Intuition: The BYU Undergraduate Journal in Psychology

Volume 8 | Issue 1 Article 4

2012

Narcissism in Social Interactions: Measurement Design and Validation

References

Blass, T. (1999). The Milgram paradigm after 35 years: Some things we now know about obedience to authority. Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 29(5), 955-978. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.1999.tb00134.x

Brigham Young University. (2010). Honor Code Statement. Provo, UT: Church Educational System.

Carli, L. L. (2001). Gender and social influence. Journal of Social Issues, 57(4), 725-741. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00233

Driskell, J. E., Olmstead, B., & Salas, E. (1993). Task cues, dominance, cues, and influence in task groups. Journal of Applied Psychology, 78, 51–60.

Eagly, A.H., Wood, W., & Fishbaugh, L. (1981). Sex differences in conformity: Surveillance by the group as a determinant of male nonconformity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40, 384-394.

Eagly, A. & Chrvala, C. (1986). Sex differences in conformity: Status and gender role interpretations. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 10(3), 203-220.

Milgram, S. (1963). Behavioral study of obedience. The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 67(4), 371-378.

Wagner, D. G. & Berger, J. B. (1997). Gender and interpersonal task behaviors: Status expectation accounts. Sociological Perspectives, 40(1), 1-32.

Williams, J. E. & Best, D. L. (1990). Measuring sex stereotypes: A multination study. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Motapanyane, J. (2009). The politics of feminism in South Africa: gender consciousness and political agency in the twentieth century. Library and Archives Canada, 1, 1-300.

Peterson, I., Bhana, A., & McKay, M. (2005). Sexual violence and youth in South Africa: The need for community-based prevention interventions. Child Abuse & Neglect, 29, 1233-1248.

Posel, D. (2005). The scandal of manhood: 'baby rape' and the politicization of sexual violence in post-apartheid South Africa. Culture, Health & Sexuality, 7(3), 239-252. doi:10.1080/13691050412331293467

Richter, L. (2003). Baby rape in South Africa. Child Abuse Review, 12, 392-400. doi:10.1002/car.824

Seedat, M., Niekerk, A. v., Jewkes, R., Suffla, S., & Ratele, K. (2009). Violence and injuries in South Africa: Prioritizing an agenda for prevention. Lancet, 374, 1011-1022. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60948-X

Shisana, O., Rice, K., Zungu, N., & Zuma, K. (2010). Gender and poverty in South Africa in the Era of HIV/AIDS: A quantitative study. Journal Of Women's Health, 19, 39-46. doi:10.1089/jwh.2008.1200

Intuition 2011
Vol 8, 21-28

Narcissism in Social Interactions:
Measurement Design and Validation

Gwen Coulson, Katherine Ashby, and Annalisa Ellsworth

Narcissism, generally defined as selfish egotism, has a derogatory effect on personal relationships.In an effort to help employers and others anticipate and avoid social conflicts arising from narcissistic behavior, we created the Narcissism Sociability Index (NSI). Our hypothesis assessed narcissistic behavior in two domains, grandiose state of mind and severely disturbed social relations, in an attempt to shorten the previously established Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI. Raskin & Hall,1979). The NSI is a 10-question self-report measure using a 6-point Likert scale. We used a convenience sample consisting of 105 Brigham Young University (BYU) students, their families, and friends. The NSI had questionable internal consistency ($\alpha = .62$). Content validity ratios ranged from .12 to .92. Principal component analysis showed the highest loadings on the first and second components, which corresponded with our hypothesis. Only two questions loaded onto other factors. These results indicate that small revisions could lead to large increases in the reliability and validity of the NSI. Possible future directions for the NSI as a tool in the workforce are considered.

Narcissism may be best defined as a self-regulatory system that constantly adjusts in order to maintain and enhance positive self-views through utilizing the social environment (Campbell, Bush, Brunell, & Shelton, 2005). Over the past 30 years, from 1976 to 2006, narcissism rates among young adults have risen 30% and are continuing to rise (Twenge, Konrath, Poster, Campbell, & Bushman, 2008). Although many measures of narcissism have been created and rigorously analyzed, many of the measures seek to cover a wide range of the different dimensions of narcissism (i.e. superiority, grandiose exhibitionism, exploititativeness, entitlement, authority, self-absorption, etc.). Furthermore, the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI), considered one of the most comprehensive measures of narcissism, has been critiqued as ambiguous due to the many dimensions it seeks to measure simultaneously (Watson & Biderman, 1993). According to Corry, Merritt, Mrug, and Pamp (2008), "additional NPI research is needed to rescale, modify, or omit several NPI items and develop gender-equivalent items" (p. 593). In addition to these suggested revisions to the current NPI, another need exists within the efforts to measure narcissim. This need is the creation of measures focused on explicitly measuring the different aspects of narcissim. Ackerman et al., (2011) proposed that the current version of the NPI uses an overall summary score that may be merging all of the different manifestations of narcissim. This approach is harmful because different aspects of narcissim may be overlooked and lost in the overall score (Ackerman et al., 2011).

Another condsideration when measuring narcissism is the length of the measure. Ames, Rose, and Anderson (2006) developed the NPI-16 in an effort to create a shorter measure of narcissim that could be administered more easily and quickly. While the NPI-16 proved to be a valid alternative to long forms measuring narcissim (i.e. the NPI- 40) it was unidimensional in its approach of the construct (Ames, Rose, & Anderson, 2006). Therefore, combining focus with brevity, we strove to create a valid, compact measure of socially detrimental narcissism. Narrowing our focus we sought to measure a few of the aspects of narcissim that contribute to detrimental social interactions. We chose to create a measure of socially detrimental narcissim hoping it could lead to early detection of narcissistic behaviors and help employers and others anticipate and avoid social conflict arising from narcissistic individuals. In addition to narrowing the focus, we sought to shorten our measure of narcissim so it could be more easily administered in a wide variety of settings.

For the purposes of this study, we operationally defined narcissism as the degree to which one maintains a grandiose state of mind or is involved in severely disturbed interpersonal relations. A grandiose state of mind is defined as individuals perceiving themselves as superior to others and considering the concerns of others less important than their own (Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002; Dimaggio et al., 2002; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Pincus et al.,

2009). Severely disturbed interpersonal relationships are defined as individuals being easily offended, having ideas of reference, and struggling to sustain long-term relationships (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Campbell et al., 2002; Dimaggio et al., 2002).

Many researchers agree that one of the main dimensions of narcissism is having a grandiose state of mind (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002; Dimaggio et al., 2002; Pincus et al., 2009). Part of this state of mind is narcissists' belief that they are more valuable than and superior to others (Campbell et al., 2002). They have a strong egocentric bias and a lack of moralistic bias (Paulhus & John, 1998). Pincus et al. (2009) defines narcissistic grandiosity using several intrapsychic processes. These processes include repressing negative aspects of the self, having strong feelings of entitlement, distorting information that does not conform to a positive view of the self, and having an inflated self-image without the skills and accomplishments required to justify and sustain it. Other research has found narcissistic individuals with a grandiose state of mind are likely to openly regulate self-esteem through self-enhancement, denying weaknesses, and devaluing people who threaten their self-esteem. Narcissistic individuals also make demands of entitlement that are overbearing and show persistent anger in unmet expectations (Dickinson & Pincus, 2003).

The social consequence of narcissists continuously "working on" maintaining their grandiose view of themselves is that they see others primarily as a source of confirmation (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). In attempts to receive the feedback they desire, narcissists can frequently demand more from their relationships, and eventually destroy the very relationships upon which they are dependent (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). A recent study found that narcissists see themselves as having the right to demand and take what they want, while others have the duty to give and admire them. This expectation leads to dysfunctional interpersonal relationships that are often interrupted as others refuse to supply the admiration that the narcissists demand (Dimaggio et al., 2002). This pattern of exploitation leads to a deficiency of close relationships (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Campbell et al., 2002; Dimaggio et al., 2002), and explains why narcissists have difficulty in maintaining favorable relationships over time (Back et al., 2010; Holtzman, Vazire, & Mehl, 2010). Furthermore, narcissists are often oblivious to the dissonance between their expectations and reality and the impact that this dissonance has on their relationships (Dickinson & Pincus, 2003).

Although there are many different dimensions of narcissism, a grandiose state of mind and severely disturbed relations are two domains that capture much of the socially undesirable behavior elicited by narcissists. Through creation of a concise measure, levels of narcissism in individuals can be effectively and efficiently identified. The purpose of this study, therefore, was to create a measure of social narcissism and test its factor structure, internal consistency, and validity to determine its utility for future use in identifying social narcissism. We hypothesized that the Narcissism Sociability Index (NSI) would reliably and validly measure socially inhibiting narcissism.

Method

Participants

The participants in our survey totaled 105. We gathered a convenience sample consisting of Brigham Young University (BYU) students, their friends, and family members. Participants included 31 males ages 15 to 58, (M =35.52, SD = 12.65), and 74 females ages 18 to 70, (M =34.58, SD = 15.68); one participant did not include age information (see Table 1 for demographic data). Participants were recruited by email and Facebook (www.facebook.com).

Item Construction

The NSI was created from a pool of 30 items. Twenty-five members of an undergraduate psychology class judged the relevancy of 30 items to our two domains. Content validity ratio (CVR) ratings were computed and 10 items with CVR ratings ranging from .92 to .12 were selected (see Table 2). Three of the five negatively worded questions received less than an adequate CVR rating (the minimum acceptable value being .37), but were selected in order to avoid inaccurate responses due to thoughtless responss, or agreement bias effects. All negatively worded questions were reversed scored. We used a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 6 (strongly disagree) in an effort to help participants more accurately rate their behaviors and to give them an option in the middle that still forced the participants to either side of the scale (see Appendix A for the NSI survey).

Item Construction

The NSI was created from a pool of 30 items. Twenty-five members of an undergraduate psychology class judged the relevancy of 30 items to our two domains. Content validity ratio (CVR) ratings were computed and 10 items with CVR ratings ranging from .92 to .12 were selected (see Table 2). Three of the five negatively worded questions received less than an adequate CVR rating (the minimum acceptable value being .37), but were selected in order to avoid inaccurate responses due to thoughtless responses, or agreement bias effects. All negatively worded questions were reversed scored. We used a 6-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 6 (strongly disagree) in an effort to help participants more accurately rate their behaviors and to give them an option in the middle that still forced the participants to either side of the scale (see Appendix A for the NSI survey).

Statistical Analysis

We used principal component analysis to find what factors our items loaded onto and eigenvalues and scree plot deflections were checked to ascertain factor structures. The reliability of the NSI was determined using Cronbach's alpha to measure internal consistency, and Pearson bivariate correlations to measure the strength of the linear relationships between test items. Face validity was checked by an open-ended question asking what participants thought the survey was measuring. All data were analyzed using SPSS 18.0.

Results

Factor Analysis

A factor analysis revealed four components with eigenvalues greater than 1 (eigenvalues = 2.47, 1.72, 1.19, and 1.05) that accounted for 64.37% of the variance (see Table 3). This four-factor solution was inconsistent with our initial intent of developing a questionnaire that accessed only two factors (see Figure 1). Most of the items had primary loadings on the first and second component, except for Items 3 and 5 of the questionnaire (see Appendix A; Table 3). Item 4 had equal loadings on the first and second components, indicating that this question was not objectively characterized by either factor. We conclude that only the first and second components of the NSI corresponded with our initial domains which included characteristics of a grandiose state of mind and severely disturbed interpersonal relations.

Reliability

Cronbach's alpha indicated that the test's internal consistency was questionable ($\alpha = .62$; see Table 5), showing that the items did not efficiently assess the same intended construct and domain. A Pearson bivariate analysis revealed that 20 of 45 correlations were significant (see Table 5), suggesting a weak linear relationship between the majority of test items ($p < .05$; see Table 6).

Validity

Two of 10 items had very high content validity (≥ .82), one item had high content validity (≥ .76), three items had adequate content validity (.60), and four items had low content validity (≤ .12; see Table 2). Less than one percent of participants correctly identified the construct, indicating that the test is not face valid.

Discussion

Although there are many aspects of narcissism, we constructed the NSI in an effort to create a more valid, compact measure of socially detrimental narcissism. Factor analysis revealed that four components were captured by the NSI. Of the four components, the domain of grandiose state of mind was the most heavily weighted, accounting for much of the variance. Severely disturbed relationships, the only other domain intentionally measured, was the second most heavily weighted.While the domains of a grandiose state of mind and severly disturbed relationships were the most heavility weighted, the loadings on each domain suggest that the items did not discriminate well between the two domains. Moreover, the third and fourth components (non-identifiable) had multiple loadings on each factor. Further analysis revealed that the NSI had questionable internal consistency and reliability. This could have been due to the presence of the third and fourth components. Although the domains of grandiose state of mind and severely disturbed relationships were not the only two factors measured by the NSI, editing and revising the NSI could result in greater reliability and more accurate measurement of our desired domains.

A source of error that may have influenced the ratings of the NSI is participants' self-serving bias. The individuals' desire to portray themselves in a positive way may have suppressed the negative aspects of narcissism that they recognized in themselves. In addition, those with narcissistic traits seldom view themselves as narcissistic. Failing to report these traits could have also influenced ratings. Furthermore, our sample consisted of many more females than males. These gender differences may also have influenced our results. Although the NSI had low face validity, the questions still asked participants to admit undesirable attitudes and behaviors. Therefore, even though the overwhelming majority of participants did not know that the NSI was measuring narcissism, they

still could have felt the need to moderate their answers. This moderation may have resulted in inaccurate ratings and skewed results.

Error in the NSI could have also arisen from the non-expert panelists of the CVR. Panelists were undergraduates in a psychology course who were assigned to participate. They were not experts in the field of narcissism and rated few items as essential. While several factors may have contributed to rating decisions, most students are busy and always hurrying could have led panelists to speed through the ratings, not pausing to think about the construct and two domains. Questions chosen because of high CVR ratings may not have been the questions that best applied to the two domains.

External validity could be improved by capturing a more representative sample. Data were gathered from a convenience sample of Brigham Young University students and their close friends. Application of our measure in the workforce would require a sample of workers. A sample of working BYU students would provide a sample more representative of the workforce.

Although reliability and validity were questionable, the NSI scale did measure the targeted two domains. Extraneous measures of the third and fourth components could be eliminated by discarding Question 3, the only loading for Component 3, and Question 5, the only loading for Component 4. By replacing Questions 3 and 5 with questions that fall under our expected domains, reliability may increase and a more specific measurement of our two domains could be achieved that may yield significant results. Elimination of Questions 3 and 5 alone would not improve reliability, but would instead decrease reliability (.42, see Table 7), largely due to the small number of questions used in our measure. To increase reliability, more accurate questions aimed at measuring our two domains would have to be added.

Although the NSI was an attempt to create brief, focused measurement of socially detrimental narcissim it did not prove to be as valid as the NPI-16 (Ames, Rose, & Anderson, 2006) and did not measure our hypothesized domains succinctly. Further development of the NSI is needed before it may be used in the workforce. However, use of a more accurate NSI could lead to early detection of narcissistic behaviors and help employers and others anticipate and avoid social conflict arising from narcissistic individuals. Although the goal of this measure of narcissism is to be as compact as possible, increasing the number of questions could prove beneficial, provided the NSI does not grow to the length of other measures (i.e. NPI-16, NPI-40). Continued editing of questions to apply more directly and accurately to our domains may yield a stronger measure of narcissism. It may also be advantageous to consider other domains of narcissism that are socially detrimental, such as narcissistic individuals' need for external validation.

The aim of the NSI was to measure socially detrimental narcissism accurately, concisely, and reliably. The NSI proved to have questionable reliability. Further research is needed not only to improve reliability and validity of this measure, but also to determine the most appropriate domains for a measure of socially detrimental narcissism and to ensure that the scale measures socially detrimental narcissism as accurately as possible.

Appendix A
Tables

Table 1
Demographics

	Male		Female		Sum	
Total	31	29.52%	74	71.43%	105	
Average age	35.52		34.58		35.05	
Married	18	17.14%	50	47.62%	68	64.76%
Single	10		17	16.12%	27	25.71%
Divorced	1	.95%	2	1.90%	3	2.86%
Widowed	1	.95%	1	.95%	2	1.90%
Separated	0	0%	3	2.86%	3	2.86%
Dating	1	.95%	3	2.86%	4	3.81%

Table 2
Content Validity Ratio

Item	CVR
1	.44
2	.76
3	.84
4	.20
5	.60
6	.12
7	.60
8	.60
9	.28
10	.92

Table 3
Component Matrix

	Component 1	Component 2	Component 3	Component 4
01		.55		.34
02	.50	-.50		
03	.30		.75	
04		.60	.51	.38
05	.52			.60
06	.45	.67		
07	.74			
08	.62			
09	.41	.50	-.44	
10	.68			-.52

Table 4
Total Variance Explained

	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
Component	Total	% Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% Variance	Cumulative %
1	2.47	24.74	24.74	2.47	24.74	24.74
2	1.72	17.23	41.97	1.72	17.23	41.97
3	1.19	11.90	53.86	1.19	11.90	53.86
4	1.05	10.51	64.37	1.05	10.51	64.37
5	0.86	8.57	72.94			
6	0.77	7.69	80.63			
7	0.76	7.58	88.21			
8	0.45	4.52	92.73			
9	0.41	4.12	96.84			
10	0.32	3.16	100			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis
% = Percentage

Table 5
Cronbach's Alpha

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Standardized	N
.62	.62	10

Table 6
Pearson Correlation Coefficients

	Item 01	Item 02	Item 03	Item 04	Item 05	Item 06	Item 07	Item 08	Item 09	Item 10
Item 01	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Item 02	.32**	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Item 03	.03	.23*	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Item 04	.22*	.35**	.14	1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Item 05	.02	.28**	.17	.52**	1	-	-	-	-	-
Item 06	-.23*	.05	.15	.14	.09	1	-	-	-	-
Item 07	.12	.25**	.01	.27**	.16	.14	1	-	-	-
Item 08	.08	.08	.03	.20*	.26**	.33**	.06	1	-	-
Item 09	.16	.07	.18	.34**	.21*	.07	.28**	.28**	1	-
Item 10	.04	-.01	.04	.03	.21*	.03	.21*	.43**	.27**	1

* Significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed).
** Significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 7
Cronbach's Alpha

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Standardized	N
.41	.42	8

References

Ackerman, R. A., Witt, E. A., Donnellan, M. B., Trzesniewski, K. H., Robins, R. W., & Kashy, D. A. (2011). What does the narcissistic personality inventory really measure? Assessment, 18(1), 67-87. doi:10.1177/1073191110382845

Ames, D. R., Rose, P., & Anderson, C. P. (2006). The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism. Journal of Research in Personality, 40(4), 440-450. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2005.03.002

Back, M. D., Schmukle, S. C., & Egloff, B. (2010). Why are narcissists so charming at first sight? decoding the narcissism–popularity link at zero acquaintance. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98(1), 132-145. doi:10.1037/a0016338

Campbell, W. K., Bush, C. P., Brunell, A. B., & Shelton, J. (2005). Understanding the social costs of narcissism: The case of the tragedy of the commons. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31(10), 1358-1368. doi:10.1177/0146167205274855

Campbell, W. K., Foster, C. A., & Finkel, E. J. (2002). Does self-love lead to love for others?: A story of narcissistic game playing. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83(2), 340-354. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.83.2.340

Corry, N., Merritt, R. D., Mrug, S., & Pamp, B. (2008). The factor structure of the narcissistic personality inventory. Journal of Personality Assessment, 90(6), 593-600. doi:10.1080/00223890802388590

Cronbach, L. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal consistency of tests. Psychometrika,16, 297-334.

Dickinson, K. A., & Pincus, A. L. (2003). Interpersonal analysis of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. Journal of Personality Disorders, 17(3), 188-207. doi:10.1521/pedi.17.3.188.22146

Dimaggio, G., Semerari, A., Falcone, M., Nicolò, G., Carcione, A., & Procacci, M. (2002). Metacognition, states of mind, cognitive biases, and interpersonal cycles: Proposal for an integrated narcissism model. Journal of Psychotherapy Integration, 12(4), 421-451. doi:10.1037/1053-0479.12.4.421

Holtzman, N. S., Vazire, S., & Mehl, M. R. (2010). Sounds like a narcissist: Behavioral manifestations of narcissism in everyday life. Journal of Research in Personality, 44(4), 478-484. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.06.001

Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. Psychological Inquiry, 12(4), 177-196. doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1204_1

Paulhus, D. L., & John, O. P. (1998). Egoistic and moralistic biases in self-perception: The interplay of self-deceptive styles with basic traits and motives. Journal of Personality, 66(6), 1025-1060. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.00041

Pincus, A. L., Ansell, E. B., Pimentel, C. A., Cain, N. M., Wright, A. G. C., & Levy, K. N. (2009). Initial construction and validation of the pathological narcissism inventory. Psychological Assessment, 21(3), 365-379. doi:10.1037/a0016530

Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. Psychological Reports, 45(2)

Twenge, J. M., Konrath, S., Foster, J. D., Campbell, W. K., & Bushman, B. J. (2008). Egos inflating over time: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory. Journal of Personality, 76(4), 875-902. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00507.x

Watson, P. J., & Biderman, M. D. (1993). Narcissistic personality inventory factors, splitting, and self-consciousness. Journal of Personality Assessment, 61(1), 41-57. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa6101_4

Intuition 2011
Vol 8, 29-31

Positive and Negative Effects of Various Coaching Styles on Player Performance and Development

Aaron Singh

This review highlights the important role that coaches play in the physical and psychological development and performance of athletes under their stewardship; it also explores various types of techniques used by coaches to accomplish their goals and objectives and examines the effectiveness of these coaching techniques on the players and their ability to perform on the field. Two main ideals will be considered: the coaching techniques and the effects of those techniques on the athletes. Though there are various methods of coaching, this review will use three examples of coaching methods. The result of this review may prompt coaches to evaluate their coaching and leadership styles and make appropriate adjustments. For the purpose of this review, the coach will be placed as the leader role of the team.

The main purpose of a coach is to maximize the performance of his or her athletes, help them reach a higher level than they could have done alone, and develop a winning team. "Coaches are known to fulfill many different roles including leader, psychologist, friend, teacher, personnel manager, administrator, fundraiser and role model" (Côté, 2004).

The skill development of a player involves training and learning, therefore, it becomes important for the coach to use proper coaching techniques. The coach must find a balance between helping his or her players reach their full potential as athletes and achieving success through winning, so that one purpose does not inhibit the other. "During competition it is important that a coach wisely manages the tension between 'coaching to win' and coaching for learning" (Naylor, 2006). The question "What makes a good coach?" can then be debated between a coach that concentrates on the players and their individual development as an athlete, and a coach who measures success through a win/lose ratio. It may be argued that the ideal coach is the person who can balance or achieve both.

Coaching Techniques

From a humanistic perspective, a coach can conduct leadership through five different methods: training and instruction, democratic behavior, autocratic behavior, social support and positive feedback (Gardner, Shields, Bredermeier & Bostrom, 1996). "Coaching, from this point of view, capitalizes on a person's inherent tendency to self-actualize and looks to stimulate a person's inherent growth potential" (Ives, 2008). Similar to coaching, psychotherapy shares the purpose of developing individuals, enhancing their potential and creating a supportive relationship (Ives, 2008).

On the other hand, the goal-oriented approach is a strict goal-focused or solution-driven approach (Ives, 2008). One primary function is to promote autonomy of the players. In order to establish autonomy, the player must implicitly apply goals upon them self. According to Grant (2006), "Coaching is essentially about helping individuals regulate and direct their interpersonal and intrapersonal resources to better attain their goals." However, the concept of the goal-oriented approach is to increase performance and tactics of the team, without regard of individual feelings and thoughts (Ives, 2008).

Lastly, autonomy support from coaches shows the readiness of the coach "to take the others perspective, provide appropriate and meaningful information, offer opportunities for choice, while at the same time minimize external pressures and demands" (Black & Deci, 2000). The player's ability to become autonomous was determined by the type of environment that the coach put them in. Reinboth, Duda, & Ntoumanis (2004) said the fulfillment of the players basic needs and well-being (e.g. Do they have fun?) is essential for self-determined, goal-directed behavior. They also found that the majority of the players in their study agreed their coaches supported methods that induced autonomy amongst the players. Players