (2007b). Independence analysis and the 3+1Cs in the coach-athlete relationship. In S. Jowett, & D. Lavalley (Eds.), *Social psychology in sport* (pp. 15-28). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Jowett, S. (2008a). Moderators and mediators of the association between the coach-athlete relationship and physical self-concept. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 2, 43-62.
- Jowett, S. (2008b). Outgrowing the familial coach-athlete relationship. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 39, 20-40.
- Jowett, S. (2009). Factor Structure and Criterion Validity of the Meta-Perspective Version of the Coach-Athlete Relationship Questionnaire (CART-Q). *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 13, 163-177.
- Jowett, S., & Chaundy, V. (2004). An investigation into the impact of coach leadership and coach-athlete relationship on group cohesion. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research and Practice*, 8, 302-311.
- Jowett, S., & Cockerill, I. M. (2003). Olympic medallists' perspective of the athlete-coach relationship. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 4, 313-331.
- Jowett, S., & Frost, T. C. (2007). Race/Ethnicity in the all male coach-athlete relationship: Black footballers' narratives. *Journal of International Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 3, 255-269.
- Jowett, S., & Cockerill, I. M. (2003). Olympic Medallists' perspective of the athlete-coach relationship. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 4, 313-331.
- Jowett, S., & Nezelek, J. (in press). Relationship Interdependence and Satisfaction with Important Outcomes in Coach-Athlete Dyads. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*.
- Jowett, S., & Ntoumanis, N. (2002). The Coach-Athlete Relationship Questionnaire (CART-Q): Development and initial validation. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports*, 14, 245-257.

- Jowett, S., & Poczwardowski, A. (2007). Understanding the coach-athlete relationship. In S. Jowett & D. Lavalée (Eds.), *Social psychology in sport* (pp. 3-14). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Jowett, S., Timson-Katchis, M., & Adams, R. (2007). Too close for comfort? Dependence in the dual role of parent/coach-child/athlete relationship. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 1, 59-78.
- Jowett, S., Shanmugam, V., & Caccoulis, S. (in press). Collective efficacy as a mediator of the link between interpersonal relationships and athlete satisfaction in team sports. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*.
- Jowett, S., & Poczwardowski, A. (2007). Understanding the coach-athlete relationship. In S. Jowett & D. Lavalée (Eds.), *Social psychology in sport* (pp. 3-14). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- King, E. (1996). The use of the self in qualitative research. In J. T. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of qualitative research methods for psychologists and the social scientists* (pp. 175-187). Leicester, UK: BPS.
- Lafrenière, M. A., Jowett, S., Vallerand, R. J., Donahue, E. G., & Lorimer, R. (2008). Passion in Sport: On the Quality of the Coach-Athlete Relationship. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 30, 541-560.
- Lorimer, R., & Jowett, S. (2009). Empathic accuracy, meta-perspective, and satisfaction in the coach-athlete relationship. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 21, 201-212.
- Morse, J. M. (1995). The significance of saturation. *Qualitative Health Research*, 5, 147-149.
- Nitsch, J. R., & Hackfort, D. (1984). Basisregulation interpersonalen Handelns im Sport [Basis regulation of interpersonal actions in sport] in E. Hahn & H. Rieder (Eds.), *Sensormotorisches Lernen und Sportspielforschung [Sensor motor learning and research in sport games]* (pp. 148-166). Köln: bps-Verlag.
- Olympiou, A., Jowett, S., & Duda, J. L. (2008). The psychological interface of the coach-created motivational climate and the coach-athlete relationship. *The Sport Psychologist*, 22, 423-438.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Islands, CA: Sage
- Poczwardowski, A., Barott, J. E., & Peregoy, J. E. (2002). The athlete and coach: Their relationship and its meanings. Methodological concerns and research process. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 33, 98-115.
- Poczwardowski, A., Barott, J.E., & Jowett, S. (2006). Diversifying approaches to research on athlete-coach relationships. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 7, 125-142.
- Poczwardowski, A., Henschen, K. P., & Barott, J. E. (2002). The athlete and coach: Their relationship and its meanings. Results of an interpretive study. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 33, 116-140.
- Rhind, D. J. A. & Jowett, S. (in press). Linking maintenance strategies to the quality of coach-athlete relationships. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*.
- Riemer, H. A., & Toon, K. (2001). Leadership and satisfaction in tennis: Examination of congruence, gender, and ability. *Research Quarterly of Exercise and Sport*, 72, 243-256.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.
- Sagar, S. S., & Jowett, S. (2010a). *Fear of failure and self-control in the context of coach-athlete interpersonal relationships*. Manuscript under review.
- Sagar, S. S., & Jowett, S. (2010b). *Communicative acts of interaction in coach-athlete interpersonal situations*. Manuscript under review.

- Sagar, S. S., & Lavallee, D. (2010). The Developmental Origins of Fear of Failure in Adolescent Athletes: Examining Parental Practices. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 11, 117-187.
- Sagar, S. S., Bush, B. K., & Jowett, S. (2010). Success and failure, Fear of failure, and Coping Responses of Adolescent Academy Football Players. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 22, 213-232.
- Seiler, R., Kevesligeti, C., & Valley, E. (1999). Coaches and female athletes: The basis of interaction. *Motricidade Humana Portuguesa; Journal of Human Performance Studies*, 12, 67-76.
- Schwandt, T. A. (2003). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln. *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (2nd ed.; pp. 292-331). London: Sage.
- Smith, R. E., & Smoll, F. L. (2007). Social-cognitive approach to coaching behaviours. In S. Jowett & D. Lavallee (Eds.), *Social psychology in sport* (pp. 75-90). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Smith, J. A. (1995). Semi-structured interviewing and qualitative analysis. In J.A. Smith, R. Hare, & L. Van Langenhove (Eds.), *Rethinking methods in psychology*. London: Sage.
- Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L., & Hunt, E. (1977). A system for the behavioural assessment of athletic coaches. *Research Quarterly*, 48, 401-407.
- Tesch, R. (1990). *Qualitative research analysis types and software tools*. New York: Falmer.
- Wylleman, P. (2000). Interpersonal relationship in sport: Uncharted territory in sport psychology research. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 31, 555-572.