

Running head: INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT

**Conflict among athletes and their coaches: What is the theory and research so far?**

**Abstract**

Although social and personal relationships are vital for productivity, health and wellbeing, conflict is inevitable and is likely to cause upset and hurt feelings as well as anxiety and distrust (e.g., Jowett, 2003). Despite the potentially central role of interpersonal conflict in sport, researchers have yet to pay concerted attention to exploring the nature of conflict, its antecedents and consequences. Following a thorough literature search 80 research papers were identified, of which only a small number (6) studied interpersonal conflict directly, most captured dysfunctional interpersonal processes such as breakdown of communication. The current review aims to provide a critical summary of the existing literature around the psychological construct of interpersonal conflict, including its antecedents, management strategies and outcomes within the context of coach-athlete relationships as well as other relational contexts in sport. Based on the relevant literature, a framework of interpersonal conflict is proposed, which includes a specific focus on a key dyad within sport coaching – namely the coach-athlete dyad. Future research directions and potential practical implications for sport psychology consultants, coach educators, coaches and athletes as well as other stakeholders are discussed.

*Keywords:* conflict; framework; relationship; interdependency; communication; coach-athlete

**Conflict among athletes and their coaches: What is the theory and research so far?**

In high level sports where the stakes are high, outcomes unpredictable, and emotions heightened, effective communication and appropriate behaviour may become challenging and conflict can be provoked. Sport offers potential for conflict that can transpire as parental over- or under-involvement in their child/athlete's participation, administrators' excessive expectations of coaches, disagreements about team selection, power struggles between teammates or athletes and their coaches, disagreements about training procedures (e.g., workload, goals, techniques) or even coaches' interferences in athletes' personal life (e.g., lifestyle, significant others).

Despite its prevalence, it is surprising how little we know about interpersonal conflict within sport. Sport psychology has paid considerable attention to understanding the interpersonal dynamics between coaches and athletes or members through theoretical models involving coach and athlete leadership (e.g., Chelladurai & Saleh, 1980; Fransen, Vanbeselaere, De Cuyper, Vande Broek, & Boen, 2014), coaches' behaviours (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003; Smoll & Smith, 1989), coach-athlete relationship (Jowett & Felton, 2014), communication/relationship strategies (Rhind & Jowett, 2010), collective efficacy (Short, Sullivan, & Feltz, 2005), and team cohesion (Carron, Widmeyer, & Brawley, 1985). Nonetheless, there is dearth of research that explores interpersonal conflict among coaches, athletes and teammates. Subsequently, this scoping review aims to examine the extant literature with two central aims: a) to forward a definition of interpersonal conflict in sport and b) to propose a conceptual framework of interpersonal conflict in sport relationships primarily developed between coaches and athletes and team members. The intention of this article is to build momentum that would drive advancements in interpersonal conflict theory and research.

## Methods

Based on the novelty of the topic a scoping review was carried out investigating the status quo of research on interpersonal conflict in sport relationships. This approach was considered appropriate as it enabled the researchers to include studies focusing on interpersonal conflict in-depth, but also scientific papers that broadly covered the area of inquiry (Arksey, & O'Malley, 2005). Moreover, qualitative, quantitative and theoretically driven approaches could be integrated in the review process. Firstly, a systematic search of scientific papers and book chapters was carried out using the following databases: Web of Science, ScienceDirect, SportDiscuss, PsychInfo, PsycArticles, OvidSP, PubMed, ProQuest, SPONET, and Scopus; results generated a total of 6201 hits. All references were examined and key references extracted. These were used to identify further relevant articles. To be considered for inclusion, scientific papers had to demonstrate a number of general criteria: 1) relevance to the research inquiry, 2) publication in peer reviewed journals, conference proceedings or book chapters, and 3) written in English or German language according to the native languages of the main researchers. A first examination led to the exclusion of 6020 references, including double positive and inaccessible sources. The remaining 180 articles underwent a more thorough review where sound methodological standards, clear reasoning for the conducted research, relevance to the current investigation and coverage of diverse participant perspectives (athletes, coaches, external agents) were considered. Moreover, four papers and one conference presentation were added after the original review process due to later publication dates. A final sample of 80 articles was included in the review, these are marked with an asterisk (\*) in the reference list. Despite the rather large number, only six of these articles directly focused on conflict experiences (1x interpersonal conflict, 5 x intra-team conflicts). An additional four examined intra-team communication, and another three covered conflict management and team building. Within the remaining 67 papers conflict was

mentioned peripherally. In the final stage, a theoretically driven thematic analysis (Dixon-Woods, Agarwal, Jones, Young, & Sutton, 2005) of the literature was conducted. Subsequently, four areas of interest were identified: 1) a definition of interpersonal conflict in sport relationships (e.g., coach-athlete, peer relationships), 2) determinants of interpersonal conflict (e.g., personality, relationship quality), 3) prevention and management (e.g., communication, problem-solving), and 4) conflict consequences (e.g., well-being, performance).

## Results

Based on the thematic analysis of the identified papers, a definition of interpersonal conflict and an exploratory conceptual framework for understanding interpersonal conflict in sport relationships are proposed (Figure 1). The identified literature focuses heavily on the coach-athlete relationship, but also draws on research findings on peer conflict. Therefore, the term 'sport relationships' refers directly to those core relationships between coaches and athletes as well as team members throughout this paper.

The framework as displayed in Figure 1 integrates main areas of interpersonal conflict and can be split in three different sections: 1) determinants, such as intrapersonal, interpersonal and external factors; 2) cognitive, emotional and behavioural processes associated with conflict (including initial reactions and management behaviours); and 3) intrapersonal, interpersonal and performance consequences. Hence, it accounts not only for factors related to the individual conflict parties, but also interpersonal relationship characteristics, external circumstances and sport performance which may influence interpersonal interactions.

### Developing a Definition of Interpersonal Conflict within Sport Relationships

Despite the extensive research concerning conflict within both organisational and social psychology, the concept of conflict remains unclear, complicated, and controversial. Barki

and Hartwick (2004), scholars in organisational/management psychology, explained that not only the lack of a clear conceptualisation of the construct of conflict but also the lack of its operationalization has made it extremely challenging to compare results of different studies and has prevented the development of knowledge within the conflict domain. For example, interpersonal conflict has been described in terms of where it occurs (e.g., organizational conflict; Rahim, 2002), its various dimensions (e.g., moral conflict; Duquin & Schroeder-Braun, 1996), or orientations (e.g., task, relationship; Barki & Hartwick, 2004). Amason (1996) distinguished conflict by its outcomes (functional vs. dysfunctional) and its underlying processes (cognitive vs. affective). Further, Barki and Hartwick (2004) focused on conflict parties when differentiating between intrapersonal, interpersonal, intra-group and intergroup conflict. Finally, conflict as a psychological concept has been confounded with such terms as abuse, mistreatment, and aggression (e.g., Duquin & Schroeder-Braun, 1996). Thus, conflict requires a definition that describes what this concept represents and what it does not. Accordingly, it needs to be acknowledged that conflict is more than a mere (cognitive) disagreement between people, but it also involves strong emotional reactions (e.g., frustration) and interfering behaviours (e.g., confrontation, social isolation) (e.g., Paradis, Carron, & Martin, 2014a).

**Drawing from the sports literature.** Within the sport literature, only a few empirical studies have directly examined the concept of conflict. In one of them, Mellalieu et al. (2013) investigated interpersonal conflict at the highest level of competition including European Championships, World Cups and Olympic Games. Findings revealed that conflict was experienced by nearly 75% of participants ( $N = 90$ ) who occupied roles as coaches, athletes, managers and external agents. They described conflict as short-lived and occurring only a few times during major events, however, long-term conflict was also reported among participants of all groups. Mellalieu et al.'s (2013) study offered a first insight into conflict in

sport and while they highlighted its negative content and outcomes, they also explained that not all participants experienced conflict during competitions.

A more in-depth description of the nature and content of conflict was offered by Holt, Knight, and Zukiwski (2012) and Paradis et al. (2014a, 2014b) who focused on athletes' perceptions of intra-team conflict. Drawing on the work of Barki and Hartwick (2004), Paradis et al. (2014a) defined conflict based on the co-occurrence of its three dimensions: cognitive, affective and behavioural responses. The interviewed athletes described cognitive conflict as a disagreement about goals, strategies, opinions or a "clash of personalities" and considered it to be the "heart of conflict" (Paradis et al., 2014a, p. 12). The affective dimension was seen as a tense atmosphere with negative emotions, that fosters the potential for conflict escalation. Lastly, behavioural expressions of conflict included verbal or physical responses, like blaming, fighting or negative body language. Furthermore, task and relational types of conflict cut across the three dimensions of conflict mentioned earlier. Here, relationship conflict was associated with negative relations outside the sport, long-term isolation of athletes, severe interference of one's behaviour and a spread of negative emotions within the team. Overall, the participants of this study emphasized the negative nature of conflict. Correspondingly, Partridge and Knapp (2015) described that intra-team conflict was manifested in direct or indirect victimization (e.g., aggressive behaviours, isolation, rumours, dirty looks) of individuals and was based on experienced disagreements or disputes. They suggested that conflict would negatively influence individual well-being, team cohesion and therefore also performance. This assumption is in line with Leo, Gonzalez-Ponce, Sanchez-Miguel, Ivarsson, and Garcia-Calvo's (2015) findings who viewed conflict as a negative interference of one individual's interests by another party and proposed that both, relationship and task conflict, led to a decrease in collective efficacy within female football teams. Collectively, these findings are consistent with a study conducted by Holt et al. (2012). They

explained that social (interpersonal or relationship) conflict was a dysfunctional process which was potentially harder to solve. On the other hand, they pointed out that task conflict, which addressed practice, competition or playing time, could be functional at times as it reminded athletes that developing skills and improving performance were central to their programme and subsequently development.

**Defining interpersonal conflict.** Considering the coverage of interpersonal conflict within sport psychology (albeit limited) as well as diversity and complexity of conflict within the wider psychology literature (e.g., Barki & Hartwick, 2004; Paletz, Miron-Spektor, & Lin, 2014), we decided to integrate the various components of conflict discussed earlier and draw a definition of interpersonal conflict in sport relationships. Proposing a definition of interpersonal conflict is important because it provides the boundary conditions of the concept under scrutiny. In this paper, we define interpersonal conflict as a situation in which relationship partners perceive a disagreement about, for example, values, needs, opinions or objectives that is manifested through negative cognitive, affective and behavioural reactions. Moreover, interpersonal conflict is influenced by the social and cultural context within which it occurs, including individuals' characteristics, personality, age and gender. It is noteworthy that the definition does not imply a static conceptualization of conflict; conflict is described as a situation and this reflects a dynamic process that may last over a prolonged period of time (episode) and can re-occur several times (frequency). The nature of interpersonal conflict is presented as the core of the proposed conceptual framework.

An essential requirement of conflict is a *perceived* disagreement between individuals which is reflected in cognitive processes based on a negative interdependence of conflict parties (Deutsch, 1969), for instance, when one's goal achievement is potentially impeded by the other's behaviour. This cognitive dimension of conflict involves, but is not limited to disagreements about personal objectives, mismatching values, opposing needs and interests

or limited resources and is expressed by spontaneous conflict behaviours. Moreover, individuals are likely to experience initial negative emotions, such as anger and aggression (hard emotions; associated with power and selfishness) or disappointment and sadness (soft emotions; pro-social, associated with vulnerability; Sanford, 2007). Finally, individuals may perceive the intensity of conflict differently (more or less severe), depending on their personality, culturally determined role expectations or collectivistic-/ individualistic-orientation (Paletz et al., 2014). However, it remains to be explored how individual perceptions, characteristics, and social interaction shape conflict experiences within sport.

### **Determinants of Conflict: Intrapersonal, Interpersonal and External Factors**

As presented in the first part of Figure 1, conflict may be caused and further influenced by both *intrapersonal factors*, such as personality, worldviews, self-esteem, motivation, competence, as well as skills, experiences and qualifications (e.g., Greenleaf, Gould, & Dieffenbach, 2001; Jowett, Lafreniere, & Vallerand, 2012), and by *interpersonal factors*, such as incompatibility, poor communication and relationship quality, or ineffective motivational climate and leadership (e.g., D'Arripe-Longueville, Fournier, & Dubois, 1998; Jowett & Cockerill, 2003). These determinants can function independently in a co-existing manner, but also interact with each other. For example, a less desirable personality characteristic such as neuroticism (i.e., emotionally unstable, continuously worried) and an anxious attachment style (i.e., excessively dependent, possessive) may contribute to the experience of conflict or disagreement. These personality characteristics may also be coupled with low levels of trust, both uni- and multi-directional, exacerbating the conflict experienced. Alongside personal and interpersonal determinants, also *external factors*, including situational circumstances, social and social-cultural differences (e.g., language, customs) can cause conflict.

#### **Intrapersonal factors.**



***Stable intrapersonal factors.*** Interpersonal factors can be grouped into stable (traits) and situational (states) attributes. For example, one of these stable intrapersonal factors which are related to perceptions of interpersonal conflict is gender; it has been found that male athletes engage in more conflict behaviour and conflict communication with their peers than females (Sullivan, 2004; Weiss & Smith, 2002). Another example of stable intrapersonal factors included personality traits of dyadic partners. Research indicated that personality may be linked to interpersonal conflict in sport relationships (Holt et al., 2012; Magnusen, 2010). Based on the Big 5 personality model (Costa & McCrea, 1992; Digman, 1990) Jackson, Dimmock, Gucciardi, and Grove (2010, 2011) conducted two studies investigating the relationship quality of athlete-athlete and coach-athlete dyads, respectively. Results indicated that dissimilarities between partners regarding extraversion and openness were associated with more unstable, dysfunctional and incompatible relationships all of which were likely to facilitate conflict. Yang, Jowett, and Chan (in press) also found that neuroticism was associated with less than optimal coach-athlete relationships.

Finally, findings highlight that an individual's attachment style can determine relationship quality and the experience of conflict (Davis & Jowett, 2014; Felton & Jowett, 2013c). Thus, secure attached athletes reported only minor conflicts with their coaches as they are more likely to have developed better social and interpersonal skills (e.g., effective communication) (Davis & Jowett, 2014). Similarly, avoidant attached athletes perceived little conflict with their coaches, which might be caused by a tendency to avoid close interactions or close bonds with others. It may be interesting to see whether similar patterns are found for other sport relationships, such as athlete-athlete dyads or within teams.

***Situational intrapersonal factors.*** When considering interactions between coaches and athletes as well as between athlete-peers less stable intrapersonal factors (states) also need to be taken into account. One of these is passion which is defined within sport as a

“strong inclination toward an activity that people like, that they find important, and in which they invest time or energy” (Vallerand & Miquelon, 2007, p. 250). Passion is generally categorized into obsessive (internal forces, lack of control) and harmonious (personal endorsement, personal choice) passion, which have been found to relate differently to the experience of interpersonal conflict in sport. Accordingly, Jowett, Lafreniere, and Vallerand (2012) stated that athletes’ and coaches’ obsessive passion was positively associated with perceived interpersonal conflict in coach-athletes dyads, and further, a coach’s obsessive passion was predictive of lower personal satisfaction and higher perceptions of athletes’ conflict. However, this finding was not replicated within sport teams. Accordingly, the findings by Paradis et al. (2014b) did not show a significant association between obsessive passion and team conflict, while harmonious passion was inversely related to team conflict. The role of passion differs regarding the experience of conflict within the relationship quality developed among teammates and coaches-athlete dyads. These differences may be due to diverse expectations and relationship characteristics. However, research on athlete-athlete relationships is scarce and therefore no certain conclusions can be drawn.

Recently, efficacy beliefs have received empirical research within the context of sport. Jackson and his colleagues introduced the notion of tripartite efficacy; a set of psychological efficacy beliefs that include self-efficacy, others-efficacy and relation-inferred self-efficacy (RISE) that have been found to determine relationship quality in sport dyads (Jackson, Grove, & Beauchamp, 2010; Jackson, Gucciardi, & Dimmock, 2011; Jackson, Knapp, & Beauchamp, 2008). Specifically, a partner’s low perception of an athlete’s/coach’s self-efficacy was stated as a factor for relationship termination in both, athlete-athlete and coach-athlete dyads, whereas a partner’s higher ratings were connected to a greater relationship satisfaction when actor-partner interdependence models were conducted (Jackson et al., 2011). Investigating tripartite efficacy profiles via cluster analyses of coach-athlete

dyads, they further observed a link between unfulfilled tripartite profiles of athletes and higher perceived interpersonal conflict with their coaches; in opposition, fulfilled profiles related to higher relationship commitment and satisfaction. Overall, perceived confidence and competence of a dyad member seemed to play a major role in maintaining an effective relationship. This conclusion has been supported by several studies investigating athletes' perceptions on good and bad coaching behaviours (e.g., Becker, 2009; Gearity, 2012; Gearity & Murray, 2011). Specifically, conflict seemed to occur due to perceived incompetence (Greenleaf et al., 2001; Hanton, Fletcher, & Coughlan, 2005; Jowett & Cockerill, 2003), disagreements upon one's training schedule and workload (Greenleaf et al., 2001; Jowett, 2003) or handling of injuries (Greenleaf et al., 2001; Shrier, Safai, & Charland, 2014). Considering the task-orientated purpose of a coach-athlete relationship where performance improvement is central (Jowett & Shanmugam, in press), these findings seem very plausible as athletes' performance success and wellbeing are to a degree dependent on their interactions with their coaches and the coaches' instructions, knowledge and experience. Subsequently, when investigating interpersonal conflict in sport, research that aims to explore specific intrapersonal factors, such as personality, competence or efficacy beliefs, is warranted.

**Interpersonal factors.** Whereas intrapersonal factors are likely to impact the quality of the interaction between people, the level of interdependence, relationship quality, communication, group unity, and co-operation may also affect the experience of conflicts (Figure 1).

**Interpersonal relationships.** Within sport, the coach-athlete relationship has attracted a concerted research effort. Jowett's 3+1Cs model (Jowett & Shanmugam, in press) provided the impetus needed when Wylleman (2000) described the concept of the coach-athlete relationship as an "uncharted territory". The model is concerned with coaches' and athletes' affective closeness (e.g., mutual trust, respect), cognitive commitment (e.g., thoughts of

maintaining a close relationship over time) and behavioural complementarity (e.g., co-operative acts of interactions), as well as co-orientation (e.g., perceptual agreement). Within this literature, it has been postulated that low levels of closeness, complementarity, commitment and co-orientation can have a negative impact on the quality of the coach-athlete relationship and potentially lead to a regressive spiral of recurrent interpersonal conflict that could even cause relationship termination (Jowett & Cockerill, 2003). Jowett (2003) described the characteristics by which an athlete experienced conflict relative to her coach as follows: (a) low (intensity) and negative (quality) closeness and reflecting in feeling unattached, distant, distressed, frustrated and even rejected; (b) non-complementary transactions that were manifested in power struggles and opposed behaviours; (c) lack of commitment or willingness to maintain a close bond with each other over the foreseeable time leading to the termination of the relationship; and finally (d) dis-orientation or lack of agreement was said to be leading to disputes, contested views, and disagreements. In conclusion, interpersonal conflict may be associated with either one or all dimensions of relationship quality (closeness, complementarity, commitment, co-orientation) as they are capable of dis-stabilising the symmetry and evenness (stability and harmony) that characterise effective and successful relationships (Jowett, 2005). Empirical research has substantiated these initial assumptions by linking closeness, commitment, and complementarity with interpersonal conflict (Jowett, 2009). Interestingly though, it has also been noted that the more interdependent relationships are, the more likely conflict will occur (Stirling & Kerr, 2009). Therefore, relationship characteristics are not only determinants to relationship quality, but they are rather also defined by interpersonal processes, environmental factors, and intrapersonal factors and hence, cannot be discussed in isolation.

**Communication.** Communication, for example, is an essential process at all stages of relationship development and maintenance as it provides the members with information about

one another and fosters closeness, commitment, and complementarity; thus the simple process of getting to know the other person, her or his needs and expectations are central to effective and successful interactions (LaVoi, 2007). Communication also plays a major role in developing and maintaining an effective coach-athlete relationship (Rhind & Jowett, 2010). For instance, Trzaskoma-Bicsérdy, Bognár, Révész, and Géczi (2007) explained that while all coach-athlete dyads may encounter difficulties at some point in their collaboration and athletes might feel unsupported, misunderstood or isolated, these issues can be solved by openly discussing their differences. Hence, the role of communication is instrumental in preventing, processing and resolving conflict (Rhind & Jowett, 2010).

Failing to communicate effectively, in contrast, has been suggested as one of the main characteristics of poor coaching (Gearity & Murray, 2011; Scanlan, Stein, & Ravizza, 1991). Interestingly, that does not only concern the coach-athlete relationship, but also unsatisfying communication patterns within coaching teams and sport organisations which are directly or indirectly affecting individuals perceptions and coach-athlete interactions (e.g., D'Arripe-Longueville, et al., 1998; Kristiansen, Tomten, Hanstad, & Roberts, 2012).

Investigating the occurrence of conflict in major competitions, Mellalieu et al. (2013) reported a breakdown of interaction and communication as the most common determinant to conflict as it was mentioned by over 50% of the study's participants. Similarly, several studies have cited a lack of communication as underlying factor of perceived struggles or conflicts between coach-athlete/ athlete-athlete dyads or within coaching teams and sport organisations. (e.g., Culver & Trudel, 2000; Hanton et al., 2005; Jowett & Frost, 2007; Kerwin, Doherty, & Harman, 2011). However, these investigations have so far failed to provide any specific information on in-/effective communication patterns.

On another level, communication may also serve as a manifestation of power relations within relationships and therefore lead to interpersonal conflict. D'Arripe-Longueville et al.,

(1998) and Purdy, Potrac, and Jones (2008) described how coaches used a communication style which was characterized as loud, distant, and angry and included negative strategies such as bossing athletes around and blaming. Additionally, Purdy et al. (2008) emphasized that conflict escalation may be promoted by coaches who are ignorant, deliberately withhold information and restrict communication. Lastly, hostile and inadequate reactions in critical situations during practice or after unsuccessful competitions may also be the mere expression of conflict (e.g., Purdy et al., 2008; Sagar & Jowett, 2012).

Sullivan and Feltz (2003) developed a questionnaire to assess typical communication patterns in sport teams; it contained four dimensions, two of which measured negative conflict and positive conflict. Negative conflict captures the expression of agitation or anger as well as its emotional, personal and confrontational nature, whereas positive conflict captures constructive and integrative ways of dealing with disruption. A number of studies have used this assessment tool in studies that examined group dynamic variables such as role ambiguity, cohesion and leadership (Cunningham & Eys, 2007; Smith, Arthur, Hardy, Callow, & Williams, 2013).

**Team processes.** Apart from relationship and communication that may be responsible for the onset of conflict, team processes form another set of dimensions that may be significant sources of interpersonal conflict. Research has shown that a less task- and more ego-involving climate is correlated with negative perceptions of peer relations, less perceived acceptance within a team and increased perceived conflict between team members (e.g., Ommundsen, Roberts, Lemyre, & Miller, 2005; Smith, Balaguer, & Duda, 2006). Moreover, while strong relations between coaches and athletes have been found to associate positively with team cohesion and collective efficacy (e.g., Hampson & Jowett, 2014; Jowett & Chaundy, 2004), poor relations between coaches and athletes have been found to facilitate intra-team rivalry and power struggles (e.g., D'Arripe-Longueville et al., 1998; Holt et al.,

2012; Kristiansen et al., 2012). Those may lead to jealousy or strong attitudes among team members resulting in even more conflict (Partridge & Knapp, 2015). Furthermore, Hardy, Eys, and Carron (2005) found that high task-cohesion may lead to conflict or even a breakdown of friendships due to a performance-oriented, competitive team climate. In another study, Paradis, Carron, and Martin (2014b) showed that both task and social conflict were negatively related to all dimensions of team cohesion. However, due to the correlational research design no conclusions about causal effects were made. Overall, it would seem that more interpersonal conflict is caused by loose interpersonal social and task connections and equally, interpersonal conflict may also be the reason for lower cohesion due to, for example, disagreements and discrepant goals. Role ambiguity between team members has also been found to cause interpersonal conflict, especially if athletes and coaches do not appreciate, understand and carry out their role responsibilities (Benson, Eys, Surya, Dawson, & Schneider, 2013). It is important to note here that often the athlete leader is seen to be responsible for solving conflicts among team members or to mediate between coaching staff and athletes (Fransen et al., 2014).

***Leadership and power.*** One condition for the above point to work is that it requires the coach and athlete leader to relate and cooperate effectively. Dysfunctional relationships between coaches and their captains, on the other hand, have been found to lead to miscommunication and lacking information flow between the coaching staff and team, causing further trouble for team members (Dupuis, Bloom, & Loughhead, 2006).

Considering coach leadership in the discussion of role expectations, it has been suggested that autocratic behaviours potentially impair the coach-athlete relationship as well as athletes' well-being by not satisfying psychological needs, such as relatedness, autonomy and competence (Felton & Jowett, 2013a, 2013b, 2013c). Further, research has also highlighted that behaviours such as being overly controlling likely lead to resistance which in

turn is associated with conflict and distress (Potrac & Jones, 2009; Scanlan et al., 1991). Moreover, an indecisive coach may cause conflict with athletes, especially when facing critical situations under high pressure (Hanton et al., 2005). Furthermore, a lack of supportive behaviours has been mentioned to foster conflict within coach-athlete dyads (e.g., Hanton et al., 2005; Jowett, 2003; Jowett & Cockerill, 2003). Another source of conflict is represented by power abuse of coaches or power struggles between coaches and athletes. Power abuse might occur in very different forms, such as punishment after mistakes or defeat (Sager & Jowett, 2012), when undermining athletes' experiences, opinions and needs (Jowett, 2003), controlling the private life of athletes, harassment (Tomlinson & Yorganci, 1997), as well as emotional or physical abuse (Stirling & Kerr, 2009). These negative coaching behaviours may furthermore lead directly to conflict (e.g., Stirling & Kerr, 2008; Tamminen et al., 2013) or to negative responses by the athletes (e.g., Stirling & Kerr, 2008, 2009) who are facing these conflicting situations (Duquin & Schroeder-Braun, 1996).

**External factors.** Besides antecedents that reside within or between relationship members, there are also antecedents that are external to them and can influence the onset of interpersonal conflict. These variables may be located in the wider situational and environmental circumstances surrounding the relationship members; they may be situational, (e.g., practice location) or permanent (e.g., culture or ethnical background) (see Figure 1). There has been evidence to indicate that discrimination, inequality and stereotypical thinking exists in semi-professional soccer players, among fans, opponents and teammates, as well as coaches (e.g., Jowett & Frost, 2007; Khomutova, 2015). Such discriminatory behaviours (e.g., prejudice, unfairness, favouritism) are less tolerable and may lead to conflict if players do not perceive them somewhat with a sense of humour or ignorance to prevent escalated trouble (Jones, 2002). Also gender may lead to very similar experiences within sports; female sport participants are often associated with stereotypes of homophobia, lack of



acceptance or lack of perceived competence (e.g., LaVoi & Dutove, 2012; Mazerolle, Bruening, & Casa, 2008; Shaw & Allen, 2009). Correspondingly, female coaches have described their work as being inhibited by higher positioned male coaches, not accepted by male athletes and disesteemed due to stereotypical and sexual assumptions. Similarly, female athletes have been found to be treated in inferior manners to male athletes and therefore experience conflict during mixed practices or competitions (Tomlinson & Yorganci, 1997).

Moreover, a number of studies recently have investigated organisational stressors within sports. These studies revealed that such stressors are linked to interpersonal conflict with team management/ headquarters of the organization, support networks, administrators, or judges (Fletcher & Hanton, 2003; Fletcher, Hanton, Mellalieu, & Neil, 2012; Hanton, Fletcher, & Coughlan, 2005). In line, old-fashioned systems within clubs or national associations might restrict the flexibility to build up athlete-centred, flexible practice environments and effective coach-athlete relationships (D'Arripe-Longueville et al., 2001; Kristiansen et al., 2012). Additionally, parents have been reported to engage in direct conflict with coaches, with other athletes or with their own athlete-children - preventing them from forming a close relationship with coaches (Jowett & Timson-Katchis, 2005; Lauer, Gould, Roman, & Pierce, 2010; Scanlan et al., 1991; Weiss & Fretwell, 2005) or stirring intra-team conflict (Partridge & Knapp, 2015).

Lastly, situational circumstances may refer to disagreements about issues that directly concern both the coach and the athlete, such as training and competition schedules, expectations, values or interpersonal differences especially as these can be developed following a significant change of events within or outside the relationship (e.g., Gould, Greenleaf, Guinen, & Chung, 2002; Greenleaf et al., 2001; Jowett, 2003; Kristiansen et al., 2012). Winning an Olympic medal, for example, can be followed by a chain of negative changes, such as disagreements about goals, pursuing conflicting personal ambitions, media

distractions or reports or being influenced by externals, such as agents (Jowett, 2003). Speaking of major competitions, it might be the case that personal or local/club coaches cannot support their athletes during competitions but are instead replaced by the national or another coach. In this case conflict can be caused due to non-established relationships, contrasting instructions from coaching staff or a lack of communication within the coaching team (e.g., Jowett, 2008; Kristiansen et al., 2012). Additionally, team selection processes may lead to conflicts between athletes and the coaching staff or even the sport organisation (Fletcher & Hanton, 2003; Gould et al., 2002; Kerwin, Doherty, & Harman, 2011) and thus how team selection is being communicated may be paramount to relationship development.

In sum, the extant literature seems to indicate that interpersonal conflict can be caused by intrapersonal, interpersonal and external factors, such as expectations, misunderstandings, or even bad intentions. This review highlights that understanding the determinants of interpersonal conflict in sport would help identify and facilitate conflict management and resolution strategies based on the causes of it. While more focused research efforts are required to examine the antecedents of interpersonal conflict in sport more directly, the next section discusses strategies that have been found to be employed in an attempt to manage and resolve conflict.

### **Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution**

Considering that individuals usually engage in relationships for a purpose it is likely that they will try to protect it from harm or even termination (Carron & Brawley, 2012). Conflict, however, represents a risk to any relationship if not dealt with constructively. Therefore, relationship partners may want to prevent situations in which conflict can erupt, for example by using relationship maintenance strategies, such as setting common goals, mutual assurance, open communication, or making use of constructive problem-solving strategies after disagreements (Rhind & Jowett, 2010, 2011). Accordingly, the process of

stopping the onset of conflict is called *conflict prevention*; it can include general relationship maintenance strategies as well as behaviours focusing specifically on potential disagreements. Slightly more controversial is the categorization of conflict behaviours that are shown after the onset of conflict. Thus, *conflict styles* describe individuals' preferences to engage in certain conflict management and/or resolution behaviours (e.g., collaborative, competitive or avoidant behaviours; Volkema & Bergmann, 1995). *Conflict management*, furthermore, refers to the use of effective behavioural strategies to reduce dysfunctional conflict and to facilitate constructive conflict (e.g., information sharing, goal setting, role clarification). In contrast to *conflict resolution* strategies (e.g., negotiation, bargaining, mediation), conflict management does not necessarily aim to diminish or terminate conflict (Rahim, 2002). Generally, it can be expected that relationship partners will engage in conflict management and/or resolution strategies, after conflict prevention has failed. Within a feedback-loop the nature of a conflict, described by content (cognitions, emotions, behaviours), duration and intensity, will influence and be influenced by these conflict behaviours (see Figure 1).

**Conflict prevention.** As stated before, conflict prevention is not only dependent on intra- and interpersonal characteristics, but also on the potentially identified disagreement. Hence, conflict parties may engage in self-reflection processes and gather further information about potential topics of disagreement, develop sound communication skills, avoid conflicting situations or accept inequitable attitudes (D'Arripe-Longuevill et al., 1998; Gearity & Murray, 2011; Langan, Blake, & Lonsdale, 2013; Stirling, 2013). However, first and foremost, all involved parties need to be willing to engage in constructive behaviours in order to maintain the relationship. With the COMPASS Model (Rhind & Jowett, 2010, 2011) a theoretical framework integrating behaviours that aim to maintain and enhance the coach-athlete relationships was developed. Listed are reactive and proactive strategies concerning

conflict management, openness, motivation, prevention, assurance, support and social networks (Rhind & Jowett, 2011, 2012). Interestingly, the majority of strategies target the prevention of conflict, for example by being honest, giving constructive feedback and setting common goals (Jowett & Shanmugam, in press). Other strategies include coaches employing an open-door policy, showing interest in the athlete as a person and establishing rapport (e.g., Becker, 2009; Bennie & O'Connor, 2012). Besides imparting maintenance strategies, Jowett and Carpenter (2004) further indicated the establishment of rules within coach-athlete dyads in order to prevent interpersonal conflict. These rules may cover certain role expectations of coaches and athletes. Within the framework of complementarity in the coach-athlete relationship, Yang and Jowett (2013) explained that athletes and coaches assume distinct roles, where athletes usually have submissive roles reflected in the expectation to execute instructions and consider advice whereas coaches usually assume dominant roles reflected in the expectation to be in charge and provide instruction and feedback. Yang and Jowett (2013) made it clear that these behaviours represent role expectations which aim to provide structure and organisation (Jowett & Carpenter, 2004); they are not synonymous to controlling behaviours as understood within the self-determination theory (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Consequently, while great coaches should aim to fulfil basic psychological needs they also should recognize and meet athletes' needs for structure and guidance (cf. Ryan & Deci, 2000; Becker, 2009). Accordingly, pursuing a balance between facilitating an athlete's independence and connection, without making him or her feel left alone and helpless or making him or her controlled by the coach, within a well-defined coaching structure, provides one of the many challenges of great coaching.

The establishment of high-quality relationships between a coach and each individual athlete in the team and the creation of an atmosphere of trust, respect and honesty is also likely to influence team dynamics positively and will facilitate bonding processes among

team members (e.g., role modelling, communication and conflict culture); therefore, building a strong, common network in which individuals can rely on each other should be a priority (Rhind & Jowett, 2010). Efforts here should be directed at establishing trust and respect, facilitate open, positive communication, setting a common ground for team members and fostering team cohesion (Copeland & Wida, 1996; Evans, Slater, Turner, & Barker, 2013; Hardy & Grace, 1997; Smith, 2001). Close relationships among team members may encourage individual players to emphasize a more task involving team climate, including mutual support and encouragement also in difficult situations (Smith & Smoll, 1997) and therefore also enable team members to discuss problems openly as well as engaging in co-operative, effective conflict resolving strategies (Holt et al., 2012). Moreover, high quality relationships are also a core element of team resilience; communication, for example, forms an essential ingredient in building and maintaining a group structure which is likely to ensure stability and organisation during times of crisis, such as conflict (Morgan, Fletcher, & Sarkar, 2013). Accordingly, a well-established group identity may prevent conflict due to lower ego-involvement and salient collectivistic thought processes. It might also enable group members to focus on task issues instead of targeting personal relationships directly. Taken together, based on the reviewed literature we recommend to create high-quality relationships between coaches and athletes, just as between peers by relying on stable communication, mutual care, trust, respect, reliability and common expectations in order to prevent conflict.

**Conflict management and conflict resolution.** Despite coaches' and athletes' best efforts to prevent conflict there may be times where conflict occurs and its management becomes paramount. In fact, it has been acknowledged that conflict is inevitable in relationships and the more interdependent the relationships the higher is the likelihood of experiencing issues within a relationship (e.g., Stirling & Kerr, 2009). Without clearly differentiating between management and resolution, several effective and ineffective conflict

strategies have been mentioned in the literature. Importantly, the effectiveness of employed strategies may highly depend on situational circumstances and conflict partners' characteristics, thus, whereas some approaches can be clearly positive or negative, some may not be categorized that easily (Mellalieu et al., 2013). Investigating conflict during major competitions, Mellalieu et al. (2013) assessed conflict solving strategies which were employed by sport participants ( $N = 90$ ; e.g., athletes, coaches, staff members). While no participants stated the use of forcing or overpowering behaviours, most participants tried to resolve the conflict either on their own or by looking for help (47%), while others noted attempts to withdraw from conflict (29%). This empirical data finds support in several qualitative studies in which athletes were reported to avoid or withdraw from conflicts with team members or coaches and to seek social support in people outside of their sport (e.g., Gearity & Murray, 2011; Tamminen et al., 2013). When confronted with low quality coaching or even abusive behaviours athletes reported furthermore to ignore or accept conflicts with coaches (e.g., Gearity & Murray, 2011; Stirling, 2013; Stirling & Kerr, 2008).

Important requirements for all these conflict management/ resolution strategies are the ability to recognize and address conflict in early stages in order to prevent an escalation due to a summation of emotions and negative behaviours (Holt et al., 2012) and to communicate effectively (e.g., Jowett & Cockerill, 2002; LaVoi, 2007; Zimmermann, 2009). This includes creating open channels of communication, listening skilfully, just as being able to deliver messages successfully. Most effective conflict strategies are targeting the conflict issue (e.g., practice schedule, lack of communication, etc.) in a collaborative fashion requiring the willingness of both conflict partners to collaborate. It has been proposed that conflict discussions should preferably take place in structured meetings and with the help of a neutral mediator (Holt et al., 2012; Rovio, Eskola, Kozub, Duda, & Lintunen, 2009). Here, it is noteworthy that athletes seem to prefer senior players, the captain or sport psychologist to

mediate meetings which concern relational conflicts, whereas the head coach would only be consulted in case of performance conflicts (Holt, Black, Tamminen, Fox, & Mandigo, 2008; Holt et al., 2012). Different methods and tools have been suggested within the sports literature, these include team building interventions in order to improve communication and build a perception of togetherness, modified performance profiling with an emphasis on relationship quality, as well as team and social skills, win/win strategies in which conflict partners are asked to find a common ground and formulate solutions which enable both to achieve their individual goals, or structured approaches aimed at developing a range of alternative solutions to a problem or broadening individuals' perspectives by sharing information (Hardy & Crace, 1997; Holt et al., 2012; Jowett & Cockerill, 2002; Zimmerman, 2009). Besides addressing conflict directly, also seeking social support and gaining perspective about the issue in question have been mentioned within the sport literature (Mellalieu et al., 2013; Rhind & Jowett, 2010; Tamminen et al., 2013).

Finally, approaches targeting emotional intelligence or mindfulness of individuals have been put forward recently. These generally aim to improve individuals' self-/other-awareness, tolerance, understanding, and psychological flexibility (Chan & Mallett, 2011; Hayes, 2004; Moore, 2009) and may therefore facilitate conflict management. Perceiving and understanding one's own and the partner's emotions correctly may further enhance interpersonal interaction as it enables conflict partners to consciously regulate emotional responses to disagreements. Individuals may, for example, purposefully show soft emotions in order to down-regulate their conflict partner to prevent negative emotional contagion and conflict escalation (e.g., Overall, Simpson, & Struthers, 2013; Sandford, 2012).

Nevertheless, athletes and coaches have also been found to engage in *negative conflict management and resolution strategies*. Accordingly, athletes seem to employ more win-loss approaches and aggressive behaviours compared to non-athletes which were explained by the

competitive nature of sport. Besides showing aggressive behavioural tendencies, relational approaches have also been found to be ineffective or even increase interpersonal conflict (Holt et al., 2012; Kerwin et al., 2011). Relational strategies are usually targeting an individual directly (e.g., intelligence, skill level, etc.) rather than aiming at the actual problem, hence, causing feelings of personal affront or threat which in turn lead to reactant behaviours of the conflict partner (Holt et al., 2012; Miron & Brehm, 2006). Moreover, coaches seem to abuse their power position in terms of physical/emotional punishment, when ignoring athletes' needs or when not integrating them in decision-making processes (e.g., Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, 2009; D'Arripe-Longueville et al., 1998).

### **Consequences of Interpersonal Conflict**

Finally, conflict can lead to consequences which may relate to intrapersonal (e.g. well-being), interpersonal (e.g. termination, cohesion) as well as performance (e.g. competition result) factors and can either be positive, negative or neutral (see Figure 1).

**Intrapersonal consequences.** Interpersonal conflict is likely to influence the manner to which coaches and athletes think, feel and behave. Mellalieu et al. (2013), investigating conflict at major sport events, found that most responses to conflict were perceived negative (65-70%;  $N = 90$ ), whereas only few were perceived positive or neutral (5-29%). Negative cognitive effects included worry, confusion, or even panic; positive cognitions related to increased focus and task clarity. Affective responses covered, for example, frustration, feeling upset, disappointment, but also feeling more positive and confident; behavioural consequences were associated with withdrawal and defensive behaviours, as well as increased motivation and problem solving.

Additionally, multiple studies suggest a negative connection between interpersonal conflict and satisfaction (e.g., Paradis et al., 2014b; Sullivan & Gee, 2007). Further, conflict between coaches and youth athletes may lead to decreased self-description concerning



physiological abilities and overall performance (Jowett & Cramer, 2010). Athletes may also start to question their identity, skills, lose self-confidence or face emotional break downs after severe disputes. Further, it has been mentioned that conflict between peers can lead to athletes' isolation (Paradis et al., 2014a; Tamminen et al, 2013), increased competitive anxiety and other negative affective responses (Partridge & Knapp, 2015). Gould et al. (2002) further stated that Olympic coaches perceived conflicts about team selection processes before major competitions and an athlete's involvement in conflict during major competition as inhibiting their own coaching effectiveness. Taken together, poor-quality relationships and interpersonal conflict can increase stress levels in athletes and coaches (e.g. Fletcher et al., 2012; Hanton et al., 2005; Olusoga, Butt, Hays, & Maynard, 2009) and even lead to quitting the sport (Olusoga, Butt, Maynard, & Hays, 2010; Stirling, 2013). Conflict may as well have severe health-related consequences. In interaction with other factors, such as a high workload, conflict has shown to increase symptoms of athlete burnout and promote maladaptive eating habits (e.g., Shanmugam, Jowett, & Meyer, 2013, 2014; Smith, Gustafsson, & Hassmén, 2010; Tabei, Fletcher, & Goodger, 2012). However, it is important to keep in mind that multiple variables account for the development of psychological disorders, such as self-esteem, depressive symptoms, perfectionism and attachment (Shanmugam et al., 2013, 2014; Stirling & Kerr, 2008).

In contrast, interpersonal conflict may also facilitate personal growth and skill development, therefore lead to positive outcomes (Tamminen et al., 2013). Thus, athletes reported becoming more aware of their strengths, gaining perspective about their sport and viewing adversity as an ongoing journey. Additionally, athletes seemed to improve their social interactions, were more often willing to help and showed more appreciation for significant others. Overall, it is particularly important to consider positive aspects of conflict in order to challenge the negative connotation of the concept just as to develop a more

effective approach to conflict management. For future studies we suggest to take research on resilience into consideration as the important role of social support and high quality relationships in buffering effects on negative stress responses and increasing individuals' resilience to adversity has been documented recently (Sarkar & Fletcher, 2014).

**Interpersonal consequences.** Conflict may also have interpersonal or relational consequences, such as relationship deterioration (e.g., disliking), relationship termination, formation of cliques, low team cohesion, deselection, favouritism, quitting a specific team/club and even dropping out of the sport (e.g., Antonini-Phillippe & Seiler, 2006; Kristiansen et al. 2012; Paradis et al., 2014a; Sullivan & Feltz, 2001; Tamminen et al., 2013). On the other hand, effective conflict solving strategies may positively influence relationships and cohesion as common goals can be worked out and information about one another is shared, leading to a better understanding of each other (e.g., Sullivan & Feltz, 2001).

**Performance consequences.** Finally, performance also seems to be affected by conflict; Mellalieu et al. (2013) found a moderate negative influence of interpersonal conflict on individual and team performance during major competitions. As pointed out previously, data was collected from a variety of sport participants, including coaches, managers and other staff members besides athletes. It therefore is possible that the negative effect of conflict on performance was alleviated by non-athlete participants and would have been greater when analysing athletes' data only. This assumption is supported by reports of adolescent athletes who reported a decrease in performance after intra-team conflict (Patridge & Knapp, 2015) as well as by high-profile athletes who were asked to identify factors influencing their performance at major competitions. Interviewees who previously failed in those major events mentioned the perceived negative impact of issues with coaches, team members and the support network more often than successful athletes (e.g., Gould et al., 2002; Greenleaf et al., 2001). Nevertheless, also positive outcomes of conflict can be found in the literature; for

example, setting up improved training schedules, being more motivated and engaged in practice, or feeling more focused on the task ahead may foster an athlete's performance (Holt et al., 2012; Mellalieu et al., 2013).

However, overall the negative consequences of ongoing dysfunctional interpersonal conflict seem to be more severe than positive ones may be helpful, e.g., when comparing increased performance (Paradis et al., 2014a) with heightened stress and health problems (Shanmugam et al., 2013, Tamminen et al., 2013). Hence, preventing conflict and maintaining a high-quality, effective relationship between athletes and their coaches, teammates or support network should be emphasized and facilitated. A recent field study conducted by Musculus, Nau, Lobinger, and Raab (2015) concerning the assessment of psychological variables for diagnostic processes in youth soccer pointed out that cooperation and conflict behaviours are indeed important variables in applied sport psychology as they are taken into account by youth coaches regarding talent selection processes. It will be interesting to see which findings originate from this line of research in future.

### **Conclusion & Future Directions**

The apparent lack of a clear conceptual delineation of conflict within the context of sport relationships has prevented research to develop a sound body of theoretical, empirical and practical knowledge around interpersonal conflict. Recent research attempts address conflict within sport, though the lack of a clear conceptualisation and operationalization makes it difficult to compare the results these studies have generated. In this paper, we proposed a definition and conceptual framework (Figure 1) of conflict within sport relationships in an effort to provide the impetus necessary to conduct systematic research. There is an enormous empirical scope including research that aims to study (a) sources of conflict (e.g., are sources of conflict similar in team and individual sport, across sport and age levels or female and male athletes?); (b) the conflict process (e.g., how is acute conflict

perceived and described by athletes and coaches, how long does a single conflict episode last and why last some conflict episodes longer than others?); (c) conflict prevention and management (e.g., which behaviours do coaches and athletes show to resolve conflict and how do they differ from each other?); (d) conflict outcomes (e.g., how do coaches and athletes cope with conflict personally and what consequences does conflict have for their relationship and performance?). Additionally, research that focuses on testing interventions that aim to prevent and/or manage conflict is warranted. It is also essential to develop psychometric tools that are valid and reliable measures of different aspects of interpersonal conflict. The generated findings of this future research are likely to be more focussed as well as more consistent and less controversial since researchers have a conceptual and operational map to guide them.

In summary, a preliminary framework of interpersonal conflict in sport relationships was proposed in an attempt to generate research that is both systematic and focused. Guided by relevant, albeit limited, research surrounding the concept of interpersonal conflict within sport, the content and nature of conflict was discussed as well as its determinants and consequences. In addition, approaches to prevent and manage interpersonal conflict were discussed and were integrated into the proposed framework. Research in this area has practical applications including developing effective and healthy coaching environments where conflict is contained and managed well.

## References

- Amason, A. C. (1996). Distinguishing the effects of functional and dysfunctional conflict on strategic decision making: Resolving a paradox for top management teams. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 123–148. doi:10.2307/256633
- \*Antonini Philippe, R., & Seiler, R. (2006). Closeness, co-orientation and complementarity in coach–athlete relationships: What male swimmers say about their male coaches. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, 7(2), 159–171. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2005.08.004
- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005) Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), 19–32. doi:10.1080/1364557032000119616
- Barki, H., & Hartwick, J. (2004). Conceptualizing the construct of interpersonal conflict. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 15(3), 216–244. doi:10.1108/eb022913
- \*Bartholomew, K. J., Ntoumanis, N., & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C. (2009). A review of controlling motivational strategies from a self-determination theory perspective: implications for sports coaches. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 2(2), 215–233. doi:10.1080/17509840903235330
- Becker, A. J. (2009). It's not what they do, it's how they do it: athlete experiences of great coaching. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 4(1), 93–119. doi:10.1260/1747-9541.4.1.93
- Bennie, A., & O'Connor, D. (2012). Coach-athlete relationships: A qualitative study of professional sport teams in Australia. *International Journal of Sport and Health Science*, 10, 58–64. doi:10.5432/ijshs.201208

- 717 \*Benson, A., Eys, M., Surya, M., Dawson, K., & Schneider, M. (2013). Athletes' perceptions  
 718 of role acceptance in interdependent sport teams. *The Sport Psychologist*, 27, 269–  
 719 280.
- 720 Carron, A. V., & Brawley, L. R. (2012). Cohesion conceptual and measurement issues. *Small*  
 721 *Group Research*, 43(6), 726-743. doi: 10.1177/1046496412468072
- 722 Carron, A. V., Widmeyer, W., & Brawley, L. (1985). The development of an instrument to  
 723 assess cohesion in sport teams: The group environment questionnaire. *Journal of*  
 724 *Sport Psychology*, 7, 244-266.
- 725 \*Chan, J. T., & Mallett, C. J. (2011). The value of emotional intelligence for high  
 726 performance coaching. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 6(3),  
 727 315–328. doi:10.1260/1747-9541.6.3.315
- 728 Chelladurai, P., & Saleh, S. D. (1980). Dimensions of leader behavior in sports: Development  
 729 of a leadership scale. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 2(1), 34-45.
- 730 \*Copeland, B. W., & Wida, K. (1996). Resolving team conflict: Coaching strategies to  
 731 prevent negative behavior. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*,  
 732 67(4), 52-54. doi:10.1080/07303084.1996.10607376
- 733 Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Four ways five factors are basic. *Personality and*  
 734 *Individual Differences*, 13(6), 653-665. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(92)90236-I
- 735 \*Culver, D., & Trudel, P. (2000). Coach-athlete communication within an elite alpine ski  
 736 team. *Journal of Excellence*, 3, 28–54.
- 737 Cunningham, I. J., & Eys, M. A. (2007). Role ambiguity and intra-team communication in  
 738 interdependent sport teams. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 37(10), 2220–  
 739 2237. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00256.x

- 740 \*d'Arripe-Longueville, F., Fournier, J. F., & Dubois, A. (1998). The perceived effectiveness  
 741 of interactions between expert French judo coaches and elite female athletes. *The*  
 742 *Sport Psychologist*, 12, 317–332.
- 743 \*Davis, L., & Jowett, S. (2014a). Coach-athlete attachment and the quality of the coach-  
 744 athlete relationship: Implications for athlete's well-being. *Journal of Sports Sciences*,  
 745 32(15), 1454–64. doi:10.1080/02640414.2014.898183
- 746 Deutsch, M. (1969). Socially relevant science: reflections on some studies of interpersonal  
 747 conflict. *American Psychologist*, 24(12), 1076–1092. doi:10.1037/h0028993
- 748 Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual*  
 749 *Review of Psychology*, 41(1), 417-440. doi: 10.1146/annurev.ps.41.020190.002221
- 750 Dixon-Woods, M., Agarwal, S., Jones, D., Young, B., & Sutton, A. (2005). Synthesising  
 751 qualitative and quantitative evidence: a review of possible methods. *Journal of Health*  
 752 *Services Research & Policy*, 10(1), 45-53B. doi:10.1177/1468794107078517
- 753 \*Dupuis, M., Bloom, G., & Loughhead, T. (2006). Team captains' perceptions of athlete  
 754 leadership. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 29(1), 60–78.
- 755 \*Duquin, M. E., & Schroeder-Braun, K. (1996). Power, empathy, and moral conflict in sport.  
 756 *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 2(4), 351–367.  
 757 doi:10.1207/s15327949pac0204\_6
- 758 Evans, A. L., Slater, M. J., Turner, M. J., & Barker, J. B. (2013). Using personal-disclosure  
 759 mutual-sharing to enhance group functioning in a professional soccer academy. *The*  
 760 *Sport Psychologist*, 27, 233-243.
- 761 Felton, L., & Jowett, S. (2013a). “What do coaches do” and “how do they relate”: Their  
 762 effects on athletes' psychological needs and functioning. *Scandinavian Journal of*  
 763 *Medicine & Science in Sports*, 23(2), e130-e139. doi: 10.1111/sms.12029

- 764 Felton, L., & Jowett, S. (2013b). Attachment and well-being: The mediating effects of  
 765 psychological needs satisfaction within the coach–athlete and parent–athlete relational  
 766 contexts. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, 14(1), 57–65.  
 767 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.07.006
- 768 \*Felton, L., & Jowett, S. (2013c). The mediating role of social environmental factors in the  
 769 associations between attachment styles and basic needs satisfaction. *Journal of Sports*  
 770 *Sciences*, 31(6), 618–28. doi:10.1080/02640414.2012.744078
- 771 \*Fletcher, D., & Hanton, S. (2003). Organisational stress in elite sport. *The Sport*  
 772 *Psychologist*, 17, 175–195.
- 773 \*Fletcher, D., Hanton, S., Mellalieu, S. D., & Neil, R. (2012). A conceptual framework of  
 774 organizational stressors in sport performers. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine &*  
 775 *Science in Sports*, 22(4), 545–57. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2010.01242.x
- 776 \*Fransen, K., Vanbeselaere, N., De Cuyper, B., Vande Broek, G., & Boen, F. (2014). The  
 777 myth of the team captain as principal leader: extending the athlete leadership  
 778 classification within sport teams. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 32(14), 1-9.  
 779 doi:10.1080/02640414.2014.891291
- 780 Gearity, B. T. (2012). Poor teaching by the coach: A phenomenological description from  
 781 athletes' experience of poor coaching. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 17(1),  
 782 79–96. doi:10.1080/17408989.2010.548061
- 783 \*Gearity, B. T., & Murray, M. A. (2011). Athletes' experiences of the psychological effects  
 784 of poor coaching. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 12(3), 213–221.  
 785 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.11.004
- 786 \*Gould, D., Greenleaf, C., Chung, Y., & Guinan, D. (2002). A survey of US Atlanta and  
 787 Nagano Olympians: Variables perceived to influence performance. *Research*



- 788        *Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 73(2), 175-186.  
 789        doi:10.1080/02701367.2002.10609006
- 790    \*Gould, D., Guinan, D., Greenleaf, C., & Chung, Y. (2002). A survey of US Olympic  
 791        coaches: Variables perceived to have influenced athlete performances and coach  
 792        effectiveness. *The Sport Psychologist*, 16(3), 229-250.
- 793    \*Greenleaf, C., Gould, D., & Dieffenbach, K. (2001). Factors influencing Olympic  
 794        performance: Interviews with Atlanta and Nagano US Olympians. *Journal of Applied*  
 795        *Sport Psychology*, 13(2), 154–184. doi:10.1080/104132001753149874
- 796    \*Hampson, R. & Jowett, S. (2014). Effects of coach leadership and coach-athlete relationship  
 797        on collective efficacy. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sport*, 24(2),  
 798        454–460. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0838.2012.01527.x
- 799    \*Hanton, S., Fletcher, D., & Coughlan, G. (2005). Stress in elite sport performers: A  
 800        comparative study of competitive and organizational stressors. *Journal of Sports*  
 801        *Sciences*, 23(10), 1129–41. doi:10.1080/02640410500131480
- 802    \*Hardy, C. J., & Crace, R. K. (1997). Foundations of team building: Introduction to the team  
 803        building primer. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 9(1), 1–10.  
 804        doi:10.1080/10413209708415381
- 805    \*Hardy, J., Eys, M. A., & Carron, A. V. (2005). Exploring the potential disadvantages of high  
 806        cohesion in sport teams. *Small Group Research*, 36, 166-187. doi:  
 807        10.1177/1046496404266715
- 808    Hayes, S. C. (2004). Acceptance and Commitment Therapy, Relational Frame Theory, and  
 809        the Third Wave of Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies. *Behavior Therapy*, 35, 639–  
 810        665. doi:10.1016/S0005-7894(04)80013-3

- 811 \*Holt, N. L., Black, D. E., Tamminen, K. A., Fox, K. R., & Mandigo, J. L. (2008). Levels of  
 812 social complexity and dimensions of peer experiences in youth sport. *Journal of Sport*  
 813 *& Exercise Psychology*, 30, 411–431.
- 814 \*Holt, N., Knight, C., & Zukiwski, P. (2012). Female athletes' perceptions of teammate  
 815 conflict in sport: Implications for sport psychology consultants. *The Sport*  
 816 *Psychologist*, 26, 135–154.
- 817 Jackson, B., Dimmock, J. A., Gucciardi, D. F., & Grove, J. R. (2010). Relationship  
 818 commitment in athletic dyads: Actor and partner effects for Big Five self- and other-  
 819 ratings. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 44(5), 641–648.  
 820 doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.08.004
- 821 \*Jackson, B., Dimmock, J. A., Gucciardi, D. F., & Grove, J. R. (2011). Personality traits and  
 822 relationship perceptions in coach–athlete dyads: Do opposites really attract?  
 823 *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 12(3), 222–230.  
 824 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.11.005
- 825 Jackson, B., Grove, J. R., & Beauchamp, M. R. (2010). Relational efficacy beliefs and  
 826 relationship quality within coach-athlete dyads. *Journal of Social and Personal*  
 827 *Relationships*, 27(8), 1035–1050. doi: 10.1177/0265407510378123
- 828 \*Jackson, B., Gucciardi, D., & Dimmock, J. A. (2011). Tripartite efficacy profiles: A cluster  
 829 analytic investigation of athletes' perceptions of their relationship with their coach.  
 830 *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 33, 394–415.
- 831 Jackson, B., Knapp, P., & Beauchamp, M. R. (2008). Origins and consequences of tripartite  
 832 efficacy beliefs within elite athlete dyads. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*,  
 833 30(5), 512.
- 834 \*Jones, R. L. (2002). The black experience within English semiprofessional soccer. *Journal*  
 835 *of Sport & Social Issues*, 26(1), 47–65. doi:10.1177/0193723502261004

- 836 \*Jowett, S. (2003). When the “Honeymoon” is over: a case study of a coach-athlete dyad in  
 837 crisis. *The Sport Psychologist*, 17, 444–460.
- 838 Jowett, S. (2005). The coach-athlete partnership. *The Psychologist*, 18(7), 412–415.
- 839 \*Jowett, S. (2008). Moderators and mediators of the association between the coach-athlete  
 840 relationship and physical self-concept. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 2,  
 841 43–62.
- 842 \*Jowett, S. (2009). Validating coach-athlete relationship measures with the nomological  
 843 network. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 13, 1–18.  
 844 doi:10.1080/10913670802609136
- 845 \*Jowett, S., & Carpenter, P. (2004, October) *Coaches’ and athletes’ perceptions of rules in*  
 846 *the coach–athlete relationship*. Poster presentation at the Annual Conference of the  
 847 Association of the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology. Minnesota, USA
- 848 Jowett, S., & Chaundy, V. (2004). An investigation into the impact of coach leadership and  
 849 coach-athlete relationship on group cohesion. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research*  
 850 *and Practice*, 8, 302–311. doi:10.1037/1089-
- 851 \*Jowett, S., & Cockerill, I. (2003). Olympic medallists’ perspective of the athlete–coach  
 852 relationship. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 4(4), 313–331. doi:10.1016/S1469-  
 853 0292(02)00011-0
- 854 \*Jowett, S., & Cramer, D. (2010). The prediction of young athletes’ physical self from  
 855 perceptions of relationships with parents and coaches. *Psychology of Sport and*  
 856 *Exercise*, 11(2), 140–147. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2009.10.001
- 857 Jowett, S. & Felton, L. (2014). Coach-athlete relationships and attachments. In M.  
 858 Beauchamp & M. Eys (Eds.), *Group Dynamics Advances in Sport and Exercise*  
 859 *Psychology (Second Edition)*. New York: Routledge.

- 860 \*Jowett, S., & Frost, T. (2007). Race/Ethnicity in the all-male coach-athlete relationship:  
 861 Black footballers' narratives. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*,  
 862 5(3), 255–269. doi:10.1080/1612197X.2007.9671835
- 863 \*Jowett, S., Lafreniere, M. A. K., & Vallerand, R. J. (2012). Passion for activities and  
 864 relationship quality: A dyadic approach. *Journal of Social and Personal*  
 865 *Relationships*, 30(6), 734–749. doi:10.1177/0265407512467748
- 866 Jowett, S., & Shanmugam, V. (in press). Relational coaching in sport: Its psychological  
 867 underpinnings and practical effectiveness. In R. Schinke, K.R. McGannon, B. Smith,  
 868 *Routledge International Handbook of Sport Psychology*. Routledge.
- 869 \*Jowett, S., & Timson-Katchis, M. (2005). Social networks in sport: Parental influence on  
 870 the coach-athlete relationship. *The Sport Psychologist*, 19, 267–287.
- 871 \*Kerwin, S., Doherty, A., & Harman, A. (2011). “It’s Not Conflict, It’s Differences of  
 872 Opinion”: An in-depth examination of conflict in nonprofit boards. *Small Group*  
 873 *Research*, 42(5), 562–594. doi:10.1177/1046496411398395
- 874 \*Khomutova, A. (2015, ahead of print). Basketball coaches' experience in working with  
 875 multicultural teams: Central and Northern European perspectives. *Sport in Society*.  
 876 doi:10.1080/17430437.2015.1067777
- 877 \*Kristiansen, E., Tomten, S. E., Hanstad, D. V., & Roberts, G. C. (2012). Coaching  
 878 communication issues with elite female athletes: two Norwegian case studies.  
 879 *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 22(6), 156–67.  
 880 doi:10.1111/j.1600-0838.2012.01521.x
- 881 Langan, E., Blake, C., & Lonsdale, C. (2013). Systematic review of the effectiveness of  
 882 interpersonal coach education interventions on athlete outcomes. *Psychology of Sport*  
 883 *and Exercise*, 14(1), 37–49. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.06.007

- 884 \*Lauer, L., Gould, D., Roman, N., & Pierce, M. (2010). Parental behaviors that affect junior  
 885 tennis player development. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 11(6), 487–496.  
 886 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.06.008
- 887 \*LaVoi, N. M. (2007). Interpersonal communication and conflict in the coach-athlete  
 888 relationship. In S. Jowett & D. E. Lavalley (Eds.), *Social Psychology in Sport* (1st ed.,  
 889 pp. 29–40). Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- 890 LaVoi, N. M., & Dutove, J. K. (2012). Barriers and supports for female coaches: An  
 891 ecological model. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1(1), 17–37.  
 892 doi:10.1080/21640629.2012.695891
- 893 \*Leo, F. M., González-Ponce, I., Sánchez-Miguel, P. A., Ivarsson, A., & García-Calvo, T.  
 894 (2015). Role ambiguity, role conflict, team conflict, cohesion and collective efficacy  
 895 in sport teams: A multilevel analysis. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 20, 60–66.  
 896 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.04.009
- 897 Mageau, G. A., & Vallerand, R. J. (2003). The coach–athlete relationship: A motivational  
 898 model. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 21(11), 883–904.  
 899 doi:10.1080/0264041031000140374
- 900 \*Magnusen, M. (2010). Differences in strength and conditioning coach self-perception of  
 901 leadership style behaviors at the National Basketball Association, Division I, and  
 902 Division II levels. *The Journal of Strength & Conditioning Research*, 24(6), 1440–  
 903 1450. doi: 10.1519/JSC.0b013e3181d321ec
- 904 \*Mazerolle, S. M., Bruening, J. E., & Casa, D. J. (2008). Work-family conflict, part I:  
 905 Antecedents of work-family conflict in national collegiate athletic association division  
 906 I-A certified athletic trainers. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 43(5), 505–12.  
 907 doi:10.4085/1062-6050-43.5.505

- 908 \*Mellalieu, S., Shearer, D. A., & Shearer, C. (2013). A preliminary survey of interpersonal  
 909 conflict at major games and championships. *The Sport Psychologist*, 27, 120–129.
- 910 Miron, A. M., & Brehm, J. W. (2006). Reactance theory-40 years later. *Zeitschrift für*  
 911 *Sozialpsychologie*, 37(1), 9-18. doi:10.1024/0044-3514.37.1.9
- 912 Moore, Z. E. (2009). Theoretical and empirical developments of the (MAC) approach to  
 913 performance enhancement. *Journal of Clinical Sports Psychology*, 4, 291–302.
- 914 \*Morgan, P. B., Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2013). Defining and characterizing team  
 915 resilience in elite sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 14(4), 549-559.  
 916 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.01.004
- 917 \*Musculus, L., Nau, A., Lobinger, B., & Raab, M. (2015). Die Erfassung psychologischer  
 918 Variablen im Nachwuchsleistungsfußball – Implikationen Psychologischer Diagnostik  
 919 für die Praxis der Talentselektion. In K. Wunsch, J. Mueller, H. Mothes, A.  
 920 Schoendube, N. Hartmann, & R. Fuchs (Eds.) *Stressregulation und Sport*. 47.  
 921 *Jahrestagung der Arbeitsgemeinschaft für Sportpsychologie (asp)*, 47.
- 922 \*Olusoga, P., Butt, J., Hays, K., & Maynard, I. (2009). Stress in elite sports coaching:  
 923 Identifying stressors. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 21(4), 442-459.  
 924 doi:10.1080/10413200903222921
- 925 Olusoga, P., Butt, J., Maynard, I., & Hays, K. (2010). Stress and coping: A study of world  
 926 class coaches. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 22(3), 274–293.  
 927 doi:10.1080/10413201003760968
- 928 \*Ommundsen, Y., Roberts, G. C., Lemyre, P. N., & Miller, B. W. (2005). Peer relationships  
 929 in adolescent competitive soccer: Associations to perceived motivational climate,  
 930 achievement goals and perfectionism. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 23(9), 977-989.  
 931 doi:10.1080/02640410500127975

- 932 Overall, N. C., Simpson, J. A., & Struthers, H. (2013). Buffering attachment-related  
 933 avoidance: Softening emotional and behavioral defenses during conflict discussions.  
 934 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 104(5), 854. Doi:10.1037/a0031798
- 935 Paletz, S. B., Miron-Spektor, E., & Lin, C. C. (2014). A cultural lens on interpersonal conflict  
 936 and creativity in multicultural environments. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and*  
 937 *the Arts*, 8(2), 237-252.
- 938 \*Paradis, K. F., Carron, A. V, & Martin, L. J. (2014a). Athlete perceptions of intra-group  
 939 conflict in sport teams. *Sport & Exercise Psychology Review*, 10(3), 4–18.
- 940 \*Paradis, K., Carron, A., & Martin, L. (2014b). Development and validation of an inventory  
 941 to assess conflict in sport teams: the Group Conflict Questionnaire. *Journal of Sports*  
 942 *Sciences*, 32(20), 1966-1978. doi:10.1080/02640414.2014.970220
- 943 \*Partridge, J. A., & Knapp, B. A. (2016). Mean girls: Adolescent female athletes and peer  
 944 conflict in sport. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 28(1), 113-127.  
 945 doi:10.1080/10413200.2015.1076088
- 946 \*Potrac, P., & Jones, R. (2009). Power, conflict, and cooperation: Toward a micropolitics of  
 947 coaching. *Quest*, 61(2), 223–236. doi:10.1080/00336297.2009.10483612
- 948 \*Purdy, L., Potrac, P., & Jones, R. (2008). Power, consent and resistance: An  
 949 autoethnography of competitive rowing. *Sport, Education and Society*, 13(3), 319-336.  
 950 doi:10.1080/13573320802200693
- 951 Rahim, M. A. (2002). Toward a theory of managing organizational conflict. *International*  
 952 *Journal of Conflict Management*, 13(3), 206-235. doi:10.2139/ssrn.437684
- 953 \*Rhind, D. J., & Jowett, S. (2010). Relationship maintenance strategies in the coach-athlete  
 954 relationship: The development of the COMPASS Model. *Journal of Applied Sport*  
 955 *Psychology*, 22(1), 106–121. doi:10.1080/10413200903474472

- 956 \*Rhind, D., & Jowett, S. (2011). Working with coach-athlete relationships: Their quality and  
 957 maintenance. In S. Mellalieu & S. Hanton (Eds.), *Professional Practice in Sport*  
 958 *Psychology: A Review* (219-248). Routledge
- 959 \*Rhind, D. J., & Jowett, S. (2012). Development of the Coach-Athlete Relationship  
 960 Maintenance Questionnaire (CARM-Q). *International Journal of Sports Science and*  
 961 *Coaching*, 7(1), 121–138. doi:10.1260/1747-9541.7.1.121
- 962 Rovio, E., Eskola, J., Kozub, S. A., Duda, J. L., & Lintunen, T. (2009). Can high group  
 963 cohesion be harmful?: A case study of a junior ice-hockey team. *Small Group*  
 964 *Research*, 40(4), 421–435. doi:10.1177/1046496409334359
- 965 Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic  
 966 motivation, social development, and well-being. *The American Psychologist*, 55(1),  
 967 68–78. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68
- 968 \*Sagar, S. S., & Jowett, S. (2012). Communicative acts in coach–athlete interactions: When  
 969 losing competitions and when making mistakes in training. *Western Journal of*  
 970 *Communication*, 76(2), 148–174. doi:10.1080/10570314.2011.651256
- 971 Sanford, K. (2007). Hard and soft emotion during conflict: Investigating married couples and  
 972 other relationships. *Personal Relationships*, 14(1), 65-90. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-  
 973 6811.2006.00142.x
- 974 Sanford, K. (2012). The communication of emotion during conflict in married couples.  
 975 *Journal of Family Psychology*, 26(3), 297. doi:10.1037/a0028139
- 976 Sarkar, M., & Fletcher, D. (2014). Psychological resilience in sport performers: A review of  
 977 stressors and protective factors. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 32(15), 1419-1434.  
 978 doi:10.1080/02640414.2014.901551



- 979 \*Scanlan, T. K., Stein, G. L., & Ravizza, K. (1991). An in-depth study of former elite figure  
 980 skaters: III. Sources of stress. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 13(2), 103-  
 981 120.
- 982 \*Shanmugam, V., Jowett, S., & Meyer, C. (2013). Eating psychopathology amongst athletes:  
 983 The importance of relationships with parents, coaches and teammates. *International*  
 984 *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 11(1), 24–38.  
 985 doi:10.1080/1612197X.2012.724197
- 986 \*Shanmugam, V., Jowett, S., & Meyer, C. (2014). Interpersonal difficulties as a risk factor  
 987 for athletes' eating psychopathology. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in*  
 988 *Sports*, 24(2), 469–76. doi:10.1111/sms.12109
- 989 \*Shaw, S., & Allen, J. B. (2009). The experiences of high performance women coaches: A  
 990 case study of two Regional Sport Organisations. *Sport Management Review*, 12(4),  
 991 217–228. doi:10.1016/j.smr.2009.03.005
- 992 Short, S. E., Sullivan, P., & Feltz, D. L. (2005). Development and preliminary validation of  
 993 the collective efficacy questionnaire for sports. *Measurement in Physical Education*  
 994 *and Exercise Science*, 9(3), 181-202. doi:10.1207/s15327841mpee0903\_3
- 995 \*Shrier, I., Safai, P., & Charland, L. (2014). Return to play following injury: whose decision  
 996 should it be? *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 48(5), 394–401.  
 997 doi:10.1136/bjsports-2013-092492
- 998 \*Smith, S. R. (2001). The toughest game – reducing conflict with parents and players.  
 999 *Strategies*, 14(3), 28–31. doi:10.1080/08924562.2001.10591488
- 1000 \*Smith, A. L., Balaguer, I., & Duda, J. L. (2006). Goal orientation profile differences on  
 1001 perceived motivational climate, perceived peer relationships, and motivation-related  
 1002 responses of youth athletes. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 24(12), 1315–27.  
 1003 doi:10.1080/02640410500520427

- 1004 \*Smith, A. L., Gustafsson, H., & Hassmén, P. (2010). Peer motivational climate and burnout  
 1005 perceptions of adolescent athletes. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 11*(6), 453-460.  
 1006 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.05.007
- 1007 \*Smith, M. J., Arthur, C. A., Hardy, J., Callow, N., & Williams, D. (2013). Transformational  
 1008 leadership and task cohesion in sport: The mediating role of intrateam  
 1009 communication. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 14*(2), 249-257.  
 1010 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.10.002
- 1011 Smith, R., & Smoll, F. (1997). Coach-mediated team building in youth sports. *Journal of*  
 1012 *Applied Sport Psychology, 9*, 37-41. doi:10.1080/10413209708415387
- 1013 Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (1989). Leadership behaviors in sport: A theoretical model and  
 1014 research paradigm. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19*(18), 1522-1551. doi:  
 1015 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1989.tb01462.x
- 1016 Stirling, A. E. (2013). Understanding the use of emotionally abusive coaching practices.  
 1017 *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 8*(4), 625-640.  
 1018 doi:10.1260/1747-9541.8.4.625
- 1019 \*Stirling, A., & Kerr, G. A. (2008). Elite female swimmers' experiences of emotional abuse  
 1020 across time. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 7*(4), 89-113. doi:10.1300/J135v07n04
- 1021 \*Stirling, A. E., & Kerr, G. A. (2009). Abused athletes' perceptions of the coach-athlete  
 1022 relationship. *Sport in Society, 12*(2), 227-239. doi:10.1080/17430430802591019
- 1023 \*Sullivan, P. (2004). Communication differences between male and female team sport  
 1024 athletes. *Communication Reports, 17*(2), 121-128. doi:10.1080/08934210409389381
- 1025 \*Sullivan, P. J., & Feltz, D. L. (2001). The relationship between intrateam conflict and  
 1026 cohesion within hockey teams. *Small Group Research, 32*(3), 342-355.  
 1027 doi:10.1177/104649640103200304

- 1028 \*Sullivan, P. J., & Feltz, D. L. (2003). The preliminary development of the Scale for  
 1029 Effective Communication in Team Sports (SECTS). *Journal of Applied Social*  
 1030 *Psychology*, 33(8), 1693-1715. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01970.x
- 1031 \*Sullivan, P. J., & Gee, C. J. (2007). The relationship between athletic satisfaction and  
 1032 intrateam communication. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 11(2),  
 1033 107–116. doi:10.1037/1089-2699.11.2.107
- 1034 \*Tabei, Y., Fletcher, D., & Goodger, K. (2012). The relationship between organizational  
 1035 stressors and athlete burnout in soccer players. *Journal of Clinical Sport Psychology*,  
 1036 6, 146–165.
- 1037 \*Tamminen, K. A., Holt, N. L., & Neely, K. C. (2013). Exploring adversity and the potential  
 1038 for growth among elite female athletes. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 14(1), 28–  
 1039 36. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.07.002
- 1040 \*Tomlinson, A., & Yorganci, I. (1997). Male coach/female athlete relations: Gender and  
 1041 power relations in competitive sport. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 21(2), 134–  
 1042 155. doi:10.1177/019372397021002003
- 1043 \*Trzaskoma-Bicsérdy, G., Bognár, J., Révész, L., & Géczi, G. (2007). The coach-athlete  
 1044 relationship in successful Hungarian individual sports. *International Journal of Sports*  
 1045 *Science and Coaching*, 2(4), 485–495. doi:10.1260/174795407783359759
- 1046 Vallerand, R. J. & Miquelon, P. (2007). Passion for sport in athletes. In S. Jowett and D.  
 1047 Lavallee (Eds.) *Social Psychology in Sport*. Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- 1048 Volkema, R., & Bergmann, T. (1995). Conflict styles as indicators of behavioral patterns in  
 1049 interpersonal conflicts. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 135(1), 5–15.  
 1050 doi:10.1080/00224545.1995.9711395

- 1051 \*Weiss, M. R., & Fretwell, S. D. (2005). The parent-coach/child-athlete relationship in youth  
1052 sport: cordial, contentious, or conundrum? *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*,  
1053 76(3), 286–305. doi:10.1080/02701367.2005.10599300
- 1054 \*Weiss, M., & Smith, A. (2002). Friendship quality in youth sport: Relationship to age,  
1055 gender, and motivation variables. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 24, 420–  
1056 437.
- 1057 Wylleman, P. (2000). Interpersonal relationships in sport: Uncharted territory in sport  
1058 psychology research. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 31, 555–572.
- 1059 \*Zimmerman, E. P. (2009). Conflict resolution strategies and improving relationships for  
1060 ATs. *Athletic Therapy Today*, 14(4), 36-39.
- 1061 Yang, S. X., & Jowett, S. (2013). Conceptual and measurement issues of the complementarity  
1062 dimension of the coach–athlete relationship across cultures. *Psychology of Sport and*  
1063 *Exercise*, 14(6), 830–841. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.06.003
- 1064 Yang, S. X., Jowett, S., & Chan, D.K. (2015). Effects of the Big-Five personality traits on the  
1065 quality of relationship and satisfaction in coach-athlete dyads. *Scandinavian Journal*  
1066 *of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 25(4), 568-580. doi: 10.1111/sms.12329

**Figure Caption**

Figure 1. A comprehensive framework of interpersonal conflict in sport relationships.