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Abstract
This study investigated how coach and teammates influence masters athletes’ sport commitment, and the effect of functional and obligatory commitment on participation in masters swimming. The sample consisted of 523 masters swimmers (330 male and 193 female) aged between 22 and 83 years ($M = 39.00$, $SD = 10.42$). A bi-dimensional commitment scale was used to measure commitment dimensions and perceived influence from social agents. Structural Equation Modelling analysis was conducted to evaluate the influence of social agents on functional and obligatory commitment, and the predictive capabilities of the two types of commitment towards sport participation. Support provided by coach and teammates increased functional commitment, constraints from these social agents determined higher obligatory commitment, and coach constraints negatively impacted functional commitment. In addition, both commitment types predicted training participation, with functional commitment increasing participation in team training sessions, and obligatory commitment increasing the hours of individual training. The findings suggest that in order to increase participation in masters swimming teams and reduce non-supervised training, coach and teammates should exhibit a supportive attitude and avoid over expectation.
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Sport Commitment and Participation in Masters Swimmers:

The Influence of Coach and Teammates

Sport commitment has been defined as “a psychological construct representing the desire and resolve to continue sport participation” (Scanlan, Carpenter, Schmidt, Simons, & Keeler, 1993, p. 6). In spite of this definition, the majority of studies on sport commitment have focused on its antecedents rather than its potential behavioural and psychological outcomes, such as participation in sport activities. Initially, sport commitment has been investigated as a uni-dimensional construct determined by enjoyment in doing the activity, personal investments in the activity, benefits and opportunities derived from the activity, attraction toward alternative activities, and constraints provided by social environment (see e.g., Scanlan, Carpenter, Schmidt, Simons, & Keeler, 1993; Scanlan, Simons, Carpenter, Schmidt, & Keeler, 1993), with social support more recently added as a determinant (Scanlan, Russell, Beals & Scanlan, 2003; Scanlan, Russell, Wilson & Scanlan, 2003). To date, studies based on this uni-dimensional construct have reported conflicting results about the relationship between commitment and behavioural outcomes (Weiss, Weiss, & Amorose, 2010; Casper, Gray, & Stellino, 2007). For example, Weiss and colleagues (Weiss et al., 2010) study of young competitive female gymnasts did not find any direct effects of psychological commitment on behavioral outcomes, measured as effort and intensity of training. In contrast, Casper and colleagues (Casper et al., 2007) study of adult recreational tennis players found that tennis commitment predicted participation frequency.

Wilson and colleagues (Wilson, Rodgers, Carpenter, Hall, Hardy, & Fraser, 2004) expanded the initial uni-dimensional construct of sport commitment and distinguished between two different types of sport commitment: functional and obligatory. This distinction was based on Brickman’s (Brickman, 1987) suggestion to consider commitment as composed by feelings of obligation and by functional resolve. This bi-dimensional construct presents similarities with self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985; 2002). Functional commitment, similarly to autonomous motivation,
reflects the will of a person to do something (“I want to”), instead obligatory commitment, such as controlled motivation, is determined by sense of duty and constriction in doing something (“I have to”). As Wilson and colleagues asserted, it is reasonable to expect different outcomes from different types of commitment. In fact, studies investigating sport commitment and motivation in physical exercise contexts have found that functional commitment and autonomous motivation are predictive of higher participation in physical activity, while obligatory commitment and controlled motivation do not have any effects (Wilson et al., 2004; Wilson, Rodgers, Blanchard, & Gessell, 2003). Alternatively, studies based on self-determination theory (Mullen & Markland, 1997; Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand, & Brièr, 2001; Ryan & Deci, 2000; 2007) suggest that autonomous motivation increases participation in sport activities, while controlled motivation determines intention to quit among sport practitioners. Both these groups of findings suggest differential effects of sport commitment on participation, implying the need to consider a bi-dimensional construct of sport commitment in order to predict sport participation.

Two of the main factors affecting participation in sport activities are the presence of social support and lack of social network (Allender, Cowburn, & Foster, 2006). Several studies in youth and adult sports identified in coaches and sport-peers two of the most relevant social agents influencing commitment and motivation (e.g., DeFreese & Smith, 2013; Gillet, Vallerand, Amoura, & Balde, 2010; Medic, Starkes, Young, & Weir, 2012; Torregrosa, Viladrich, Ramis, Azocar, Latinjak, & Cruz, 2011). For example, Medic and colleagues (2012) found that masters runners who trained with a coach exhibited a more self-determined motivational profile compared to athletes with no coach. Additionally, research in youth sport (Torregrosa et al., 2011) has found that a climate of task-orientation created by coach and teammates was the main predictor of commitment towards the activity. Studies based on sport commitment theories have examined social influence in terms of support and constraints provided by social agents. For example, Weiss and Weiss’s (2003) study of young gymnasts showed how athletes who perceived high support and low constraints from coach, teammates and parents were more attracted to their sport and athletes
who perceived high-level constraints and low support felt a sense of entrapment. More recently, research has considered the causal effect of social agents on commitment, in particular Young and Medic (2011) identified eight specific social agents supposed to influence sport commitment in the context of masters swimming: coach, training partners, sport peers, non-swimmer friends, life partner, own children, other family members and health professionals. Constraints from own children were the sole predictor of functional commitment, with support from coach and constraints from training partners, life-partner and own children positive predictors of obligatory commitment. Health professionals’ support was found to negatively predict obligatory commitment. To date, although this is the only study that has considered the effect of social influence on functional and obligatory commitment, it does suggest that different sources of social influence may impact the two commitment types differently.

The aim of this study was to investigate the roles played by coach and teammates in the development of sport commitment, and subsequently the influence of commitment upon participation in masters swimming. The first objective was to examine the influence on commitment provided by these two social agents in isolation (i.e., without considering the influence of other antecedent variables in bi-dimensional commitment model). Considering antecedents of sport commitment in isolation has some precedents in existing literature (e.g., Sousa, Torregrosa, Viladrich, Villamarin & Cruz, 2007; Young & Medic, 2011). For example, Young and Medic focused on the sole influence on commitment provided by social agents. Our choice to focus on coach and teammates was not only due to the relevance they have shown in literature but also to consider the potential for social support to increase masters’ sports participation. To date, few studies have investigated the relationship between the bi-dimensional construct of sport commitment and behavioural outcomes. Therefore, the second objective of this study was to explore the effects of commitment type on the masters swimmers’ choice of training climate. Based on Rubin and Rahe’s (2010) suggestions that athlete’s attain the greatest benefits from training in a
team under the supervision of a coach, we chose to compare hours for team training and
unsupervised training climates.

Method

Participants

Five hundred and twenty-three Italian masters swimmers were recruited for the current study
(male, $n = 330$; female, $n = 193$) with a mean age of 39.00 years ($SD = 10.42$), ranging between 22
and 83. Participants had on average 26.10 years of experience in swimming ($SD = 13.23$) ranging
from a minimum of 1 year to a maximum of 69 years of practice. Participants trained on average
5.89 hours per week (ranging from 1 to 16 hours; $SD = 2.31$), comprising both team (4.52 hours; $SD$
$= 2.32$) and non-supervised individual training (1.37 hours; $SD = 2.09$).

Measures

Descriptive variables. Initial questions asked to participants for demographic information
regarding age, gender, nationality, and years of swimming practice.

Sport commitment. In order to evaluate functional and obligatory commitment and the
influence from each social agent (coach and teammates), we used a bi-dimensional commitment
scale (Wilson et al., 2004) that has previously been adapted for use in adult sport (Young & Medic,
2011). The questionnaire was translated into Italian language by the authors of the paper, and a
preliminary pilot was conducted on 10 masters athletes (Santi, Saccinto, & Pietrantoni, 2013). Six
subscales of the questionnaire were utilized: functional commitment (three items, e.g., “I am
determined to keep doing my sport”), obligatory commitment (5 items, e.g., “I feel obligated to
continue my sport involvement”), coach support (three items, e.g., “My coach encourages me to do
my sport”), coach constraints (three items, e.g., “I have to keep doing my sport to please my
coach”), team support (three items, e.g., “My teammates supports my sport involvement”), and
team constraints (three items, e.g., “My teammates will think that I am a quitter if I stop doing my
sport”). Subscales and items are reported in Table 1. Answering options were offered on a Likert scale ranging from 1, “not at all true for me”, to 5, “very true for me”.

*Sport participation frequency.* Participation frequency was measured through two questions: 1) “In consideration of your weekly swimming training, how many hours do you train with a team supervised by a coach?” and 2) “In consideration of your weekly swimming training, how many hours do you train completely alone and without a supervision of a coach?”. Participants were asked to provide a response on a visual analogue scale ranging from 0 to 20 hours per week.

**Procedures**

Prior to recruitment, ethical permission to conduct the study was obtained from the institution ethics committee of the first author. Recruitment for this investigation was performed over a 5-week period (From 11 June 2012 to 13 July 2012). Participants were contacted either in person whilst participating in an annual FINA world masters championship, or via email using two Italian swimming websites (NuotoMania.it® and NuotoAcqueLibere.com®). All participants were invited to complete an online questionnaire realised on Qualtrics, an online survey software. The instructions for completion of the questionnaire contained relevant information to minimise social desirability effects via a focus on the need to give responses with honesty and that the information provided would be anonymous and treated with the strictest confidentiality.

**Data analysis**

Descriptive statistics, data distribution and Cronbach’s alpha analyses were performed using SPSS 20.0 with data subsequently analysed using AMOS Graphics 20.0. Two confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) were conducted in order to examine the structural validity of the commitment dimensions and social determinants. Structural equation modelling (SEM) analyses were then conducted to examine the predictive capabilities of the social determinants upon the two types of sport commitment, functional and obligatory, and the subsequent effect on two outcomes relating to individual and team training behaviors.

**Results**
Distribution analysis indicated that asymmetry and kurtosis were acceptable for all variables. Cronbach’s alpha values (functional commitment = .77; obligatory commitment = .73; coach support = .92; coach constraints = .66; teammates support = .91; teammates constraints = .63) confirmed the internal consistency reliability of the translated version of the questionnaire, making it possible to analyse data using SEM. SEM provides a fit for the whole model, in particular: a ratio between Chi-square and degrees of freedom lower than 5 indicates an acceptable model; Comparative Fit Index (CFI), Non-normed Fit Index (NNFI) and Incrementail Fit Index (IFI) must be equal to 0.90 or higher; finally a Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) lower than .10 is acceptable, while an RMSEA lower than .05 is considered excellent (Byrne, 2010).

Initially, the CFA for the commitment dimensions showed a poor fit. An item from the obligatory commitment scale (“I feel it is necessary for me to continue my sport involvement “) was subsequently removed due to its poor loading (.28), and two items in the same scale were allowed to correlate due to the similarity of their content (“I feel that my sport involvement is a duty” and “I feel obligated to continue my sport involvement”). The CFA for the final model (Figure 1) showed an acceptable fit ($X^2=33.7(12); CFI=0.98; NNFI=0.97; IFI=0.98; RMSEA=.059 [90% CI=.036-.083]$) and estimates evidenced that all items had significant loadings according to Hair, Tatham, Anderson, and Black (1998), who asserted that, with a sample of 350 participants or more, factor loadings higher than .30 should be considered to have practical significance. Additionally, results showed that there was no significant correlation between functional and obligatory commitment highlighting these as two different constructs.

Initial CFA for social determinants also showed an unacceptable fit. Items from the coach and teammates subscales with the same content (e.g., “my coach encourages me to do my sport”, “my teammates encourage me to do my sport”) were subsequently allowed to correlate, as items with similar wording tend to covary (Byrne, 2010). Modification indices identified that in both subscales one item related to constraints had also a significant loading on support. This was likely due to the wording of the two items, “my coach/my teammates will be disappointed if I quit my
For the main analyses, SEM was employed to investigate the effect of social agents on commitment, and then the different types of commitment upon participation frequency. The structural model (Figure 3) showed a good fit in explaining sport participation ($X^2=357.6(179)$; $CFI=0.97; \text{NNFI}=0.96; \text{IFI}=0.97; \text{RMSEA}=.045 [90\% \text{ CI}=.038-.052]$). Social agents were shown to have an effect on both functional and obligatory commitment. In particular, support provided by both coach ($\beta = .15$) and teammates ($\beta = .37$) enhanced functional commitment, whilst constraints from both social agents determined an increase in obligatory commitment ($\beta = .20$ coach; $\beta = .31$ teammates), and coach constraints determined a decrease in functional commitment ($\beta = -.19$). Other beta coefficients were not significant. When considering the effects of commitment type on participation, functional commitment was the sole predictor of supervised team training hours ($\beta = .16$), but was not significant in predicting individual training, while obligatory commitment predicted individual training ($\beta = .10$), but not supervised team training. Collectively, the model explained the 21% of the variance for functional commitment and the 21% for obligatory commitment, and accounted for 3% of supervised team training participation and 1% of non-supervised individual training.

**Discussion**

The aim of this study was to investigate how support and constraints provided by coach and teammates influence sport commitment and consequently participation in masters swimming. Our findings show that support from coach and teammates enhances functional commitment in masters swimmers while it has no effect on obligatory commitment. This suggests that a supportive attitude...
by social agents leads to a voluntary approach to sport, despite the fact that research to date has shown little association between social support and functional commitment. This is in contrast to significant associations between social support and obligatory commitment (Wigglesworth, Young, Medic, & Grove, 2012; Young & Medic, 2011; Young, Piamonte, Grove, & Medic, 2011). For example, studies adopting the bi-dimensional construct of commitment have found some evidence to suggest a negative influence from social support on obligatory commitment (Young & Medic, 2011; Young, Piamonte, Grove, & Medic, 2011). In particular, Wigglesworth and colleagues (2012) found an inverse association between social support and obligatory commitment in male masters swimmers. In contrast, our findings are in line with other motivation-based studies that have found perceived social support from both coach (Gillet, Vallerand, Amoura, & Baldes, 2010), and teammates (DeFreese & Smith, 2013) to have a positive effect on self-determined motivation, highlighting that perceived social support from coaches and teammates is associated with greater report of voluntary commitment to sport.

With regards social constraints, our study results suggest perceived pressure and obligation from coach and teammates lead to increased obligatory commitment, and that high coach constraints lead to a decrease in functional commitment. This is in line with previous studies where perceived social constraints from other people (Wilson et al., 2004) or from sport peers (Young & Medic, 2011) have been found to increase obligatory commitment. Our findings support, therefore, the previous literature on sport commitment and highlight that perceived social constraints determine a sense of duty in carrying on the activity (Wilson et al., 2004; Young & Medic, 2011). To date, little is known about the causal effect of constraints on functional commitment, in particular in Young and Medic’s study (2011), constraints from own children showed a positive effect on functional commitment. In contrast, in our study coach constraints were found to negatively affect the will of masters athletes. However, this result is partially supported by Weiss and colleagues’ (2003, 2006) findings who found an association between those athletes with a low
attraction towards the activity and the perception of high constraints from social agents including coach. The present investigation shows that both functional and obligatory commitments predict the amount of weekly training hours undertaken by masters swimmers. In particular functional commitment was the sole predictor of hours of swimming training in a team supervised by a coach, while obligatory commitment was found to predict hours of non-supervised individual training. Support for the effect of sport commitment in increasing participation frequency can be found in the existing literature that has adopted a uni-dimensional approach to the construct (Casper et al., 2007). Indeed, the fact that a voluntary approach to activity is predictive of the choice to participate in physical activity is supported by Wilson and colleagues’ (2004) findings. Although no previous studies on sport commitment have identified that a commitment determined by a sense of obligation results in increased training hours, there are similarities with Duncan, Hall, Wilson, and Jenny’s (2010) findings, which suggest that the controlled motivation of regular female exercisers is predictive of the exercise intensity adopted.

In summary, the findings of our study suggest that, in the context of masters swimming, support provided by coach and teammates increases group participation through an enhancement of functional commitment. Furthermore, perceived pressure from coach and teammates increases the obligatory commitment and consequently the individual training undertaken. High pressure from the coach may therefore have a negative effect on participation in the swimming team by reducing the functional commitment of masters athletes. Teammates support and constraints held a stronger impact on functional and obligatory commitments when compared to respective influences of the coach. This may have occurred because teammates represent a social network which makes possible the sharing of goals, lifestyles and difficulties, developing a sense of relatedness between members (Allender et al., 2006; Hassell, Sabiston, & Bloom, 2010). Our results also support the need to adopt a bi-dimensional construct for the measurement of sport commitment as the two forms of commitment have differential effects on the behaviors in different training climates.
While our study has highlighted potential relationships between sources of social influence, commitment and training behaviors, a number of limitations should be noted. First, the choice to investigate the influence of social agents in isolation does not allow for consideration of our results in relation to all the antecedents of the Sport Commitment Model. On the other hand, the focus on social agents increases knowledge regarding the role played by social factors, providing further directions for the implementation of social support based interventions aimed to increase sport commitment and participation. A second issue regards the measurement of training participation frequency, which was measured by asking participants to self-report the amount of training hours undertaken. Although this approach allowed us to achieve a larger population sample, self-report measures present the potential for the participants to report a false attendance level and mask under/over-training. We did, however, adopt anonymous surveying, via the internet, an approach that has been previously found to avoid interferences and reduce social desirability effect (e.g., McBurney, 1996). The adoption of appropriate measures will allow researchers to consider the social desirability bias and evaluate the accuracy of data (Paulhus, 2002). For example, in order to control the potential bias associated with self-reported data, the coaches can directly measure level of team participation. Moreover, although the training participation measure used in our study was acceptable, we suggest that future studies measure this variable using a pre-validated self-report instrument to ensure data collection is both accurate and consistent with previous studies in this area. Third, because we used a cross-sectional design we were unable to measure participation related constructs such as drop-out, or make conclusions with regards to causality. However, research on motivation and commitment has highlighted the relationship between non-volitional perceptions and intention to quit the activity (e.g., Lukwu & Lujan, 2011; Ryan & Deci, 2007; Weiss & Weiss, 2006). The majority of studies that have considered this issue have registered participation 1-year post completion of the first survey (Lukwu & Lujan, 2011; Weiss & Weiss, 2006); therefore a longitudinal study design would permit this outcome to also be assessed.
Future research on this topic should also consider more in-depth study of participation in masters sports. For example, qualitative studies may be able to understand which coach and teammates’ behaviours and communication styles are perceived more supportive/constrictive.

Considering the wide age range in masters sports, future studies may investigate how the relationship between antecedents and commitment dimensions or between commitment and participation changes as a function of age. For example, in a previous study on masters swimmers, age emerged as a moderator on the relationships between the various antecedents and two types of commitment (Young, Piamonte, Grove, & Medic, 2011). A greater knowledge of these aspects would therefore allow evaluation of the effectiveness of social support-based interventions.

Interventions of this nature have the capacity to provide athletes with essential support to increase participation within the group (Rosenfeld & Richman, 1997).

A further consideration for future research is the ongoing development of the bi-dimensional commitment scale used in this study. The current findings supported the internal consistency reliability of this instrument, confirming the factorial validity of the two different commitment types, as well as social support and constraints variables related to coach and teammates. However, some items need to be reworded in order to ensure the effective measurement of sport commitment determinants. Based upon issues experienced in this investigation, we recommend that the items “my coach will be disappointed if I quit my sport” and “my teammates will be disappointed if I quit my sport” should be reconsidered because we think these items are likely to be misinterpreted by respondents.

Future studies also need to explore possible extensions of the proposed model to different populations as it is likely the effect of social agents may vary based on the population studied (Weiss & Weiss, 2006, 2007). For example, Weiss and Weiss (2006, 2007) have highlighted the importance of other social agents, such as parents or best friend, when developing sport commitment in youth sport context. There is a possibility that the importance of social support may vary across different contexts. For example, previous research has reported an inverse relationship
between the importance of social support from certain agents and athlete age, suggesting social support is most important for young athletes (Weiss & Weiss, 2007). We suggest that conducting this research among a more heterogeneous sample would allow for the extension of these findings to a larger population, permitting practitioners to develop interventions focused on the promotion of participation in sport and physical activity. In addition, while this investigation outlines the importance of sport commitment towards effective participation in competitive sports, there is little understanding of the effects the various types of commitment have towards a number of different outcomes synonymous to participation in sport, such as adherence to treatment during rehabilitation following sport injury.
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Tables and figures

*Figure 1.* CFA of commitment dimensions. Model fit: \( X^2 = 33.7 \) (12); \( CFI = 0.98; \) \( NNFI = 0.97; \) \( IFI = 0.98; \) \( RMSEA = 0.059 \) [90% CI = .036-.083]. Large circles represent latent SCS-Ita factors. Small rectangles represent manifest SCS-Ita items. Standardized factor loadings (\( \lambda \)s) are placed along the pathway from latent dimension factors to each manifest SCS-Ita item (all significant at \( p < 0.001 \)). Small circles represent residual error variances. Correlation between functional and obligatory commitment is not significant.

*Figure 2.* CFA of social determinants. Model fit: \( X^2 = 102.3 \) (40); \( CFI = 0.98; \) \( NNFI = 0.97; \) \( IFI = 0.98; \) \( RMSEA = 0.055 \) [90% CI = .042-.068]. Large circles represent latent SCS-Ita factors. Small rectangles represent manifest SCS-Ita items. Standardized factor loadings (\( \lambda \)s) are placed along the pathway from latent dimension factors to each manifest SCS-Ita item (all significant at \( p < 0.001 \)). Small circles represent residual error variances. Correlation between teammates constraints and coach support is not significant. All other correlations are significant at \( p < 0.001 \).

*Figure 3.* Structural equation modelling predicting dimensions of commitment and participation behaviors from social determinants. Model fit: \( X^2 = 357.6 \) (179); \( CFI = 0.97; \) \( NNFI = 0.96; \) \( IFI = 0.97; \) \( RMSEA = 0.045 \) [90% CI = .038-.052]. Pathway coefficients represent standardized estimates using maximum likelihood estimation procedures. Small circles represent residual error variances. Standardized estimates > 0.10 are significant at \( p < 0.05 \). All other standardized estimates are non-significant; dashed lines represent non-significant paths.
Table 1. Subscales and items of the Sport Commitment Scale – Italian Version (SCS-Ita).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item number</th>
<th>Original item wording</th>
<th>Italian translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I am determined to keep doing my sport</td>
<td>Sono determinato nel continuare a praticare il mio sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I am dedicated to keep doing my sport</td>
<td>Dedico del tempo al mio sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I am committed to keep doing my sport</td>
<td>Sono coinvolto nel continuare a praticare il mio sport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I feel that my sport involvement is a duty</td>
<td>Sento che impegnarmi nel mio sport è un dovere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I feel obligated to continue my sport involvement</td>
<td>Mi sento obbligato a continuare nel mio impegno sportivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I feel forced to continue my sport involvement</td>
<td>Mi sento forzato a continuare nel mio impegno sportivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I feel compelled to continue my sport involvement</td>
<td>Mi sento costretto a continuare nel mio impegno sportivo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8*</td>
<td>I feel it is necessary for me to continue my sport involvement</td>
<td>Sento che sia necessario per me continuare nel mio impegno sportivo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coach 1

| Coach 1 | My coach encourages me to do my sport | Il mio allenatore mi incoraggia a praticare il mio sport |

Coach 2

| Coach 2 | My coach supports my sport involvement | Il mio allenatore supporta il mio impegno nello sport |

Coach 3

| Coach 3 | My coach thinks it is okay for me to do my sport | Il mio allenatore pensa che per me vada bene praticare il mio sport |

Coach 4

| Coach 4 | I have to keep doing my sport to please my coach | Devo continuare a fare il mio sport per fare piacere al mio allenatore |

Coach 5

| Coach 5 | My coach would be disappointed with me if I quit my sport | Il mio allenatore sarebbe deluso se lasciassi il mio sport |

Coach 6

| Coach 6 | My coach will think that I am a quitter if I stop doing my sport | Se smettesi di praticare il mio sport il mio allenatore penserebbe che io mi arrenda facilmente |

Teammates 1

| Teammates 1 | My teammates encourage me to do my sport | I miei compagni di squadra mi incoraggiano a praticare il mio sport |

Teammates 2

| Teammates 2 | My teammates support my sport involvement | I miei compagni di squadra supportano il mio impegno nello sport |

Teammates 3

| Teammates 3 | My teammates think it is okay for me to do my sport | I miei compagni di squadra pensano che per me vada bene praticare il mio sport |

Teammates 4

| Teammates 4 | I have to keep doing my sport to please my teammates | Devo continuare a fare il mio sport per fare piacere ai miei compagni di squadra |

Teammates 5

| Teammates 5 | My teammates would be disappointed with me if I quit my sport | I miei compagni di squadra sarebbero delusi se lasciassi il mio sport |

Teammates 6

| Teammates 6 | My teammates will think that I am a quitter if I stop doing my sport | Se smettesi di praticare il mio sport i miei compagni di squadra penserebbero che io mi arrenda facilmente |

*removed item
Figure 1.
Figure 2.
Figure 3.