

**Per Marius Haugen**

# Coaching Legacy

An achievement goal perspective

**Master thesis in Sport Sciences**  
Department of Coaching and Psychology  
Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, 2013



## Abstract

**Introduction:** A coach can affect the thoughts and cognitions of athletes. The development of what we consider as success, how we become motivated for physical activity and how we approach sport is thought to happen partly through the perceived motivational climate (Nicholls, 1984; 1989; Roberts, 2001).

**Purpose of study:** The main goal of this project was to find out if there is a form of coaching legacy, and explore how this legacy is passed on. To find out what this legacy consisted of, research from achievement goal theory was used to construct and find the common features that construct a legacy.

**Method:** In-depth interviews were conducted on three expert handball coaches who had been elite-players and played for the national team. At the start of their careers, two of the informants had previously played for the first informant. These two became elite-players before they became coaches themselves.

**Results and discussion:** Analyses from the in-depth interviews revealed several similarities as well as some differences among coaches' experiences and development. There was a general agreement about the importance of the transfer of passion for team handball.

**Conclusion:** It was revealed that the focus on tasks in order to achieve results was a frequent feature for all three. Indicators of both a performance climate and a mastery climate were identified. Different views were also reported about the coach-athlete relationship and coaching effectiveness. A coaching legacy seems to exist and it is suggested that it may be transferred by mechanisms related to a passion for an activity.

# Index

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>Abstract.....</b>  | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Index.....</b>   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>Index.....</b>   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>1. Before starting.....</b>  | <b>7</b>  |
| 1.1 Introduction.....   | 7         |
| 1.2 Background and overall aim for this project.....                                    | 9         |
| 1.2.1 Purpose of study.....   | 10        |
| 1.2.2 Theoretical perspective.....  | 11        |
| <b>2. Method.....</b>   | <b>12</b> |
| 2.1 Previous research and Selection of informants.....                                  | 12        |
| 2.2 Social science and hermeneutics.....  | 13        |
| 2.3 Participants.....   | 14        |
| 2.4 Procedure.....  | 14        |
| 2.4.1 Qualitative method and the interview Guide.....                                   | 15        |
| 2.4.2 Analyses.....   | 16        |
| 2.4.3 Ethical reflections.....  | 17        |
| <b>3. Theory.....</b>   | <b>19</b> |
| 3.1 Motivation.....   | 19        |
| 3.2 Conceptual clarification:.....  | 21        |
| 3.2.1 What is Achievement Goal Theory, coaching effectiveness and self-regulation?..... | 21        |
| 3.2.2 Coaching effectiveness:.....  | 22        |
| 3.2.3 Self-regulation and goal setting.....   | 23        |
| 3.2.4 Passion and outcomes (including SDT and AGT aspects).....                         | 24        |
| 3.3 Research in connection with climate.....  | 25        |
| 3.3.1 The purpose of sport in AGT perspective.....                                      | 25        |
| 3.3.2 Psychosocial outcomes connected to climate.....                                   | 26        |
| 3.3.3 Moral functioning.....  | 28        |
| 3.3.4 Performance anxiety and climate (AGT).....  | 30        |
| 3.4 Coaching effectiveness and the Mastery approach to coaching.....                    | 33        |
| 3.4.1 Cohesion.....   | 33        |
| 3.4.2 The coach matters.....  | 34        |
| 3.4.3 Effects of mastery-oriented climate manipulation.....                             | 36        |
| 3.5 The role of goal setting and self-regulation.....                                   | 38        |
| 3.5.1 Individual developing of cognitions, skills and behavior.....                     | 38        |

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| 3.5.2 Self-regulation through goal-setting .....                | 38        |
| <b>4. Results and Discussion .....</b>                          | <b>40</b> |
| 4.1 Structure and presentation of data .....                    | 40        |
| 4.2 Interview .....   | 40        |
| 4.3 Analyses and coding .....                                   | 41        |
| 4.4 Introducing the coaches .....                               | 42        |
| <b>5. Discussion .....</b>                                      | <b>45</b> |
| 5.1 Background for structure .....                              | 45        |
| 5.2 Climate .....   | 46        |
| 5.2.1 Achievement goals .....                                   | 46        |
| 5.2.2 Creating task-goal involved players .....                 | 47        |
| 5.3 Self-regulation through goal-setting .....                  | 50        |
| 5.3.1 The next step is motivating .....                         | 52        |
| 5.3.2 Mastering is motivation .....                             | 53        |
| 5.4 Development of moral and performance anxiety .....          | 54        |
| 5.4.1 The coach as a role model .....                           | 54        |
| 5.5 Performance anxiety .....                                   | 56        |
| 5.5.1 Climate changes .....                                     | 56        |
| 5.5.2 Room for making errors and being creative .....           | 57        |
| 5.5.3 Coach-induced pressure .....                              | 58        |
| 5.5.4 Preventing anxiety through the mastering of tasks .....   | 60        |
| 5.5.5 Ego threat .....  | 61        |
| 5.6 Coaching effectiveness .....                                | 62        |
| 5.6.1 The coach-athlete relationship .....                      | 63        |
| 5.7 Cohesion .....  | 63        |
| 5.7.1 Coach-athlete cohesion .....                              | 64        |
| 5.7.2 Team-cohesion through mastery .....                       | 65        |
| 5.7.3 Self-talk .....   | 69        |
| 5.8 Legacy .....  | 70        |
| 5.8.1 Know your trade .....                                     | 70        |
| 5.8.2 Transferring something .....                              | 71        |
| 5.9 Passion .....   | 72        |
| 5.9.1 Visible passion .....                                     | 72        |
| 5.9.2 Passion for leading and performing .....                  | 74        |
| 5.9.3 Passion for mastering tasks .....                         | 75        |
| 5.9.4 Passion for creating something and pushing yourself ..... | 76        |
| 5.10 Limitations .....  | 78        |
| <b>6. Conclusions .....</b>                                     | <b>79</b> |

|   |               |
|---|---------------|
| <b>6.1 What does the legacy consist of? .....</b>                         | <b>79</b>     |
| 6.1.1 Psychosocial outcomes.....  | 79            |
| 6.1.2 Self-regulation and goal-setting .....                              | 80            |
| 6.1.3 Relations.....  | 81            |
| 6.1.4 Passion for a form of activity .....                                | 82            |
| <br><b>References: .....</b>  | <br><b>83</b> |
| <br><b>Appendix .....</b>   | <br><b>90</b> |
| Appendix 1: Semi-strukturert dybde-intervju .....                         | 91            |
| Appendix 2: Semi-strukturert intervju med Anders (M2) og Thomas (M3)..... | 100           |
| Appendix 3: Approval NSD.....   | 106           |
| Appendix 4: Trenerfabrikken .....   | 107           |

# 1. Before starting

## 1.1 Introduction

*“A speaker at a recent conference began by likening coaching to holding a bird in one’s hand. Hold it too tight and it would be crushed, while too loose a grip would see it fly away. The only certainty was that, even if success was achieved in holding the bird comfortably without distress, it was still sure to shit all over you!”* (Jones & Wallace, 2006, p. 52). In the life of a young athlete, the coach often plays an important part and role. A coach can contribute in making the sport experience one where the athlete feels satisfaction with the performance or satisfaction with the perceived level of development. Horn and colleagues (2011) states that a coach can undermine or facilitate the psycho-social development of their athletes through their behavior and their leadership style (p. 191). This can be done, for example, by emphasizing different aspects of the game such as highlighting the importance of winning or highlighting the importance of development, or both. The coach will affect the athletes’ skill developing within the chosen discipline as well as their psycho-social cognitions and development (Chaumeton & Duda, 1988). The task of balancing these different aspects of sport, which in the end (to some extent) forms the individuals’ thoughts and perceptions about life itself and not just sports, is as the bird-holding example shows, not an easy careless job.

There is no single answer to why the best became the best according to Gilberg & Breivik (1998) and a study of the 18 most winning athletes in Norway (period 1993-1997). All in all they became successful and spent a long time within their chosen sport and probably experienced both ups and downs on their way to the top. How did they get to the point of achieving all the victories, and laying down the amount of energy into a chosen sport almost every day several times a day? Their motivation appear as an obvious answer if we are to explain this, and Gilberg & Breivik would perhaps agree but still point out that this is complicated. They would point out the many factors the individual cannot control. Such as: having older siblings, supporting parents as well as influence from a coach, possibilities to be involved in both organized and unorganized activity and few limitations in the local community, living in a smaller place and not a big city and several other limitations (ibid). Sport is more than just these few successful

athletes and motivation plays an important role not only for these experts, but for everyone taking part in physical activity.

According to the Norwegian school of sport science (NIH) strategic plan (2011-2015) the subject of coaching and sport psychology falls into the category which the school presents as the following (translated into English by author): “*NIH is to prioritize research within training and performance-development within both recreational sport activity and elite sport activity*” (strategic plan, NIH 2011-2015). For leaders within sport contexts, which this school is to provide, there lies a deep responsibility for the ones you are leading.

*”As school professionals, physical educators have a duty to educate the whole (thinking, feeling, moving) pupil. Physical education allows for simultaneous stimulation of students’ minds and bodies”* (Ommundsen & Lemyre, 2007, p.142). I will add that sport participation outside of PE allows for the same *education*. Making more coaches become aware of how their behavior affects their athletes’ thoughts and psychological development should be of importance in organizations dealing with the educating of teachers within physical education as well as sport-instructors, managers and coaches. Thus should this also be of importance for the development of successful athletes such as described by Gilberg & Breivik (1998).

Are the individuals presented by Gilberg & Breivik (1998) the only ones who are successful? Some would perhaps say yes, whilst others no. Either way, the athletes who spend over 20 years playing any sport in lower levels, are of importance for society because of the goal of lifetime health, which regular physical activity can more or less provide. Successful or not, recreational athletes who’s been at it for twenty years, have surely demonstrated competence a few times. They too must have some motivation and passion for the chosen sport leading them to participate in it for such a long time. This brings up an important aspect of sport; in order to get elite-teams and athletes you need recruiting, and to get recruiting it is favorable to provide as many young athletes as possible with the right type of motivation. So what do the right type of motivation consist of?



The understanding of motivation has increased the last years (e.g., Deci & Ryan, 2002; Roberts, 2001; 2012) hopefully helping this project in its pursuit of finding the psychological mechanisms forming the “right motivation”. This research is seeking to explain and explore motivation, hopefully giving meaning to this project and end up as something useful in the years to come. Especially in terms of providing more coaches and teachers with means and concepts to increase the understanding of motivation and its development as well as an expanded understanding of how we can alter it through what we emphasize as important and through our actions.

## **1.2 Background and overall aim for this project**

In addition to the needs of society and the strategic plan of the Norwegian School of Sport Science, there is also a personal side of this project linked to interest and personal history. All though this is not the most interesting side of this project it is somewhat important. Nothing is un-biased when dealing with qualitative research; something this project is an example of (Thagaard, 2010). Therefore it should be of interest of the reader, to make sure the answers in this project can be viewed and interpreted in light of the author’s bias.

Like many other young people, I spent much of both my childhood and my youth running around after a ball. Due to my interest in this ball-chasing activity and my early birth-date, which I now understand probably helped me, I was rather successful too (Augste & Lames, 2011; Vandendriessche et al., 2012). The success and the interest of the games of both football (soccer) and handball must have worked as a symbiosis, as I cannot remember any particular points of lack in interest or stop in development. I still use a lot of my time running with and after different sized balls, and still feel both interest and development. However, having rarely had coaches with experience within football or handball, I still appreciate that someone was there. Not everyone have this interest for ball-chasing, nor is everyone born in January with a physical advantage for sport which this often provides. Coaches and teachers are creators of the learning environment and can stimulate interest and provide young people with means to help them develop themselves (Ommundsen & Lemyre, 2007; Pensgaard & Roberts, 2002;

Smith, Smoll & Cumming, 2007; Smoll, Smith, Barnett & Everett, 1993). How conscious are coaches about these aspects?

With this in mind, some questions arise; how do coaches stimulate interest for a given sport through their actions, how do coaches and teachers provide young athletes with means to develop themselves, how can a coach create a climate that provides development and how do coaches prevent their athletes from cheating, committing injurious acts and not care for others? In order to investigate these questions my choice of method was qualitative interviewing. This allowed me to take part in experienced coaches (former athletes) experiences in a close and personal form. I hope that some of the topics that are discussed in this project can serve as real alternatives for the practice of both teaching and coaching.

In the first year of the master-program, the creation of a mastery climate was emphasized as important in both lectures given at school and in a considerably part of the curriculum [from AGT especially]. The question of how a coach can optimize this seems interesting. After reading about athletes experiences in studies from Becker (2009) about *great coaches* and Pensgaard & Roberts (2002) regarding the importance of the coach as creator of climate, it appeared as if this was one of the most important aspects of being a coach. This lead to questions of what the successful and experienced coaches have done in order to reach a high level, both as players and as coaches.

### **1.2.1 Purpose of study**

The goal of this study will be to examine a coach's behaviors and find out more about a coach's level of consciousness when it comes to the way of coaching. What have they done and why did they do it that way. Why do they believe that their method is effective and how do they affect the athletes? The main questions will be:

1. Is there a coaching legacy being transferred from one coach and on to an athlete, who later become a coach himself?

The underlying content and aspects of this question will be:

2. What is transferred between coach and athlete (and the athlete who then later became a coach) regarding topics of achievement goal theory, psychosocial outcomes (moral development and performance anxiety), self-regulation, coaching-effectiveness and passion?

### **1.2.2 Theoretical perspective**

Success is achieved when you are able to demonstrate competence according to Achievement goal theory (Nicholls, 1984; Nicholls, 1989; Ames, 1992). The complexities that lie within this statement will be treated later in this project. Most people seek success in some way, either in form of fortune and fame or something else. Even if this can be debated, it is basically your own thoughts that decide whether you are successful or not. What decides what we think about success, and what are our thoughts about how to achieve the wanted success [in form of demonstrating competence]? These are questions which Achievement goal theory (AGT) seeks to explore. The perspective in this project will be from the eyes of experienced handball coaches and their assumptions about coaching. Coaches are a part of the environment as well as creators of it, and this project will therefore be seen from an inward perspective. This perspective will hopefully provide alternative answers of the questions AGT-research seek to explain.

## 2. Method

### 2.1 Previous research and Selection of informants

*"In recent decades, the definition of psychology was expanded to include the study of both human behavior and experience"* (Becker, 2009, s. 95). Research within the domain of sport psychology and coaching needs to explore the experiences of both coaches and athletes to gain understanding about human behavior, in addition to the more traditionally "explaining" research-methods (this will be explained further down). According to Abrahamsen & Pensgaard (2012) there has been a modest amount of valid research on how changes in the climate and environment of athletes will affect their perceptions of self-confidence and performance anxiety (p. 31). However, this study used experienced coaches to explore climate. The search for valid research, and the aspects of it, will be the same as mentioned above by Abrahamsen & Pensgaard. How do coaches create climate, and how does it affect the athletes?

For leaders within sport contexts there lies a deep responsibility for the ones you are leading. *"As school professionals, physical educators have a duty to educate the whole (thinking, feeling, moving) pupil. Physical education allows for simultaneous stimulation of students' minds and bodies"* (Ommundsen & Lemyre, 2007, p.142). Making more coaches become aware of how their behavior affects their athletes' thoughts and psychological development should be of importance in organizations dealing with the educating of teachers within physical education, sport-instructors, trainers and coaches. This project seeks to contribute to the domain of coaching and sports psychology literature, to make sure the influence coaches have will develop further and more effective.

*"Another, and potentially more insightful way of determining coaching greatness is to examine the experiences of the athletes who play for them"* (Becker, 2009, p. 94). In line with this and adding to it, this project sought to gain insight from athletes who played for an experienced coach and became coaches themselves. Hopefully this will be a valuable source for collecting data, considering all the experience these coaches and former players might hold in terms of expertise-development, mental training and psychosocial abilities as well as technical and tactical knowledge about their sport. *"To date, only a handful of studies have examined coach personalities, and a common*

*profile for successful (or great) coaching does not currently exist*” (Becker, 2009, s. 100). If something can be found to have been transferred from coach to player, and to a player which became a coach, this seems interesting in search of the answer on how to how effective coaching can be done and how it can be upheld.

## **2.2 Social science and hermeneutics.**

This project within sport psychology can be put in the more general area of *social science*, where we seek to explain the how, what and why of social interaction. In order to create some form of knowledge about coaching and sport psychology, the research method of *hermeneutics* will be used to accomplish this. Hauge & Holgernes (2005) explain that hermeneutics has its linguistic origin in the Hellenic verb *hermeneuein*, which means to interpret, translate and express (p. 71), which is what this qualitative project sets out to achieve in terms of analyzing data provided by words of people. Føllesdal & Walløe (2000) explain that another, more widely held explanation, is that the nature sciences (mathematics, biology, chemistry etc.) hold a purpose of *explaining*, while the humanistic sciences, and to some extent the social sciences, intent on *understanding* (p. 83). The means of hermeneutics are to help us understand people and their actions.

Føllesdal & Walløe (2000) separate between: persons (a), actions (b) and products of action (c). Understanding a human means that that you seek to know what this person can bring to expression through beliefs, attitudes, values and feelings (p. 85). This represents the issue of this project where coaches were the persons we sought to understand. In the search for answers regarding how to maintain and increase participation in sports, it seems logical to search for the answers of those who, to some extent, have managed to do this. Their values, attitudes, feelings and believes are of great interest. Hauge & Holgernes (2005) argues that the inductive research method is important within the *hermeneutic* science and that this form of research shows us how we seek the “truth” on a daily basis (p. 33). We observe and hear about people’s actions and eventually we see patterns that give us means to predict what we think will happen, albeit on a low scientific level.

## **2.3 Participants**

The participants in this study were three handball coaches. All of them have international experience as players and all of them have more than ten years of experience as coaches. The three coaches also have international experience as coaches. The oldest participant had more than 25 years of experience and had also been a coach for the two other participants. All of the three participants were male. To ensure the confidentiality of the informants, quotes will be presented with fake names, and an identification-letter with a number in brackets will be in use. All three coaches are coaches within handball and the oldest coach who had served as a coach for the two others will be recognized as Glenn (M1). The two others will be Anders (M2) and Anders (M3).

## **2.4 Procedure**

After applying and receiving the approval for this study by NSD (Norwegian Social science database), letters with formal information about the project was sent by ordinary mail to all three participants. The performers were then contacted by phone approximately one week after they should have received the information, and all of them reported that they had seen the information. All of them consented to take part in live interviews lasting approximately 120 minutes.

The first interview was conducted in a classroom at the school of which the student is attending (Norwegian School of Sport Science). The first informant, who had received information about the project, noted at the beginning of the interview that he had prepared himself showing some notes he made before coming to the interview. He made these notes based on the formal information that was sent prior to when contact was made over telephone. This formal information listed the main topics for the interview (see appendix).

### **2.4.1 Qualitative method and the interview Guide**

In their study of the effect of exercise as therapy for schizophrenia, Faulkner & Sparkes (1999) argues that a qualitative research approach can have several advantages as opposed to more traditional research methods, and especially when we are studying a special population (p. 53), which is the case in this project.

*"First, most qualitative researchers at some stage use some form of qualitative interviewing. Many use this as their main method for generating data"* (Mason, J. 1996, s. 35). The qualitative method was chosen for this project in search of data that could be of importance for future methods of coaching. To see if the perceptions of the expert coaches were in line with theory within sport psychology and coaching, and in order to see if there is a connection between their coaching methods and behavior.

The perspective of this project is from experienced coaches and their assumptions of how to coach in an effective form. Thagaard (2010) notes that a precondition for understanding and analyzing metaphors and standardized expressions shows that the researcher knows a great deal of the informants' situation. Meaning that the researcher needs to know what those expressions really mean (p. 132). The researcher in this project has a background as both player and coach in the sport of handball and is familiar with common expressions used by handball coaches.

When putting together the interview-guide, questions were made from the theory considered as the most interesting to obtain data towards. Thagaard (2010) explains that the topics that the researcher is to obtain data from, is mainly determined in advance, but the sequence of questions and topics are taken care of during the interview. In this way, the researcher can follow the story that the informant gives but at the same time obtain information about the topics that are thought of in advance (p. 89).

Thagaard (2010) notes that this type of interview-guide, and the way of conducting the interview, is generally known as semi-structured interview form (p. 90). The interview-guide was made on the basis of principles within the theory elected for the project. Questions relevant to the main topic were constructed and put in an order that both the mentor and student thought should fit. A pilot-interview was conducted with a Ph.D-student, and some small adjustments were made regarding the sequence of the

questions. Some questions were altered or deleted because they were already answered through earlier questions. The mentor and advisor in this project was made aware of the changes and determined that the interview-guide would be fit for the first interview after this.

During the interviews, the topics sometimes appeared in different time-periods depending on which topic the informant drifted off to. Given that the interviewer (author) did not have very much pre-experience in qualitative interviewing, there were a few stops in the interviews in terms of finding the right questions when the topic changed. The informant would verbally reflect on his own actions and then change topic. Although this happened a few times, the informants naturally drifted over to one of the next topics. Follow-up questions were asked more frequently in the two last interviews compared to the first.

The goal was to get the participants to reflect on their own actions, values, viewpoints and principles of coaching. The interview was conducted with a recording of audio using a mobile phone. The audio-file was transferred to a computer with both PC-password and storage password, then to be deleted on the main recording device. All three participants stated after the interview that it had been interesting to take part in the interview wishing the interviewer good luck.

#### **2.4.2 Analyses**

A discourse is defined by Jørgensen & Philips (2005) as the way that our language is sorted into different patterns characterizing our statements (p. 9). Dialogues and monologues therefore represent an interesting field of study, because analyses can give us information about how individuals understand their reality, through the way that one express herself. Discourse analyses have often been based on data collected from interviews and Thagaard (2010) notes that data collected from interviews still represent a suitable material for this form of analyses (p. 116).

The drawback with discourse-analyzing interviews is that the informant may sit and hold assumptions about what the interviewer wants to hear, or expects to hear, and may



therefore be characterized by the researcher's categories (Thagaard 2010). The researcher must, for that reason, be aware of his or hers own perceptions about the different discourses that appear during the interview. This may very well have happened during these interviews. Before conducting the interviews, the goal for the interviewer was to appear interested and non-judgmental. This might have affected the informant's statements. When the interviewer showed interest in the answers, the informants might have thought that this was something important and might then have tried to talk especially much about one topic.

### **2.4.3 Ethical reflections**

In this project the research ethics mainly involved questions linked to the interviewing of informants. Salling Larsen & Vejleskov (2006) writes about a few guidelines used in this project: informed consent, information about possible risks by participating, the evaluation of scientific method, the relevance of the project and information about the publication of results (p. 74). These are principles that are meant to protect the informants, and this was given a thorough consideration before starting the project.

When using interviewing as a research method, the responsibility lays with the interviewer (Thagaard, 2010), in this case the author. It is a demanding task to balance between the needs of research, in form of seeking knowledge through interesting questions, and at the same time maintaining the integrity of the participant. The informants were therefore given a thorough description of the topics and the aim of the study before taking part in the interviews. This was done to make them somewhat prepared for the questions that could arise in the interview session. The interview guide was revised a few times with the aim of both maintaining the confidentiality of the informants and keeping the credibility of the project. This was done through discussion between the author and the supervisor as well as proofreading from supervisor after the student had edited the interview-guide.

Before starting the interviews, the participants signed by their names that they consented to take part in the interviews and stating awareness of the possible consequences of participating. It was informed that the interviews would be anonymous,

but because of the interviews taking place, and the fact that a few others knew it was taking place, they could be recognized. Because of their connection to each other and the fact that the informants asked questions of why they were chosen, they were made aware of who else participated in the study. All three knew each other and none of the informants noted any problems with this.

## 3. Theory

### 3.1 Motivation

During the last two decades, two theories have had an important role in helping us better understand the role of motivation in physical activity, coaching and sport psychology, namely Self-Determination Theory (SDT) and Achievement Goal Theory (AGT). The framework and use of theory in this project will mainly consist of theory and research within AGT. It will consider specific research where our goal-orientation seems to affect how we perceive sports, and how it affects our goals for participating in sport and other achievement situations. The research will consist from the area of *self-regulation*, *passion* and will also include theory about *coaching effectiveness*. This part of the assignment seeks to highlight some of the possible mechanisms and outcomes, which comes as a result of the motivational climate within a group and from the goal-orientation we hold. Based on empirical research and different studies, which are connected to the framework, the theory presented in this project is attempted to link especially towards the sport of team handball. This is the sport where the data in this project was derived from.

Self-determination theory (SDT) explains that individuals have an innate need for development. In this development process we have a need for deciding our selves what we want to do, meaning that we are in need of different options. In this process we have an instinctive need for *autonomy*, *competence and relatedness* (Deci & Ryan, 1985). Achievement goal theory sees motivation through an individual's need for mastering tasks and demonstrating competence. In order to demonstrate competence, the tasks that we are given and how we approach them are of importance (Roberts, 2001).

The questions of how the climate affects the athletes within it and how the climate affects the individuals learning strategies (*self-regulation*) are also interesting in the need of demonstrating competence. How can a coach optimize the climate and provide the students or athletes with the right tools to guide themselves in their own development and at the same time avoid amoral development and maladaptive motivation? Learning strategies are important in seeking competence and will be presented. *Coaching effectiveness* theory may help to understand how coaches can help performers to fulfill this need of demonstrating competence and is therefore included.

*Passion* for sport is something we often hear about when we listen to athletes talk about their commitments. This may also affect how we enter achievement situations and is therefore also of interest in this project.

These are the topics which will be presented in the theory part and a short conceptual clarification will be provided first. This clarification will hopefully provide some simple guidelines to follow for readers who are without in-depth knowledge about sport psychology. The definitions of *coaching effectiveness* and *self-regulation* are provided, but this clarification is done regarding the understanding of *Achievement Goal Theory* which forms a great deal of the underlying background in this project. The basics of AGT will be presented as well as a few definitions of concepts that are important in this specific theory. Hopefully this will make it easier to follow and interpret the story of theory, results and discussion as it unfolds throughout the upcoming pages.

## **3.2 Conceptual clarification:**

### **3.2.1 What is Achievement Goal Theory, coaching effectiveness and self-regulation?**

#### **Achievement goal theory (AGT).**

The theory is now widespread within the research of sport psychology and it is based on the principle that all individuals want to demonstrate competence through our actions and if not to demonstrate competence, people will approach achievement situations to avoid demonstrating and displaying incompetence (Dweck, 1988, p. 259).

Nicholls (1984) emphasized that achievement goals emanate from conceptions of ability and effort. A person's effort is therefore of importance within AGT because a person might believe that effort is clearly distinct from ability. This may affect how we see ourselves, and our abilities within different disciplines. With the AGT we separate between two basic forms of involvement: Ego- and task involvement, in which we have a disposition for being. The goal-orientation disposition is orthogonal, which means that one can be high ego and high task, low ego and low task or high and low in one or the other (Nicholls, 1989).

#### **Ego-involvement – performance oriented climate.**

This is an environment where performance is most important. If one is ego-involved in situations that demands some form of performance (demonstrating competence), one is more inclined to measure the performance by comparing the results with others. It is more likely that one regards sports and learning as arenas where you can achieve social status, superiority and where success is based on outcompeting others (Horn, 2008, p. 160).

Performers, who report these criteria for success, are within AGT theory termed as *ego-involved*.

#### **Task-involvement – mastery climate.**

This is an environment where the focus is on developing and mastering tasks. Horn (2008) explain task-involvement as believing that, for example, school and sport are areas that give you the possibility of developing on a personal level through the mastering of tasks. Success is therefore perceived as a result of effort through hard work

and learning as well as something you achieve through cooperation with others. This means that success is based on self-referred criteria depending on whether one performs up to his or hers potential. This form of judging success is therefore also more controllable because it is more or less based on the individual's own actions and not the actions of others (p. 161).

A performer who reports this form of success criteria and who regards own development as success is known within AGT as a *task-involved*.

### **Development of achievement goals – task and ego.**

Achievement goal theory explains that the different goal orientations and the combination of them, is a result of different socialization processes. Through the different climates, and environments we take part in, we develop our goal orientation. From teachers, parents and significant others, we learn of *what* that is valued in achievement contexts. We adopt different ways of seeing success and what success stems from (Ames, 1992; Nicholls, 1989).

### **Avoidance of activity or increasing effort.**

*"Thus, as individuals become more certain they cannot demonstrate high ability they should tend to adopt the less attractive goal of avoiding demonstrating low ability"* (Nicholls, 1984, s.332). Task-oriented players are thought of as more likely to increase effort rather than avoiding the task presented because they regard results as something that comes from hard work. Ego-oriented players are thought to be more likely to use avoidance strategies.

### **3.2.2 Coaching effectiveness:**

The term of coaching effectiveness has a great amount of definitions, and to not add another I will quote others with a few definitions that have been used in research and known literature. *"Effective coaching behaviors are those that result in successful performance and positive psychological outcomes in athletes such as high perceived ability, self esteem, and enjoyment"* (Kavussanu et al., 2008, p.384). Another definition from the same authors; *"The main medium through which coaches exert their influence*

*on sport participants is their own behaviors, and coaches who have a positive impact on athletes engage in effective behaviors” (Kavussanu et.al, 2008, s. 383).*

Success is a part of the first definition [successful performance] but is not defined in the first quote. The most important factor to be aware of when discussing coaching effectiveness, is that success is more than win- and lose-records in which is noted in the next quote in an adequate way:

*...that which results in either successful performance outcomes (measured in terms of either win-loss percentages or degree of self-perceived performance abilities) or positive psychological responses on the part of the athletes (e.g., high perceived ability, high self-esteem, an intrinsic motivational orientation, high level of sport enjoyment) (Horn, 2008, p. 240).*

Thus success can also be *self-perceived performance abilities*. These definitions of coaching effectiveness is of great interest because the actions of a coach may form the thoughts of young athletes and can affect how they see themselves in light of others, how they see their own team and the rules and norms within it. This can also affect the individuals’ motivation.

### **3.2.3 Self-regulation and goal setting**

Ommundsen & Lemyre (2007) explain that it is normal to describe self-regulated learning (self-regulation) as an active and constructive process where the students have learned to set goals for their own learning, in order to then attempt to monitor, regulate and then control their thoughts, motivation, mood and behavior to reach these goals. Guided or limited by their goals and the characteristics of the environment that they are within (p.144). It is basically the most important abilities that we possess in order to control our own development and learning.

*“The learning environment enhances or constrains pupils’ learning outcomes in terms of cognition, motivation affect, behavior in general and achievement” (Ommundsen & Lemyre, 2007, p. 151).* The learning environment in itself is of great importance,

because it controls the development of athletes' thoughts and their ability to control their own development via different forms of self-regulation. In his clarification of how attainment of self-regulation happens, Zimmerman (2000) argues that coaches and teachers convey a message through their instruction, modeling, goal setting, and feedback and through monitoring of the performers work (p.15). We convey this indirectly through socialization and different work-methods. This is how students and athletes learn abilities such as goal setting, self-monitoring, persistence, effort-regulation and the fact that it helps to seek advice from coaches or peers regarding the respective activity.

### **3.2.4 Passion and outcomes (including SDT and AGT aspects)**

Some athletes seem to never quit, both in recreational sports and low division leagues as well as in professional leagues where professional athletes perform at the highest level possible. This is also visible within other domains besides of sport. Some people are dedicated to an activity or a cause throughout a lifetime. But what drives these people in their tireless pursuit of a specific goal or objective? Vallerand and his colleagues (2003) suggest that passion can serve as this psychological factor. But passion in itself is a complex construct and can have both positive and negative sides. The type of passion one holds can have affect on behavior, cognition, performance and relationships.

Vallerand (2008) defines passion as a strong attraction for an *activity* that people find important, invest time and energy into and which they like (p. 1). Passion can be structured into two main types of passion: *harmonious passion* and *obsessive passion*. Harmonious passion is thought to originate from internalization. People regard the activity as a part of them self and their identity, and from there it leads them to take part in the activity out of love for it. This way of perceived passion is expected to lead to more positive and adaptive outcomes. Obsessive passion is also explained to come from internalization, but in a controlled way. This is thought to make people feel an uncontrollable urge to engage in the activity and it is hypothesized that this way of being passionate will predict negative outcomes [“less adaptive outcomes”] (ibid).



In a French study which sought to test a motivational model in terms of investigating drop-out in team handball, consistent results were found for their predictions regarding climate. The more athletes perceived the coaching behavior as ego-involving [effect of performance climate], the less positive were the female athletes' perceptions in terms of fulfillment of basic needs from a SDT-perspective (competence, relatedness and autonomy). The opposite results were found when looking into perceived task-involving behavior [effect of mastery climate] exerted by the coach. More perceived task-involving behavior led to more positive perceived fulfillment of the same needs (Sarrazin et al., 2002, p. 409). Intentions of dropping out of the game can be caused by the relationship between the perception of not getting fulfilled these basic needs undermining self-determined motivation.

Rip, Vallerand and Fortin (2006) reported that results supported their hypothesis about injuries and the connection to harmonious and obsessive passion. Their results indicated that professional dancers, who reported high levels of obsessive passion, would report significantly higher degrees of acute injuries. Dancers, whose levels of harmonious passion were high, reported answers which were unrelated to being away from dance for a long time because of chronic injuries (p. 18). This may be because they had problems with holding back, as described by *passion* theory (Vallerand et al., 2003). Obsessive passion seems to hold merely negative outcomes, but it should be noted that this form of passion might be somewhat positive for performance-development in terms of persistence in the respective activity. But it can also lead to chronic injuries that might separate them from the activity for a long time, if not for good.

### **3.3 Research in connection with climate**

#### **3.3.1 The purpose of sport in AGT perspective**

In a study by Treasure & Roberts (1994) involving middle-school students, results showed that task-orientation related positively to the "*prosocial aspects of sport involvement*" (p. 24). High task-orientated students are more likely to view sport as an arena for development. Including development of self-discipline, cooperation with others, respecting authority as well as general personal development. In addition to this, task-orientation related positively to the belief that sport will affect your commitment to

“lifetime health” in a positive way. Ego-orientation, on the other hand, related positively to the more negative aspects of social development. A linear causality was found between high ego-orientation and the conviction that sport is to regard as means to an end [higher ego meant higher belief]. Meaning that these students regarded sport as a place where one could feel important through the acquiring of status which sport can provide (Treasure & Roberts, 1994). Carpenter & Yates (1997) found similar results for older English soccer players (amateur and semi-professional) supporting the theoretical propositions made by Nicholls (Nicholls, 1989), regarding how we perceive sport in light of being either task-involved or ego-involved (p. 307).

### **3.3.2 Psychosocial outcomes connected to climate**

*“Previous research has revealed that parents and coaches may give rise to both enjoyable and stressful sport experiences for the pediatric athlete and that parents and coaches are thus able to influence whether young people decide to quit sport or continue participating”* (Lemyre, Ommundsen & Roberts, 2006, p. 522). Parents and coaches play a decisive role in the development of young athletes’ cognitions, behavior and motivation. Parents can be a source of encouragement for young athletes, but unfortunately they can also be sources of pressure and have a negative affect in sport.

By creating different types of motivational climate within the groups which the pediatric athletes take part in, coaches and parents set the principles and frame of how a young athlete will interpret the sport activity he or she is taking part in (Smith, Smoll & Curtis, 1979; Horn, T., 1985; Ntoumanis & Biddle, 1999). This environment will affect the athletes’ thoughts about why they involve themselves in sport activity (motivation) in their way of considering their teammates and eventually how they behave.

In a Norwegian field study, Ommundsen et al. (2006) showed through their research on young soccer players that joint pressuring behaviors from parents and coaches related positively to maladaptive achievement striving (p.522). This was indicated by over-concern for mistakes, doubt about ones’ actions in soccer and by lowered perceptions of competence. Maladaptive achievement striving can ultimately lead to a form of maladaptive perfectionism. Ommundsen et al. (2006) describe maladaptive

perfectionism as the form of being more than normally self-critical about ones' own performance. It may lead to the problem of rarely being satisfied with the level of performance (p.522). This form of malfunctioning may lead to depression; low self-esteem, burnout and it may even cause development of bulimia-symptoms.

Correlations from the result-section are revealing that parental pressure (both criticism and expectations) is relating positively to perfectionist worries, and relating negatively to positive friendships and competency perceptions (ibid). An exact pattern was also found for coach pressure in terms of a perceived performance climate. The study was performed on 677 young (age 10-14) Norwegian soccer players (both male and female) during the Norway Cup soccer tournament in Oslo, and it suggests one possible reason for this: *“One possibility is that parental criticism and expectations turn athletes into overly self-critical perfectionists who, then behave overly critical themselves towards peers who do not conform to they own perfectionists attitudes”* (Ommundsen et al., 2006, p. 525).

The results in the study indicate young athletes perceiving high psychological pressure from parents and coaches, might perceive their friendships less positive than others in the study. The result can cause an elevation of perfectionist worries and lower competence perceptions, indicating a performance-oriented climate within the group they were a part of.

When the young athletes perceived their coaches as creators of a supportive mastery oriented climate and parents did not behave overly critical and did not communicate too high expectations, the results stood in contrast to the mentioned climate above. In a climate like this, Ommundsen and colleagues (2006) explain that athletes can turn into adaptive achievement strivers without perfectionist-worries and other self-destructing and unhealthy thoughts. At the same time the chances are greater that the players will stay friendly towards each other (p. 526).

Young athletes prefer their peers as the indicator of own performance and competence estimation. Peers also influence their social- and moral reasoning and behavior. Research by Ommundsen et al. (2005) indicates that a coach-induced mastery climate

relates positively to perceptions of friendships with high quality among 14- to 19-year-old female soccer players.

### **3.3.3 Moral functioning**

There seems to be evidence of different possible outcomes linked to how athletes are achievement-involved in sports. This meaning that those involved in either a task-oriented way or an ego-involved way may see the different sport domains as arenas for achieving quite different goals. As described earlier, a short simplification of this theory can be explained by the result showing that those who are ego-involved may wish to outperform others in order to feel that they have reached their goals. Those who are task-involved are more likely to view their achievement goals to being about developing skills and improving, and they are therefore somewhat more controllable. If individual development is the most important feature in the process of competing in sport for the individual; there seems to be evidence that this task-involved performer will be less likely to engage in low moral actions (such as the possibility for committing injurious acts) than an ego-oriented athlete (Duda et al., 1991; Dunn & Dunn, 1999; Ommundsen et al., 2005). This is complex construct and this is a simplification of what research have found regarding the relationship between ego/task-involvement and behavior outcome. The essence of it is still important in this case.

From an AGT perspective, this leads to the relatively logical reasoning that our way of being involved in achievement related situations, guides us in our decisions concerning how to reach our goals. The development of morality and ethics in terms of being either ego-involved or task-involved will be presented here, and according to Horn (2008), there are several studies that have investigated this area (p. 158). According to Horn, most of the research support Nicholls premonitions (Nicholls, 1989) hypothesizing that athletes with high ego-involvement, low task-involvement and low perceptions of ability are more likely to act unsportsmanlike to achieve their goals. These athletes report that they are more likely to break the rules to gain advantage. They may cheat (acting hurt, breaking rules), and are more likely to take actions that could harm opponents and are more likely to show aggression (p.162).

In a study from 2003, Ommundsen et al. sought to find links between the perceived motivational climate, sportsmanship, team-norms and social-moral functioning of young male Norwegian soccer players. The study included 279 boys aged 12-14 who were taking part in the soccer tournament; Norway Cup. The results they found indicate that it can be important to look at what types of motivational climates which exist within teams, in order to understand young athletes' behavior in sports. This behavior in sport settings can be linked to qualities and behavior which we should hope that young athletes will adopt. This behavior is especially linked to virtues like fairness, effort-awareness, empathy and compassion in which we regard as the sort of behavior and moral that we want to see in sports and in people generally.

There was found that the average amount of players taking part in their study, generally regarded their climate as being highly mastery-oriented and reported the climate as being low in terms of being performance-oriented (Ommundsen et al., 2003). The social-moral functioning within teams regarding disapproving illegitimate behaviors, were also mainly positive in the answers where the players were presented with moral dilemmas and specific game situations. They also reported that only a few team-mates would engage in such behavior and that their coach would not approve it.

When it comes to being either master-oriented or task-oriented, the same study also found significant differences between the two. The athletes who reported their coach as being primarily mastery-oriented and emphasized this environment were more likely to report higher levels of moral functioning (Ommundsen et al., 2003, p. 408). These players preferred “*a mature moral motive (whether it is fair or not)*” as the most important reason to consider, when presented with a game-specific moral dilemma.

The same players, who perceived their climate as mainly task-involved, were the ones that were less likely to intimidate an opponent, fake an injury or risk injuring an opponent. The climate profiling analyzes revealed that the results stood in contrast for the players who perceived their climate as being predominantly performance-oriented. They were the ones who were most likely to report engaging in amoral behaviors. According to Horn (2008), this goes along with other research that clearly indicate that players who are more concerned of outperforming others, and in that way being ego-

involved, are more likely to be more immature than those who are task-involved, regarding unsportsmanlike behavior (p. 160).

Duda, Olson & Templin (1991) found a connection between ego goal orientation and the endorsement of low moral acts such as cheating and aggressive behavior for interscholastic basketball players. Dunn & Dunn (1999) studied some of the same motivational patterns for ice-hockey players and found that the ego-oriented players were more likely to behave aggressive than their task-oriented peers.

Kavussanu & Roberts (2001) found a gender difference regarding goal-orientation through their study of interscholastic basketball players. More specifically; girls scored higher than boys in task-orientation and lower in ego-orientation. Female players were less likely to approve of aggressive acts during games and less likely to express approval of bad sportsmanship (p.44).

In contrast to most of these findings mentioned, Stephens & Bredemeier (1996) did not find any correlations between the informants' ego-orientation and their self-reported likelihood to behave inappropriate against opponents (p.170). In their study, all participants were under the age of 12 while the other studies had older participants, and an explanation for these conflicting results may therefore concern age. Nicholls & Miller (1983) showed through their research on child development that the conception of ability as a capacity (prerequisite for development of ego-orientation) does not become clear for most children until they turn 12 or older.

#### **3.3.4 Performance anxiety and climate (AGT)**

There are several studies which state that anxiety can have a negative effect on behavior and performance (Jordet, 2010; Smith, Smoll & Cumming, 2007; Abrahamsen & Pensgaard, 2012). Anxiety may affect the enjoyment of sport and the physical well being for both young athletes and older athletes which in the end may cause drop-out from organized sport as well as having other negative outcomes. Performance anxiety is linked to how an athlete personally perceives an achievement situation in terms of importance. From Baumeister (1984) we can see *performance pressure* as the context

where a performer holds the desire to perform as well as possible in a situation he or she considers as very important (p. 610). This form of anxiety holds psychological effects such as; worrying, high levels of autonomic arousal and thoughts about ones actions which might interfere directly with performance by disrupting thoughts, motor performance and attention-processes (Smith, Smoll & Barnett, 1995).

It is self-evident that situations like these will appear quite often in sports. Pressure will be felt by both younger athletes, older athletes and more professional athletes. Smith and his colleagues explain that anxiety within sport has been linked to avoidance of organized sport, sport attrition and to burn-out within sport (Smith et al., 2007). Their research shows that it is possible to change people's perceptions of anxiety, which is important, given that there are significant differences in pediatric athletes' perceived levels of both anxiety and enjoyment. This will be enlightened in the upcoming pages. Young athletes who report that they think their coach rewards them for their effort show higher levels of enjoyment than their peers who report to have had negative interactions with their coach (Smith, Smoll & Curtis, 1979; Smith, Smoll & Barnett, 1995; Smith et al., 2007).

Abrahamsen & Pensgaard (2012) argue that elite athletes are under a constant demand of performing well, and logically they are therefore prone to develop performance anxiety. This has been proved as a detrimental factor for performance (p. 31).

Abrahamsen & Pensgaard (2012) conducted a study where they looked at how changes in the coach-created motivational climate could affect the performance-anxiety of elite handball-players. Through a complete handball season they found results that were coherent with the predictions of the Achievement goal theory. However there were found differences between male and female athletes. Female athletes' perceptions of a dwindling mastery environment were positively related to perceptions of lowered athletic ability. Then again related to worries about performance (p. 31). Gender difference was revealed in their "worry analysis", but there was also a significant finding for males when looking into perceived ability. These results indicate that a perceived increase in performance climate relates positively to an increase in performance worries.

There is research indicating how athletes involved in their demonstration of competence [task-involved or ego-involved] will in many ways also predict how and why an athlete develops performance anxiety. In order to believe that she can demonstrate normative ability, an ego-involved athlete needs to perceive her athletic abilities as high. This is because the demonstration of normative ability is dependant on factors the athlete herself cannot control, such as referee-decisions and opponents performance. Roberts (1986) suggested that this factor, that is not controllable, would mean that ego-involved athletes are more exposed to develop elevated levels of performance anxiety than their task-involved peers.

The hypothesis is therefore that ego-involved athletes experience their performance anxiety as a function of their own perceived ability, measured up to their perceptions of the opponents' ability (Duda, 2001; Roberts, 2001). Abrahamsen & Pensgaard (2012) explains that as a substitute of this function, task-involved athletes will use self-referenced criteria to tell if they are successful or not. This makes the success-criterion a function of something they are in control of and their performance worries are only dependent on themselves (p. 32). Thus should they experience lower levels of anxiety connected to the sport. Abrahamsen & Pensgaard (2012) also notes another important finding from their study linked to climate and environment when they explain that it was evident that; when athletes' perceptions of the climate indicate that one specific form of climate increases, the other seems to decrease (p. 39), suggesting that climate changes can possibly prevent performance anxiety even for ego-oriented athletes. Climate may therefore be even more important than athletes' pre-constructed goal orientation because our goal-orientation is affected by the climate.

Young athletes, senior athletes and professional athletes are all under a certain demand of performing well. For elite-athletes who are under a constant demand of performing well, this pressure may cause some form of performance anxiety. It is proven to be a detrimental factor for the performance of both elite athletes and younger athletes (Abrahamsen & Pensgaard, 2012).



### **3.4 Coaching effectiveness and the Mastery approach to coaching**

#### **3.4.1 Cohesion**

Cohesion can be defined as a basic group property that serves as the factor, which can be described as the tendency to stick together and stay united in the pursuit of the team's objectives and goals (Carron, 1982). Cohesion might be perceived differently depending on how the athletes interpret their climate and regarding the goals a group have. When interpreting the definition, it is safe to say that the goals for achievement will affect a group's ability to stay together and be *cohesive*. The informants in this project have been successful both as coaches and players, and their views on how effective team-work is done and what it stems from seems as an interesting theme to explore.

In a meta-analyses study by Mullen & Copper (1995) results indicate that the effect of cohesion on performance is higher on real groups than on groups that were artificial (in example: groups sat together randomly). They found that this was mainly due to the mutual commitment to the goal and task at hand, more so than attraction between group-individuals or group pride. Beal et al. (2003) conducted a study using meta-analyses and found that there are differences in the relationship between cohesion and performance based on how group cohesion was measured (p. 989). They found that correlations were stronger between performance and cohesion when cohesion was; first identified as behavior and not outcome, secondly when it was measured as *efficiency* and not simply through effectiveness-measures, and when the intensity of team workflow patterns increased. They then argue that performance should be defined as behavior; to make it is possible to find the constructs that are predictive of performance ["...performance behavior are causally antecedent to performance outcomes"]. Their point is that applied psychology will be hindered if we are to see performance only as an outcome (Ibid). This somewhat relates to the definition of coaching effectiveness earlier in this theory, where highlighting that effective coaching actions are more than results. If self-perceived performance abilities are higher, this is also effective coaching. Effective cohesion also has to do with the process and perception of behavior, in this case in the "perceived efficiency" and not only the outcome. This, for example, is supported by the results found in a baseball coaching intervention study from 1995. After their coach had been given pre-season behavioral training, children evaluated their

coach more positively. They reported to have more fun and they showed higher levels of *attraction amongst the players and the coach*, which might indicate some form of increased cohesion in terms of social cohesion. Especially since this was found, despite that results in terms of won-lost scores were no different from the control-groups (Smith, Smoll & Barnett, 1995). An individual's bond to his or her team, and the opportunities for developing friendships, are important for young players' affiliation in sport (Smith et al., 2007).

In terms of perceived cohesion, it is also interesting to note the results found by Son and colleagues through their study on college undergraduates and their participation in a constructed team-based dart throwing activity. They found results indicating that collective efficacy, self-efficacy and general performance indicators were bigger for the teams and individuals who used "self-talk" focused on the group's capabilities rather than "self-talk" focused on the individual performance. Positive scores were also higher compared with the teams that had a neutral condition (Son, Jackson, Grove & Feltz, 2011). They suggest that this may have some implications for the development of efficacy-perceptions regarding enhancement of team performance.

### **3.4.2 The coach matters**

When searching for answers in how effective coaching is done, elite-athletes might provide us with useful information since they have showed effort and persistence over time, which might have been fueled by earlier coaches. It is of great interest to understand how elite athletes perceived their motivational climate when they were younger. We should also be interested in *how* they were motivated in order to find, and hopefully recreate, some of the same key-elements within the motivational climates coaches can create.

In an attempt to obtain a better understanding of the climate surrounding the elite athlete and to examine the importance of the coach, Pensgaard and Roberts (2002) performed in-depth interviews with seven elite athletes. They reported that all seven individual elite athletes who were interviewed emphasized that team climate was of "*major importance*" (p. 56). Pensgaard & Roberts (2001) reported that overall, the elite athletes

responded that the coach was of great importance as creator of the climate. Meanwhile, several of the informants also noted that the coach might be more personally important for some athletes than others. Several of the athletes emphasized the importance of the conviction that when a coach becomes “*a friend*” and something more than just a coach, you as an athlete will be so much stronger (p. 56).

Should coaches emphasize the importance of winning? Is winning important? Some would say that it seems possible that the competitive part of our cognitions will be stimulated by the environment and our peers, no matter what we think before we enter a competitive setting. AGT simply puts it like this: we want to demonstrate competence when a task is before us. We seek to challenge both ourselves and others in competitive settings. The coach does not necessarily need to focus on creating a performance climate in order to stimulate those competitive cognitions, which seems to be of some importance if one is to reach the elite-level [since elite-athletes often report high levels of both high task-involvement and high ego-involvement] (Horn, 2008). Pensgaard and Roberts (2002) revealed that none of the elite-athletes they interviewed reported the importance in the coach emphasizing winning during practice and competition (p. 57). Their perspective, which they found through the analyses of the in-depth interviews with seven elite athletes from the same skiing discipline (where 5 of them had taken medals in either world championships or Olympics), was: “*However, the competitive edge seemed to emanate from the interaction between the young athletes rather than being created by the coach*” (Pensgaard & Roberts, 2002, p. 57).

Becker (2009) found consistent results in a qualitative study with both team-sport athletes and individual-sport athletes on a professional and elite level. The study sought to explore the experience of successful athletes regarding their experiences with *great coaches*. The research indicates that the athletes, who have reached the elite-level, were not focused on winning when they were younger but rather on becoming better. This is summarized in the following quote: “*A focus on external criteria for success, such as found in a performance climate, seems to be a miss-match with the needs of the athletes*” (Pensgaard & Roberts, 2001, p. 58). Or as explained in the study on *great coaches* by Becker (2009), where the point is made by highlighting that the most important influence the great coach had, was the affection towards their desire and ability to become as good as they could be (p. 111).

The coach matters in this context of climate and the development of motivation. Thus it is argued, that the perceived climate by the individuals within it seems to be of great importance in search of motivational factors to determine whether young athletes prevail in sport or eventually drop out. Several studies state that the coaches should create motivational climates focusing on the mastering of tasks as a criterion for success and positive feedback. The climate should be mastery even to elite-athletes to help performance [by mastering tasks], and making sure the coach [creator of climate] avoids being a source of potential distress (Roberts, 2001; Pensgaard & Roberts, 2002; Abrahamsen & Pensgaard, 2012).

### **3.4.3 Effects of mastery-oriented climate manipulation**

In a study conducted by Smith & Smoll (1979), results showed that by altering the behavior of little league baseball coaches, the coaches developed better relationships between them and the players they were coaching. Their results indicate that the environment and the climate a coach is co-creator of, might be very important for the relationships that are created within the group. This will regard both peer-relationships and the coach-athlete relationship. By coaching in a way that rewards effort, achievement striving, technical detail-focus with patient instruction and individual feedback, a mastery-oriented climate can be created (Smith & Smoll, 1979; Smith et al. 2007). Research from coaching effectiveness training programs (CET) has showed that young athletes, who are playing for CET-trained coaches, evaluate their coach and teammates more positively, report significant increase in general self-esteem during the sport season and they report that they enjoy their sport experiences more positive (Barnett, Smith & Smoll, 1992; Smith et al., 1979; Smoll et al., 1993).

In another coaching intervention study by Smith et al. (2007) coaches in basketball went through a course of training known as Mastery Approach to Coaching (MAC). This was done in order to find out if an intervention in the motivational climate could affect the young athletes' (mean age 11,5) perception of experienced performance anxiety. They established that athletes playing for coaches given MAC-training (mastery approach to coaching) would report significantly higher levels of mastery-climate behavior from the coach, and lower levels of performance-climate/ego-climate behavior (p. 50). Regarding

these results it should be noted that coaches in both trained and untrained conditions were creating climates that were averagely more mastery-oriented than ego-oriented. The study was meant to reduce anxiety by helping coaches create a more mastery-climate than before, which is predicted by achievement goal theory to reduce anxiety (Pensgaard & Abrahamsen, 2012). In the MAC-training study it was found that trait anxiety increased from pre-season to middle season and late-season, for example depending on time of league play-offs, when competitive pressure was higher. Compared to the control group, the players who had coaches participating in the MAC-training, exhibited decreases in anxiety-scores related to the time period where pressure was higher [late-season and playoffs]. Athletes in the control group (did not play for trained coaches) had significantly increased scores on somatic anxiety and on the worry-scale, while the result on a concentration disruption scale was not significant.

Smith & Smoll (1979) show in their results from their intervention-study, that by giving coaches training in creation of mastery climate, the players developed a better relationship to the coach (p. 39). In addition to this they were also able to investigate if the altering of coaches' behavior could lead to higher self-esteem. With the participants, albeit a smaller range of them, they found positive correlations between the coaches new way of coaching and higher self-esteem. As they predicted, this was most evident for the players with low self-esteem in the first place. When increasing the self-esteem of those with the lowest self-esteem in the first place, it is reasonable to believe that this could prevent early drop-out from organized sport activity which is a known issue within literature.

An example by Boiché & Sarrazin (2009) found that perceived value of the sport was one of the predictors of dropout. Perceived value in itself was determined and positively predicted as a variable for continuation in sport, by perceived competence and *coach's investment* relating to the study by Smith & Smoll. It was negatively predicted by disagreement in terms of goals among teammates and the coach. The coach's mastery climate positively predicted satisfaction (p. 9).

### **3.5 The role of goal setting and self-regulation.**

#### **3.5.1 Individual developing of cognitions, skills and behavior.**

Although there are many different views on making a coach or teacher, for young or old individuals, successful or not, the purpose of a teacher or coach will perhaps not be debated just as much. By creating positive experiences within the sport domain, facilitating positive individual development both physically and mentally, the individuals can live healthy happy lives. Most of us would agree this serves as the purpose of a being a teacher and coach.

Some coaches understand this purpose as a form of job that one does for or to another individual. Some coaches sometimes seem obsessed about making several star-players out of his or hers team that is being controlled, or it seems as if they simply love controlling. In an article from sport pedagogy, these coaches are noted by the article-author in the following way: *“I reluctantly relate it to some past coaches I came across, who, on reflection, seemed more in love with the idea of being a coach than the job itself”* (Jones, 2009, p. 387). It is the individual who becomes a successful elite athlete (or not) and not the coach who makes a successful athlete. A coach can highlight this to the athletes and emphasize it, and hopefully give them the means to become successful themselves. This is what we wish the athletes would do and we often talk about “taking responsibility for your own development”. Within the domain of sport psychology, this can be related to the topic of *self-regulation*.

#### **3.5.2 Self-regulation through goal-setting**

Zimmerman (2006) argues for self-regulation as an important process controlling some of the key-elements to determine our development. There is research that indicates expert-athletes set very detailed objectives in order to reach full potential (p. 708). Being, or becoming, very focused on detail seems for that reason to be an important requisition in order to become an expert within the elite sport domain.

Schunk (2001) explains that self-regulation is enhanced by goals. This is because our goals affect our learning, motivation and our self-confidence regarding a specific task (self-efficacy). In order to reach goals, a group or an individual must commit to the

attainment of this goal because it will not affect performance unless this is done (p. 1). Schunk (1995) noted in earlier research that people are in need of goals. In order to persist over time, goals are needed to make people willing to exert the necessary effort regarding the demands of the different tasks (p. 117). It is summed up quite easy, and logical, stating that: *“Overly easy goals do not motivate; neither are people motivated to attempt what they believe are impossible goals”* (Schunk 2001, p. 2). In a sport setting this might be of great importance. If coaches assume that their players have the skills needed for the upcoming task, they should often prepare tasks which are intermediate in level of difficulty in order to have the best effect on self-regulation and motivation.

## 4. Results and Discussion

### 4.1 Structure and presentation of data

In this part of the project the construction of data and results will be presented. A presentation of the interviews and code system is here. The informants will be presented and a discussion of the findings will then follow.

### 4.2 Interview

The two semi-structured interview-guides that were used in this project can be found in the appendix. They are written in Norwegian and show the main topics, the main questions and sub-questions in a very detailed manner. A short explanation about how the interview was planned and executed is therefore presented here. English-readers will be able to get a clue in how the interviews were performed, and it will provide an explanation for why it was done like it was.

**Background information** was the first topic the coaches were asked about. The thought was to get them to reflect about their career and get them to think about previous experiences so that they would have thought about more than just their recent activity before answering.

**Climate and environment** served as the next topic. In order to get them to think about climate, they were asked an open question about how they thought their previous athletes would describe them. Specifically in terms of “what would *they* say that *you* as a coach was concerned about”. The objective was to get information which could enlighten the topics of *mastery climate* and *performance climate*.

**Psycho-social factors** were then brought up because research within AGT indicates that climate may have an effect on how we develop in terms of *moral-development* and the development of *performance anxiety*. The coaches were asked if they had any experiences with these topics, and what they believed caused it or causes such problems.



**Players' mental abilities** connected to both practice and competition was asked about. The hope was that the coaches would talk about subjects that could be related specifically to *self-regulation*, *task-goal involvement* and *ego-goal involvement*.

**Relations** served as a separate theme. The hope was that the coaches would talk about episodes with players they had encountered during their career and what their thoughts were on approaching players. The point was to get data that could be representative for *coaching effectiveness*, creation of *self-regulation* and general behavior.

Communication was a big theme in this part of the interview and the coaches was asked specifically about how they rewarded players, what they rewarded and what they did not reward. *Goal-setting*, *effort-regulation* and *handball-specific* subjects were something which the interviewer was especially interested in during this part.

**Motivation** on a personal level was of interest in order to find out about why they involved themselves in handball. The questions had to do with what they their *drive* and *passion* for handball was, and what their future plans was.

**Legacy** was one of the themes which were directly connected to the research questions. The interview ending was somewhat different in the two last interviews as opposed to the first one. The end of the two last interviews had to do with *legacy* in terms of how the two coaches (Anders M2 and Thomas M3) had experienced their previous coach (Glenn M1) and other coaches. Glenn (M1) was asked about why he thought that so many of his previous players had become coaches themselves.

**Conclusion** and summary was a small part of the interview and came at the very end. The respective coach was asked to sum up his work as a coach so far in his career, and asked about how his coaching-future looked like.

### **4.3 Analyses and coding**

The analyses were done through coding via MAXQDA 11. This is a data-analysis program for computers which lets you create codes and sub-codes. MAXQDA is very easy to use and was very helpful when the discussion was made, and mostly because it was very easy to extract the specific segments that you wanted over to one document.

This made it easy to compare the data provided by the coaches and similarities and differences was easy to detect.

The different codes were based on the theoretical topics that were used in the theory part of this project. The following code system was used for all three interviews:

| <b>Code:</b>                          | <b>Included following sub-codes:</b>                      |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| AGT (performance and mastery climate) | Task-involvement, Ego-involvement                         |
| Coaching effectiveness                | Relations, Handball-specific                              |
| Self-regulation                       | Effort-regulation, monitoring (self- and peer-monitoring) |
| Motivation and goal-setting           |   |
| Psycho-social factors                 | Anxiety, moral development                                |
| Passion (drive)                       | Obsessive passion, harmonious passion                     |
| Cohesion                              |   |
| Legacy                                |   |
| Others                                |   |

Examples of quotes that were used within the different codes will be presented in subsequent section. Retrieved segments within all of the different codes cannot entirely be presented in the discussion. Nonetheless, these codes have been a part of the analyses and have contributed in the work of distinguishing the three coaches and their statements from one another. All in all, these codes are the main factor of why the discussion was constructed the way it was. These results, which were created out of these constructed codes, have set the premises for what this study found and what it will conclude at the very end.

#### **4.4 Introducing the coaches**

Three quotes are used to give an initial description of the three different coaches who took part in this project. These statements are presented in order to introduce the three characters. Their other statements which they gave in the interviews will then be discussed in light of the theory that was chosen for this project. After the discussion there will be a short conclusion regarding what the analyses found in terms of differences and similarities between the three coaches. This will be the answers to the main research questions regarding *coaching legacy* and what it may consist of as well as

how this seems to be transferred. These findings will form the basis of the conclusion and future-research which will be the last part of this project.

After asking the coaches about their careers as both players and coaches, each interview started with a rather open question. This was about what they thought their former athletes would respond, if they were asked about what their previous coach was concerned about. The analyses showed similarities from the answers they gave, and is interesting considering many of the topics which were presented in theory. The statements are also very interesting considering the discussion which will use many of the same topics as the theory did. All together, these quotes were coded with the following codes: *Performance-climate*, *Mastery climate*, *Legacy and Coaching effectiveness*.

**Glenn (M1):**

*I believe they would say that I was concerned about reaching the goals (small laugh), and that I was able to create a climate (environment) which was good in terms of being both socially good and being a “performance-climate”, if one could call it that. The thing which is most important when coaching senior teams, I’ve had teams on the highest or second highest level who have fought their way up and played finals and won titles, for me as a coach and which determines if you are to win something is which goals you set.*

**Anders (M2):**

*So, I have always wanted to mix that thing with both having fun at practice but at the same time have an environment where one is supposed to, eh where there is competition. So the combination of competing and at the same time enjoying it, which might have made them perceive me in the way that I have been demanding. That may very well be...*

**Thomas (M3):**

*That I’m concerned about. I think I’m very concerned about whether they are, are well prepared and that they do things which they have been told to do. And it’s probably*

*obvious that I am very demanding of tasks and that I have high standards. So I'm a tough coach, and I willingly admit it. That is also what I have been given feed-back on, that when things don't go as planned "Thomas can be quite tough" and it is direct and... It probably has to do with those I've had as coaches myself.*

## 5. Discussion

### 5.1 Background for structure

The different topics, which formed the basics of the theory part in this project, will now be discussed through the use of data which were created during analyses. Different themes were found and created during analyses and through coding of the three different interviews. These will be highlighted in order to show the most interesting aspects found in this project. The goal for this discussion is to highlight different aspects of the theory, and specifically areas where there seems to be a strong connection between the coaches' reported actions and theory of coaching and sport psychology. And off course those connections which do not go along with the answers provided by research. The three coaches will not be given equally space in this part, regardless if either one of them, two of them or all three did the same thing. Similarities and differences will be drawn and pointed out. The main intention has been to find and discuss data which can shed light on theory or data through good examples and quotes. These subjects will hopefully say something about *coaching legacy*. In the finishing conclusion, which will follow after this discussion, the questions regarding coaching legacy and its mechanisms will be presented. Hopefully they will also be answered in a reliable way.

When analyses and coding took place, it soon became obvious that the different themes which emerged from analyses held many similarities. Parts of the data-material were often coded with more than one code in which they happened to fit into several parts of the theory. This is not necessarily a bad thing and it could be argued that this provides support for the reliability of theory, specifically regarding the question of whether there are connections between the different topics or not. Connections between the different aspects of theory were found and this made it somewhat difficult to determine which topics to put first or as most important. The order of topics and themes will to some extent follow in the same way as the theory part where the topics are presented in a way which first deals with the outer contextual frames (climate) and then over to the more individual contexts (coach-athlete relationship and then self-regulation). At the end of this discussion, despite of this order, the findings which seem to be of most value for future research will be presented. These aspects will hopefully appear as the most interesting ones, and can be considered as the introduction for the conclusion. These

topics now appear in an order which could very well have been different, but an attempt to arrange them in a way which seems natural and that follows a story has been done.

## 5.2 Climate

*“The learning environment enhances or constrains pupils’ learning outcomes in terms of cognition, motivation affect, behavior in general and achievement”* (Ommundsen & Lemyre, 2007, p.151). The learning environment in itself has an impact on pupils’ personal development and specifically connected to the development of *self-regulation* skills. It has been argued that teachers and coaches convey a message through their instruction, modeling, goal-setting, monitoring of practitioners’ work and their feedback given to their disciples (ibid). Teachers and coaches communicate indirectly through the socializing process and through their methods of work. It is in this way that students or athletes learn skills as goal-setting for achievement, self-monitoring, persistence, effort regulation and the fact that it is useful to seek help from coaches or their peers.

If students or athletes are to develop self-regulation strategies and mechanisms that lead to conscious thoughts of achievement for their own part, the coach or the physical education teacher should be using the strategies that generate this. The three coaches, who provided the data-material for this project, have all been educating both young and older players and they have been creators of climate. As mentioned in the theory, the climate can affect how we approach sports, what our *achievement goals* will be and what we consider as success. The coaches’ own thoughts and statements about their own actions will now be discussed.

### 5.2.1 Achievement goals

*“I always wish for the athletes to grow fond of winning, for them to have that as their drive. Or making it! Making their shot-attempt, making their dribble, getting their defensive work to be successful, and if we can do this, we will also win matches!”*

*(Glenn M1)*

This quotation about becoming fond of *winning* and *making it* was coded as both *task-involvement* and *ego-involvement* in the analyses. It relates to both results (performance climate) and tasks (mastery climate). The quote may indicate that the coach could be both task-involved and ego-involved in the activity. It seemed that for him, the two

conditions follow each other. When Glenn started to talk about what he wanted the athletes to be committed to, the first sentence was about winning. After saying this, he quickly rephrased it and he became more engaged when he talked about *making it* in terms of basic handball abilities. In the end of the quote he sums it up by explaining that ‘winning’ and ‘making it’ is two sides of the same story because the one thing leads to the other.

*”But the positive results emerging for a high task-high ego orientation profile continue to ruffle a few feathers in the achievement goal fraternity”* (Horn, 2008, s. 166). When put into a practical setting by an expert coach and aside from theoretical speculation and calculation, creating high task-high ego involved athletes suddenly appear as the most natural thing in the world. It seems that for Glenn (M1), these two types of involvement are not necessarily separated in any way.

### **5.2.2 Creating task-goal involved players**

When talking about individual feedback, the most experienced coach (Glenn M1) explained that everyone gets different feedback depended on which level they are. He highlighted that this was especially important with younger athletes, but he also noted that he had experienced the same challenges with senior athletes regarding this.

*The thing you need to explain, which I often explain to young athletes after they say to me that: “You gave him credit for that, but you never give me credit for the same thing?”. But that has to do with the fact that he has more than enough to work on with that step (shows a paper sheet and points at it), while you are here (points out a higher step). All of these steps below which you know, I take for granted that you are able to do! “You will get credit, first when you start at a higher step!”. I believe that this is a smart thing to explain to a younger player. I’ve also had some senior-athletes who have mentioned this, albeit not on the absolute highest level: “But heck, he gets credit when he does that”, or “she gets credit for that”. Specifically girls who are concerned about justice and who are able to count the exact number of positive feedback during one session! They exist you know. On the highest level also, someone who does that! Then it is really important that you explain to them that this happens because there are some*

*differences in which level we are on. You are capable of this, so therefore I start giving you praise at this level. She is not capable of just as much so I give her credit there already (shows a lower point with his hand). So it is not because I like her better or think more of her or something, but it has to do with which level we are on. Not everyone is aware of this! (Glenn M1)*

It seems logical that if one is to reach a higher level, or “step” as Glenn (M1) talked about, increasing the effort is necessary. Nicholls (1984) explains that when students were asked to anticipate their feelings of competence after passing a language test, in terms of high versus low effort, all of them believed that higher effort would lead to more gains in competence. Two conditions were presented in this explanation of how we consider achievement situations (which is called the *differentiated conception*): *competitive-oriented* and *learning-oriented conditions*. But when put into a competitive and ego-involving setting, students anticipated that they would feel less able if they were to increase effort (p. 332). Handball practice is a competitive setting and these athletes (that Glenn M1 talked about) seemed to have been expecting to get credit for their demonstration of higher normative ability and not their exerted effort and tries. If he was consequent in doing this, the only way a player could earn recognition seems to be through increasing effort and reaching a higher *step*. This is basically the most important characteristic of *task-involved* athletes.

The coach is the leader, who sets the premises for what it means to *demonstrate competence*. The only way these athletes could *demonstrate competence* had to be through increasing effort. This could contribute in making the training session, which can be considered as a *competitive-oriented condition*, become a *learning-oriented condition*, thus fostering a mastery climate. As noted in the theory part: by coaching in a way that rewards effort, achievement striving and if the coach engage in training with a technical detail-focus using patient instruction and through individual feedback; a mastery-oriented climate can be created. Smith & Smoll (1979) showed that by doing this, the players will develop a better relationship to their coach. Other positive outcomes related to a mastery climate are the possible avoidance of creating performance anxiety as well as having a positive influence on the development of moral (Abrahamsen & Pensgaard, 2012; Duda et al., 1991; Dunn & Dunn, 1999; Ommundsen et al., 2005).



As for the part of “patient instruction”, which is highlighted as a factor in the work of developing a mastery climate (Smith et al., 2007), the informant noted what he meant was necessary to do as a coach in order to get results. In one monologue he talked about avoiding mistakes in practice in order to avoid mistakes in matches. He explained that one important season with senior athletes; he had used the first 5-10 minutes and spent almost every training-session repeating the same thing over and over. Every time the ball would hit the floor and not a player he told them that: *“that could be the pass which prevents us from making it”*. This was coded as both *ego-goal oriented* and *obsessive passion*. It is clearly related to a goal of performance. It has a lot to do with patience, but probably not as much to do with creating a better climate. He said that his team won by one goal in the most important play-off match that year! It was after a time-out and a planned tactical play! They did not miss their passes according to him.

*...I believe there was a connection there. In why we did not miss (focus on not missing passes in practice). But it is exhausting! Do you have the energy for it? Most coaches say this one time, or ten times and then they say that: “don’t you think that i have said that to them Glenn? Do you think I’ve said that they need to concentrate on their passes, do you think that I’ve said that they need to stop shooting up on that goal-keeper, do you think I said ‘that’ after the game or...”. Well I believe that you said it, but the thing about being a coach is that you have to have the energy to repeat yourself in the infinite! And I have said to myself that; “the day you can’t stand to do this Glenn”, you have to quit as a coach... Because someone will take advantage, cut a few corners and “let’s take it easy for 5 minutes” (imitating player) and eh... Yes. (Glenn MI)*

These two examples show the complexity in coaching. The first quote; about praising players if they are able to do something new, clearly indicates a *mastery-oriented climate*. This last one seems to be about never failing in order to withhold performance, clearly indicating a *performance-oriented climate*. It is important to note that he specifically related the first example to younger athletes while the last example was about senior athletes competing on the highest international level.

### 5.3 Self-regulation through goal-setting

Glenn (M1) talked about how he had worked with the players and how he had communicated the different individual goals and objectives to them and with them. He said that he had worked a lot with breaking the main team goal setting into individual goals. He had done this for both physical demands and technical demands in addition to team demands in terms of exact percentage of successful shot percentage and such. When he first brought statistics as a subject up he said that:

*When writing this I measure everything in, well most things that happens in a match...  
(Glenn M1).*

This group became very successful (in terms of results) and he explained that he was convinced that this form of detailed goal-setting for both the team and for each and every player was one of the reasons for it. As the introduction of Glenn (M1) showed, he was very concerned about these goals you set as a coach. He meant this was the main factor in which controls the process, and which guides you in your actions. He talked about both team-goals and personal goals.

*So... That means that you as a left side player Carl: 'you need to physically be able to do those demands we talked about earlier, and you have to have the count of successful shots like this, this and this. And in order to reach these goals you should work on this, this and that!' That makes it so much easier. It's like walking it step by step and in the end you're on top! You just have to manage to maintain focus on that one step in front of you, and avoid thinking that: 'Oh shoot... It's like 10 steps up there, I don't stand a chance'. Well, so take one step at the time then! (Glenn M1)*

From a handball perspective, these goals which he explained and talked about are quite specific and detailed. This is in line with what theory of *self-regulation* have proposed regarding goal-setting for performance. Several studies explain that expert-athletes are better at goal-setting than novices and amateur players. They set very detailed goals for achievement connected to both practice and competition (Zimmerman, 2006; Toering et al., 2011). The point he makes about *taking one step at the time* is explained as a very important factor in order to be motivated. If the goals set are too easy, they will not motivate. If the goals seem impossible to reach, they will not motivate (Schunk, 1995).

Glenn noted in another setting, where he talked about goal-setting and how he had communicated these goals with the players, that:

*And I think that was motivating for them, or it HAS to have motivated them because the results just went through the roof without me pushing them any (Glenn M1).*

In this case, regarding how coaches can facilitate self-regulation abilities, it seems reasonable to suggest that this expert coach helped the players in the process of goal-setting. He used a lot of time to write their performances down and he provided the players with detailed statistics so that they would know what to improve. This included, for example technical mistakes, number of shots missed and the numbers of goals scored. It is likely that this helped them realize exact which parts of the game they needed to work on in order to improve. The specific team and players, which he talked the most about in this setting, improved so much that they became internationally highly ranked as a team. Several of the players became professional and even came to play for the national team.

Teachers and coaches convey a message through the process of socialization and players can learn from this (Ommundsen & Lemyre, 2007; Zimmerman, 2000). Glenn (M1) reported that he had worked on this aspect of finding goals. At a later point of the interview, he also talked about how important the preparation work was for him. If we are to believe his words, he probably conveyed several messages in quite effective ways since he noted that everyone would get these statistics individually. If he used a lot of time on working with goal-settings and individual statistics, the players might have come to believe that this is important. They might even have found this process to be motivating.

*“...so what I didn't say, when I explained about how your objectives controls your work, is that there is a whole bunch of sub-goals. One breaks that main goal into many sub-goals, and on that part I worked a whole lot” (Glenn M1).*

### 5.3.1 The next step is motivating

When Anders (M1) talked about common features of his previous coaches, those who he had learned most from, he seemed to have experienced these demands and *sub-goals* which his previous coach was concerned about. He even noted this as being *motivating*.

*They have given me that trust and that's important, and useful and I've had that feeling with many of those coaches [his best coaches]. So trust, eh... Security and been demanding! Definitely been demanding of me in terms of goals. Realistic, but high, so that they have motivated me. Motivating coaches! (Anders about previous coaches, including Glenn)*

Thomas (M3) had also used these individual statistics and team-statistics which Glenn (M1) reported to have used. He worked a lot with this form of *monitoring* [self-regulation ability] through statistics, so that the players would now what their goals were. When Thomas (M3) was asked about his relationship to results, result-lists and statistics, his first response had to do with these statistics:

*To statistics I have a very, eh how should I put this ...a strong relationship to. I have written the same statistics... I was measured on the same statistics myself, back when I was a player. And that way of writing statistics I keep going, and I have been keeping it going for every team that I have coached (Thomas M3).*

Anders (M2) also talked about these statistics and player-tasks and demands. He noted that this was his weakest side as a coach which can be interpreted in the way that he also saw this as important. All though he did not write everything down, he still was concerned about communicating these demands and statistics to the players so that they would know what they needed to work on:

*I am not very... My obvious weak side is, and something which I have not been before nor am I now, being systematic. I have never been systematic in terms of writing down that; we have to do this and this and that. But I believe that I, all of the time when I am coaching, try to give them input on what they need to improve (Anders M2).*

To improve seemed to be the main reason for this task-focus. Glenn (M1) and Thomas (M3) specifically talked about these player-statistics as a method in order to know what happened during a match. They used the statistics to see what was good and where it went wrong. They could use it to change their focus during a match or use it to know what to practice on after a match. As noted earlier, these statistics were also presented for the players at some point.

*It is an important tool, for me as a coach, both here and now as well as after a game in order to see where we missed and why we were not good enough (Thomas M3).*

### **5.3.2 Mastering is motivation**

*But off course we try to motivate and we try by having some expectations for each player in the upcoming matches, but the job for a coach is not to motivate the players in every match. I assume that they have an intrinsic motivation for becoming better! Then it is our job to make a program and get the player into practice-sessions that are appealing and which contribute to making that player develop... And that this should be motivating in itself! (Thomas M3)*

All three coaches were concerned about these tasks which were essential for them in order to develop. All of them reported that they believed their former players would report them as being demanding of tasks because they thought they would consider them as very performance-oriented. Thomas (M3) said that he had a strong belief in these task-demands as an effective tool to help the players.

*Well this happens during our conversations (coach-athlete). Vi have co-worker talks, which we have had previous this year and this week, that I have believed in. The thing where we can sit down and discuss, they can receive a written feedback from their coach and they get the opportunity to see their individual statistics. Then they will see that “Oh, my shooting is quite poor from that position, I make too many mistakes...”.*

*They use that all of the time in order to become better. I believe that this is a good tool  
(Thomas M3).*

The three coaches had been part of a performance group and they were measured on results. Still they emphasized that these tasks and demands, which they communicated to the players, was about becoming better. It seemed as if it had little to do with becoming better than others. All in all there was very little talk which had to do with others, in which players and coaches who are *ego-involved* should be concerned about according to AGT. The athletes who played under these coaches would probably report high scores on *ego-involvement* since they played on a high national level (Hardy, 1997). As described in the theory, a performance climate may have several negative outcomes regarding player's development of moral and behavior. It has also been related to performance anxiety (Smith, Smoll & Cumming, 2007). Still it is not sure that this was the case with these coaches. They used results (individual statistics) mainly to ensure that the players would know what they needed to work on. Analyses found many statements connected to *ego-involvement* but none of it dealt, for example, with *interpersonal competition*. As noted earlier, it could be that this is an effective way of changing these competitive results which forms a *competitive condition* into a more *learning-oriented condition* (Nicholls, 1984).

## **5.4 Development of moral and performance anxiety**

Previous research findings (e.g., Biddle & Ntoumanis, 1999) offered evidence that a mastery motivational climate is typically linked with adaptive motivational patterns in sport participants, while a performance climate has been associated with maladaptive motivational profiles and less adaptive affective responses.

### **5.4.1 The coach as a role model**

Glenn (M1) said that he had one particular player who he had trouble with when speaking of moral. This one player could sometimes cross the line and lose his temper. Besides of this, all three coaches reported that they had experienced very few problems with players who behaved overly aggressive or possibly injurious.

*Well, regarding match-fixing for example, that is something I've never been a part of. But the fact that some players play tougher and potentially injurious and that sort of things eh... It has to be because they have a coach with low moral I guess (small laughter)? There are probably coaches who encourage players to... Eh, to being extra tough and if there are coaches who encourage players to cheat and those things, that is just a shame. I don't feel that this has been a problem (Anders M2).*

Glenn (M1) talked about experiences outside of Norway and he had especially many negative experiences from eastern-European countries regarding experiences which could be characterized as low in moral. For example: their whole teams' locker room had been robbed one time during a professional match, they had been given training-facilities with no lights and they had experienced bus-drivers who drove around for a very long time. Although their hotel was just nearby! He talked about these experiences and especially one tournament for younger teams abroad (around 15-16 years old). In this tournament one opposing team had gone too far and had been given several red cards already after 10 minutes. He was then asked about what role the coach holds in this. His answer came quickly and without hesitation.

*Everything, almost everything! If you're active on the sideline, yelling and getting exclusions (two minutes team penalty in handball) and that is your standard, then you are going to get players who yell and who get exclusions. That's the power of example! That one is on the coach or on the other grown-up leaders who's there (Glenn M1).*

Thomas had a similar view on this. It was important for him to have his team be considered as a fair-play team. He felt that the team represented him. The interviewer noted that there are differences between players regarding this, and asked what he believed was the reasons for this.

*Big differences! When I am coaching, last year we were so lucky to become that years "fair-play team" (an award which the national handball federation hands out) as a handball team, and that is cool. In my previous club we became the fair-play team two out of three seasons and in the last club I coached we had one season where we had the least exclusion of all the clubs! So I would say that me as a coach: it is important to me because it is obvious that the teams become a bit like their coach is. And perhaps one*

*might say that we have been too 'nice', but I would rather get a fair-play award than becoming like many of the other teams and players on the top level. Those who have both two and three red cards! Those who are acting like idiots and playing coarse! I would not achieve something from that and I can't tolerate it... (Thomas M3)*

When asked about why some players became like this, both Glenn (M1) and Thomas (M3) answered in a way that supports the phrase: “when winning is everything, you’ll do anything to win”. Glenn (M1) brought up an incident from last year’s European Championship for women (EHF), where one Serbian coach had pulled a Norwegian player’s shirt during a match, in order to explain why he thought some players became like this.

*There is a probability that... We are supposed to win, but we can't cheat! But we can be fair and tough (Thomas M3).*

*On that level (EHF)... It happens more often in such. In those cultures! Something like 'to win no matter what'! (Glenn M1)*

It seems clear that winning was very important for these coaches. Despite of this, they were not willing to do anything in order to achieve it. It seems as if they have been mainly task-oriented. If this is the case, they may therefore have managed to avoid a lot of trouble with moral-issues all though they were a part of a performance climate. “*It is our contention that downplaying ego-orientation holds some promise for athletes' moral growth*” (Kavussanu & Roberts, 2001, p. 51).

## **5.5 Performance anxiety**

### **5.5.1 Climate changes**

One of the informants meant that the coaches’ behavior could be of importance for how the players considered the upcoming events, and specifically in terms of preventing performance pressure and avoiding anxiety. He talked about this and meant that the players would be able to “*recreate*” the same actions as in practice and in previous matches if the coach did not differ too much from one competition to another. Anders



(M2) remembered that when his team finally had reached the highest international competition with their team, his previous coach (Glenn, M1) changed his behavior.

*And at that point it was very striking how big that competition was for Glenn. He had never been in such a competition himself. They had filmed and videotaped the locker-room where we should change clothes and such beforehand. They did this sort of: "Wow! There is the bench we are going to sit on and..." They made ... I just felt that they made a too big deal out of it.*

His example was somewhat exaggerated (his coach did not literally talk about the sideline bench), but his point seems to be important for the players who are going to play. One qualitative study of team sport elite athletes stated that many players saw it as important that their coaches did not change their actions too much. They saw it as positive that the coach did not differ in his actions all though the situation had changed from before. This was an important finding and a *major theme* in Becker's study of elite-athletes (2009) where a great deal of the informants reported this as important. In this article, one quote given by a team-sport athlete suits this example. It can be connected to this topic about changing attitude towards an upcoming event, which Anders (M2) talked about: *"Whether we were playing in front of 20,000 or 2,000 people, I don't think you saw a difference in his personality. He didn't prepare differently. His life didn't change. His actions didn't change"* (Becker, 2009, p. 110).

### **5.5.2 Room for making errors and being creative**

Glenn (M1) talked about the importance of not being afraid to miss shots, and Anders (M2) also talked about letting the players make mistakes. He was concerned about control in the way that he did not see it as smart to control too much. The players needed to find out what type of actions and plays which are constructive for themselves in order to learn. He also thought of handball as a play where every situation is *unique* in some way. Because of this, he did not see it fit to control too much. He was afraid to control too much in case the next situation were to be just a little bit different from the previous one, and then his message could turn out to be the wrong one.

*I believe coaches, and I have to correct myself in this too. You can't sort of go in and control everything, and there have to be room for quite much eh... In the wrong direction that is. Room for a lot of errors in order to reach far! If one makes the same mistake four times in a row then, eh... Then the player has to start to think differently: "Now I have to do this differently". Instead of me saying that, after two mistakes: "you can't do like that because then it will end up like this"! Because the next time it happens, the situation might have changed a little (small laugh). So a balance between controlling and making the decisions, and the act of letting the players explore I guess (Anders M2).*

Thomas (M3) was also concerned about letting the players unfold and letting them explore, specifically the players who he considered as creative, thinking and who held a high degree of game-intelligence. In this next quote he talks about letting these players unfold freely. He explains how to approach them, if you actually do want to control them and make them do your play. Most importantly, he explains what you should not do. In this example it is about the play-maker in handball, who is supposed to carry out the team's tactical play. These plays have often been practiced on before matches (typical of handball as a sport).

*They are very thinking people. If you want them to do something, perhaps you have to give them some small input throughout the whole week, so when they get to match-day they might have gotten something in! But to, all of the time, scream and shout orders from the sideline such as, "Do the play 'I right', now", when the player is standing there and thinking: "Damn! We can't do that, it won't work". If you do that you will get that clinch instead. That is what I mean; you just have to let that player be creative.*

### **5.5.3 Coach-induced pressure**

*Ehm... Have to think (long pause). I can say that it was, there was one player on a younger team which I thought was good and who I gave a lot of positive feedback to. I probably had the impression that this player could become very good. This was around*

*when they were 15-16-17 years old and it is obvious that this player felt this. Gradually, I felt that this player lost a great deal of his self-confidence, because he did not live up to the expectations which the environment demanded. So I'm pretty sure that this ruined a little bit for... It probably had some negative consequences for his confidence. You could see that he was not 'switched on' during matches. You could see that the fear of missing and failing was very evident, although he said that he did not have performance anxiety. Regarding this... I have been very careful to ask about this like "do you have performance anxiety?" you know. It is not like you often get that question from the coach! Despite of this, the coach can stand in front of everybody and say that "you are all suffering from performance anxiety". It is very easy for them. Haha (seemed to laugh because coaches are in power to say what they want). But to say that directly to a player, that is quite brutal. And it is hard to admit. It was very obvious that this player; he did not live up to the expectations he felt that we had, although these not necessarily were so huge all the time, and he saw that his performances waned (sank). Performances could be ok during matches, eh practice I mean, but you could see that the quality, concentration and the total overview of the play disappeared. (Anders M2)*

*I've experienced a few players in this way. And that might be because of me. Off course! Wrong signals at the time, and that I just missed on my pedagogy. Maybe others... It might have been a random comment also, but if I am to consider my role in this I might have said things like, eh... I believe that I had a body-language which was very evident in terms of... Although I am now saying that I wish to develop players and develop eh... When it was match-time, it was very little doubt about the fact that I wanted to win. And off course someone might notice this, and for some of them, I believe this might have been threatening. For my own players! At least the younger players I coached, because I probably behaved in the same way there, as I would do with a professional team when things get tight and feelings arise. It is, it is clear that eh... Then you say one thing, but your body says something completely different. That may be (Anders M2).*

If his body language was as clear as he said, and he wanted to win the matches they played, the athletes might have noticed this. If the coach signals that it is important to win this one match, the players could probably adopt this view as well. They would therefore wish to perform as good as possible (on a personal level) and a state of *performance anxiety* could arise (Baumeister, 1984). All three coaches reported to have

this “problem” with body language. This was found in the analyses where these quotes were coded as *ego-oriented*, since they had to do with wanting to win. It is therefore possible that all three coaches, to some extent, created a *performance-oriented climate*. Their body language may have conveyed a message which signaled that winning was very important. Still it is important to note that this powerful body language worked both ways. All three coaches noted this. They showed signals both when things were bad and when they considered performances as positive. This has been reported as a very important coach capacity (Becker, 2009) and will be further discussed in the section regarding *coaching legacy* and *passion*.

*But I also believe that they see that ‘yes’, when I do like this (puts his arms up). You can’t misinterpret that, and that this is about a good thing; “now I think he’s happy and that must mean that it was a good move” (imitating player). (Glenn M1)*

In a study which sought to explore the area of parental and coach support or pressure, the research concluded with stating that a supportive coach influence, in form of being mastery-oriented, would be beneficial. This could be constructive for psychosocial outcomes in pediatric athletes. In contrast to this: athletes who feel a joint social pressure, exerted by parents and coaches, may benefit less psychosocially through sport (Ommundsen et al., 2006, p. 522).

#### **5.5.4 Preventing anxiety through the mastering of tasks**

After talking about performance anxiety and his thoughts around it, Anders (M2) finished up by highlighting that he meant that performance anxiety also had to do with the *mastering of tasks*. During the same topic he had talked about this several times.

*Some get it and some do not. Some got it, and some do not. But off course it’s also about the feeling of mastering, that you are able to recreate that feeling of mastering during a competitive setting, although there is much more at stake. And that you are able to push the surroundings and the serious context aside. But off course, there just might be some individual differences as well... I am not a psychologist. Haha (Anders M2)*

In a study on elite handball players and their longitudinal changes in performance anxiety, it was stated in their finishing conclusion regarding the *how* to avoid performance anxiety that: *“Taken together with previous findings in different populations, the safer route would then be to accentuate a mastery climate, and ease the focus on normative results and interpersonal competition within the team, female and males alike”* (Abrahamsen & Pensgaard, 2012, p. 40). Players who perceive their environment as being mainly mastery-oriented are perhaps more likely to view their opponents as cooperating creators of their experiences. Competition will therefore be considered as a process of working hard *with* other players, and not *against* other players (Ommundsen et al., 2005). This problem of competition and consideration of sport as *we* against *them* can even have an effect on competition within the same team as the next example will discuss.

#### **5.5.5 Ego threat**

The coach states in one saying that he several times had noticed that some players performed well when they were the clear first choice for the team, but when faced with competition from one of their own team-members, their performance would drop. The statement was coded as *ego-involved* and serves as a good example of the possible mechanisms suggested by AGT.

*I've had players who did not handle competition! Who performed well if they were alone or if they had a partner (same playing-position) who was clearly not as talented. The second choice was clearly much weaker than that person, but if another player came in and threatened him or her [‘fighting’ for playing position and being first choice], there were a few players who did not handle it. Players in the same team! I've seen that quite a few times. (Glenn M1)*

This indicates that the coach has observed some form of reaction to an ego-threat in terms of competition. If ego-involved players are to feel confident and competent in their own actions, those with lower task-involvement and high ego-involvement need to know that they are better than those they are competing against [success is based on outcompeting others]. So if they are used to being best, and someone of their own

caliber threatens their position, they are more prone to devalue themselves compared to their task-involved peers (Nicholls 1984; 1989). For them, demonstrating competence means to outplay others and showing superiority. If they are not able to achieve this goal, these players will perhaps adopt the goal of avoiding to demonstrate incompetence (which is thought to be the second best choice for *ego-involved* athletes, after demonstrating competence). They could get the notion that they will not succeed in their own ego-involved definition of demonstrating competence. Instead of increasing their own effort they will not handle the pressure of competition from someone regarded as equally good or better. To avoid demonstrating incompetence they could decrease their effort or use self-handicapping strategies. "...so that the individual has a ready excuse for potential failure" (Covington, 1992, p. 85). Even if this someone plays for the same team! This could be an example of why coaches should ease the focus on interpersonal competition as suggested by research. Even for elite athletes (Abrahamsen & Pensgaard, 2012). Glenn (M1) had seen this on younger teams and senior teams and his point about explaining "what you will get credit for" seems as a constructive way of dealing with this.

## **5.6 Coaching effectiveness**

As used in the theory, the definitions of *coaching effectiveness* define what it means to be an effective coach. Becker (2009) argue that coaches are responsible for developing athletes' technical, mental, physical and tactical abilities and that coaches are expected to win! Those few coaches who are able to meet all these demands and actually win are those who emerge from their peers as *great coaches* (p. 93). This definition of great coaching (which exceeds results) may seem to have more depth than what random popular media seems to define as great coaching, through their relatively narrow glasses. Winners seem to be in a constant limelight and attention is most of the time given based on success in terms of results or the absence of positive results. It is perhaps an exaggeration but it serves as an important reminder in this project especially. "*In general, society identifies coaches as 'great' based on two criteria: win/loss records and media attention*" (Becker 2009, p. 93). This part will try to enlighten these aspects of coaching which deals with the process of coaching and not only the outcomes.

### 5.6.1 The coach-athlete relationship

The climate perceived by players is thought to be highly influenced by the coach and the one on one communication is important for athletes as well as everyone else around the team (Jowett, 2005). Elite-athletes from different team-sports have reported that their previous *great coaches* were able to be both *professional* as well as *personal* at the same time (e.g., Becker, 2009, p. 104). The informants in this study also held thoughts about how they interacted with the players as they did and why they did it.

*And I am not saying that I can't have a beer together with the guys. But it should not be too close. But I am supposed to be 'one of them' and they should feel that I care for them and that I appreciate them. They must feel that! And if they truly have some troubles, they should believe that I will take care of them. That is a goal! And then it is... I think it is much more likely that they will feel this if I behave as the person that I am. That I act naturally. That is important. If it had been completely unnatural for me to make a few funny comments and still tried, I think they would see through that! So to have some credibility as a person! Also in order to convey your message and the... That I use my competence and that I am myself is important when communicating something I believe! They will believe more in me (Anders M2).*

Anders (M2) noted that who you are as a person to the players, might affect how they perceive your message as well as how they perceive your ability to teach them something, thus dealing with being *professional*. Glenn (M1) simply said that this communication is a fundamental prerequisite in order to make it. This example will be presented it a further point. If one is to look into what athletes seem to want from a coach, and what successful athletes believed that their best coaches did, both Glenn (M1) and Anders (M2) have a point. *"In the present study, the true essence of greatness was captured in athlete experiences of who their coaches were, what they did, how they did it, and how it influenced them"* (Becker, 2009, p. 112). Who you are as a person appears as the most important factor and these coaches recognize this.

## 5.7 Cohesion

This section will deal with *cohesion*. All though this is a separate theme, it should be viewed in the light of *coaching effectiveness*. Cohesion holds an important role in coaching effectiveness according to the previously presented definitions.

### 5.7.1 Coach-athlete cohesion

When asked the question of whether his players saw it as important to make him as a coach happy, all three coaches responded quickly. Anders (M2) noted that it could be because of something he had said and for example by the fact that he had used a form of reward (extrinsic motivation) in order to get the players to focus on one special aspect of the game. It could also just be that he had worked on something in practice individually with a player and when the player did it in a match Anders was pretty sure that they felt that they had made him happy. Thomas (M3) explained something which was surprisingly similar.

*I believe so. Absolutely. If we have been training on something and I've said that "if you can do this", I have probably used those exact words as a form of motivation. Or "the first one to do this will get" ... You know those cheap tricks you use to get to them. I'm pretty sure that, eh. For example after working individually with one player, for example with shooting-technique, or defense, or ball-stealing or blocking, and then the player did that in a match, they probably felt 'that' [made coach happy]! (Anders M2).*

*Well, I believe that if we succeed in something which we have talked about during practice, if they manage to do that one shot we have trained on, or if they are able to get things right which we have worked on together... Defensive play for example, where you steal the ball or other things we have practiced on. When that is successful in a match, I believe that they become very happy. And then I become happy to! (Thomas M3).*

Becker (2009) reported in her study on elite-athletes experiences of their previous great coaches, that one "major theme" which was found was: *coaching actions*. This was a major theme because a great deal of the athletes responded in the same way. It had to do with how the athletes had experienced their previous great coach in terms of responses to effort, mistakes, emotions and performance-outcomes. The answers showed that the players thought this was very important, and it had little to do with the end-results in the game, but rather on the execution of tasks. It had to do with being happy and satisfied: "*In addition to their excitement, these coaches expressed enjoyment when their players improved and/or developed*" (p.110). When looking into the answer given by both



Anders (M2) and Thomas (M3), it looks as if this has to do with the same experiences as the elite-players from Becker's study had.

### 5.7.2 Team-cohesion through mastery

Anders (M2) talked about some form of team-cohesion in terms of mastering something together as a team. This is of interest when looking into the subject of *cohesion*. Since this was about the things he trained them to do, when they eventually mastered it, naturally he would be satisfied too! He expressed it like this:

*If you work on creating a defensive play in practice and you see that it is successful in the next match, you just sort of know that this is... Eh. This is things which we have worked on together as a team. So I'm pretty sure that the trainers, eh the players I mean, are happy and satisfied at the same time as I'm happy. Often! At least with the younger ones. The younger players. (Anders M2)*

The statement made by Anders was coded as *cohesion* because it states that Anders believed that the players, if they got something they had been practicing on right, would feel that it was something they as a whole team had been working on. This quote can also serve as an example of how two basic dimensions of cohesion work together in terms of *social cohesion* (interpersonal attraction) and *task-cohesion*. In different time periods and with different teams, Glenn (M1) and Anders (M2) had both been coaching and following their own sons over periods around 5-8 years which they talked about when asked to talk about their coaching experience. It is reasonable to believe that these two different younger teams had highly functioning mechanisms of team cohesion, given that both became among the best teams in the country in their respective age-classes (at the ages from around 13-16). These teams were not teams where players from other places came to play, but the same players who had played together since early childhood, increasing the chances that they were cohesive groups. Glenn (M1) also had a quote which described this task-focus regarding weaknesses in the game, which he thought had made the players want to make him as a coach happy:

*Things we have been working on and which may have been a game-weakness of that player have made it so that, at some point it has become important to show that eh; “now I got it right”. That is when i feel that I often get those looks over to me where they want that confirmation right away. “Did you see that, did he see that? I hope he saw it... (imitating player)”. I have interpreted that as if they have done it to make me satisfied. But that has been things that they have not been able to do before, which they eventually managed (Glenn M1).*

The quote about *creating a defensive play* also holds an important example. This is relevant to the sport and play of team handball as well as other sports. It is probably no wonder why his example has to do with a defensive play. Earlier in the interview, Anders (M2) had described the part of defensive play as more “mechanical” for the players. This can be interpreted as if defense is more demanding of each player regarding structured tasks. He meant that these tasks are more “set” than tasks in offensive play. In offensive play he was concerned about being “creative”. Most handball-players would probably agree and note that good defensive play in handball requires more team-cohesion than the offensive and more “creative” part. The most important aspect of this is that he believed that the players could feel happy and satisfied several times during the game. They would probably feel some form of team-coach cohesion in terms of task-efficiency, regardless of the result, which Anders did not mention anything about. This is in line with what Mullen & Copper (1995) found when they suggested that team cohesion was stronger for “real groups”, as opposed to “artificial groups”, mainly due to the mutual commitment to the goal and task at hand (p.2).

*When you get, eh, when you have worked with a group for so long as I did with those younger athletes, over time... You get that positive relation to the player and the group. Which is eh, which is why continuity is one of the most important factors that recur in the relation to achieve success; just to have a coach for so many years and build a relation. It makes you, makes you able to know what it is that make a player happy and vice versa (Anders M2).*

Coaches who engage in dialogues with the players and who are conscious about creating these talking-situations about players’ daily activities (school other sports etc.)

are more likely to develop coach-athlete relationships which are high in trust (Jowett, 2005, p. 415). All three informants talked about the importance of communication, while analyses showed that Glenn (M1) and Anders (M2) emphasized it somewhat more than Thomas (M3), in terms of expressing how important it was and regarding how much they went into detail about how this was done. The most experienced, most merited as coach and the oldest of the informants talked very detailed about this when summarizing what he meant was most important for achieving success. This seems to fit very well with what elite players have reported in their beliefs about what makes a great coach. It is basically about how he or she should handle the one on one relationship: *“Establishing a close relationship was one of the more significant aspects of these athletes’ experiences”* (Becker, 2009, p. 104).

*The last thing I want to say, unless you have other questions is: It doesn't matter how good you are at ball-sessions, how good you are with tactics eh, or how good you are with choosing the right systems for the team both in defense and in offense if you can't handle the athlete. By handling each and every player in the group you handle the team.*

*And the prerequisite is, and this goes for all sports now that the national biathlon athletes are a team for both girls and boys... And which I think is interesting is that more and more individual sports use the term 'team'. The national ski-jumping team is very conscious about doing this. Eh... And the basic prerequisite for achieving something in sport, as well as in the private businesses, is that we have to get to know each other. We need to get to know the player. I need to know “who are you?” Not who are you in the training ground or when we are eating together, or when we are on the transport to matches or from matches. But 'who are you in other settings?' (Glenn M1)*

Perhaps not in contrast, but Thomas (M3) did not seem to be as concerned about knowing the players as his previous coach. By having co-worker talks with the players regarding their goals and their wishes for playing, he meant that he got to know the players quite well. After he had talked about the importance of communication, a follow-up question was asked:

*Are you concerned about knowing your players well personally, or how do you...  
(student).*

*That depends. I believe that those co-worker conversations make us get to know each other quite well. Because we talk! But off course, you never treat a team the same. You never treat all the players the same way; you treat everyone differently (Thomas M3).*

Thomas (M3) did also respond a little different from the two others, to the question of whether he saw himself as a leader, friend, tutor or something else.

*I think I am a tutor, not a friend. You know I am... I was quite clear on that point with my previous team. That is certain. I do not socialize with them outside of handball. That is definitely for sure. Because I have seen that much... I'm even clearer on that when I am coaching women teams. That is just unfortunate... (Thomas M3).*

His team had not reached their goals for performance this season and according to him, they had communication problems. He talked about this a few times during the interview. When talking about communication, he brought the group-dynamics (team-cohesion) up as a theme. This was an experience which they had learned a lot from this year.

*So in the preparation for next year, now I don't know if I am here until next season, but until next season we are going to do something about the group-dynamics. We can see that it is not working and that is not fortunate (Thomas M3).*

This team had not been successful considering results this season. The coach mentioned that the players had reported problems with communication as one of the reasons, and specifically communication with him as a coach. Carron et al., (2002) explain that they found a very strong relationship between cohesion and success in sport teams (p. 124), which could very well fit into this setting. This could serve as an explanation for the problems the coach stated that they had. Communication is important within group dynamics and within team-cohesion and Thomas' (M3) plans for improving group dynamics seems smart. Still there is something that is of interest in these two quotes, which could appear as a small paradox in terms of how the coach approaches the two situations. One of the reasons of why he wanted to improve group-dynamics was because: *"we have a team which consists of 3-4 older players and the rest of them are very young. That makes it difficult"*. The players on the other hand, reported

communication-problems with the coach as one factor for why they did not achieve their results according to him (the coach). Since the coach in this case reported that he did not seem to see it as important to “socialize with the players”, this could be interpreted as if he thinks that; *they* need better team-cohesion. If this is the case, he leaves the role of the coach and *me* outside of this need for better team cohesion. This may be detrimental for team performance. The coach is a part of the team and cohesion in terms of mutual *task-goals* is important (Carron, 1982; 2002; Mullen & Copper, 1995).

### 5.7.3 Self-talk

When considering the importance of *cohesion* and the use of *we* in team sports regarding performance, the next example is interesting. The most experienced and merited coach (Glenn M1) said a few things about what he had done in his tries to activate his team. To find the right level of arousal before a match or a competition he had used different techniques. This example has to do with *visualization* which he explained that he had used a lot for himself, but also towards the players.

*I also used it towards the players. You know: “imagine how good it feels when the referee blows the final whistle!”. In a team-meeting for example, I can say that; “when the referee blows the final whistle, we have... (raises his hands) Won! Feel it. Isn’t this feeling great? Look at the score-board; 27-26 to us” ...*

*...Think about how good it will feel! Isn’t this... isn’t this great? “yeah I guess”. Well can you feel that feeling? ”yeah, I think so” (imitating the player’s answer). (Glenn*

*M1)*

*[some content removed because of identifiable information]*

He had used visualization as a method for improving performance. How he did it is worth noticing. Values for *self-efficacy*, *collective efficacy* and other performance indicators have been found to be higher for teams who used “self-talk” which focused on group capabilities, instead of individual performance (Son et al., 2011). The coach used “we have won” in order to create a feeling of success. This study by Son and her colleagues goes into detail on how to increase performance. It seemed natural for Glenn

(M1) to talk about the team as *we* and use this form of self-talk, although he most likely never read this article. Where did he (or all three) learn all these details? From whom, or what, have this been transferred to them?

## 5.8 Legacy

What these coaches thought about their previous coaches will now be presented. This part will be tightly connected to the last part of this discussion, which will deal with the topic of *passion*. This topic of legacy is about what these three coaches learned from their previous coaches, what was inspiring and what they want to transfer to their own players. This is one of the main questions of this project. *Legacy* will now be enlightened and an attempt to answer the research questions will be carried out in the conclusion.

### 5.8.1 Know your trade

When asked about his previous coach (Glenn) and other previous coaches, Anders stated that one thing they all had in common was their knowledge about the sport.

*Well they're good, eh... They have definitely been good players. The coaches I've had, which I've thought well of, have been... Glenn was a very good player and I've had coaches abroad who have been world champions and Olympic champions who all knew their trade. And eh, you can feel that. (Anders M2)*

*Knowledge* also emerged as a major theme in the study on elite-athletes' experiences of great coaches. The athletes in this study explained that these great coaches were always up-to-date on everything from tactics, strategies to techniques. The athletes also expressed that it seemed as if their coach was always learning, and that they came back to the team with this new information (Becker, 2009). Thomas (M3) had experienced the *passion* they had for winning and meant that this was a common feature of his previous coaches.

*Thomas (M3):*

*Well that is that they are, are passionately obsessed of winning... and that things should go well, or perhaps not work out well, but more like: you are to win! That is the thing. They are practically insane when it comes to this. So there was never any doubt about that. That is the common feature. They are winnerskulls!  
(a person who is obsessed by winning. Norwegian word: vinnerkalle).*

It is especially interesting to see that Thomas (M3) used the term of *passionately obsessed*, when talking about winning. In the theory part of this project, *obsessive passion* was explained and this statement and subject will be further discussed and treated in the section about *passion*.

### **5.8.2 Transferring something**

*I was there for six years, where I was the coach in two out of those six years. It is experiences from that period which I build a lot of my handball-philosophy on. At that time I had a good coach whose name was Ian Hanson, who now is a top business leader. I'm not quite sure of his whereabouts right now, but he has been leader in a big company (specific company name removed) and I feel that I have become a lot like him.  
Both the good and bad sides!(Glenn M1)*

Glenn (M1) talks about this one coach who influenced him quite much. Thomas (M3) was influenced by Glenn as well as other coaches he had experienced.

*I have learned a lot from Glenn (M1) and I think he is extremely talented. There is no doubt about that. But on my own behalf, I've probably become a quasi-solution of all of them. From every coach I've had... (Thomas M3)*

When talking about what he wanted to transfer to the players he coached, Anders talked about this as a thing which exceeds the process of only handball.

*They have to be given something to carry with them... and something that they can harvest from in their years to come, and if they become good at playing handball also, that's just fun (Anders M2).*

## **5.9 Passion**

### **5.9.1 Visible passion**

Hardys' (1997) contention about elite-athletes [elite athletes will have high scores on both ego and task-goal motivation] is interesting. Hardy suggested that cases of high ego-involvement could be beneficial for performance and outcome results despite of all the research that highlights the downsides of ego-involvement (Hardy, 1997). This contention was supported in a study on elite athletes (Pensgaard & Roberts, 2001). The athletes reported very high scores on task-goal orientation and moderate too high scores on ego-goal orientation. From these three coaches perspective, this seems to fit in with their thoughts about own behavior as well. Analyses from this project indicate that all three participants thought it was obvious for others to see that they were concerned about winning. They also meant that winning was important. It is therefore likely that they would have moderate too high levels on ego-orientation. All three participants were former elite athletes. At the same time, analyses showed that all three coaches talked most about things that were coded as *task-involved* and *mastery-climate*. In terms of how these coaches "revealed" their *passion* for handball, they stated that they did not think they were able to hide their disappointment if the play was not good:

*That is something I have been told; that I have a powerful body-language, and that is first and foremost related to negative happenings. "We can tell from your body language that you are not happy" (Glenn M1).*

Anders (M2) talked about his visible body language in the previous section about *coach-induced pressure*. He believed that this could possibly have affected a few previous players in terms of performance anxiety, thus he also had a visible sign of drive. Thomas (M2) was asked about his relationship to non-verbal communication and he said that his body language could often be perceived as negative.



*I have a body language myself too, and 'that', I have been told... That this is negative or that "you seem negative all of the time" (Thomas M3)*

The positive body language was also something they talked about. As showed in the topic of *performance anxiety*, Glenn (M1) meant that the players could not misinterpret the fact that he raised his hands and expressed joy when his players did well. Anders (M2) talked about being balanced, while Thomas (M3) seemed to be concerned about living in the moment of the game. Both these two expressed that they would not lose their minds even if things were going well.

*But I never join a dance-roundel with the players or jump back and forth or that stuff. I could perhaps join it, but I feel that it will be a bit heavy and over the top. But there is no doubt about the fact that I am happy. That I appear happy! Clearly! All though I don't go bananas (Anders M2)!*

*I just try to be myself off course... But when things are going well, I cheer and I am, I'm satisfied and living in the moment of the game... You don't just see that eh... Like: "you need to be more happy!" but that depends on how it goes! To put it like this, I can't smile and laugh when things are going straight to hell... It is not like that (Thomas M2).*

In terms of visible passion, it is suggested in a simplified manner that these three coaches showed a visible body-language and a form of visible passion connected to the sport. They showed signs of *harmonious passion* when things went well, and they showed *obsessive passion* when their activity did not go as planned. Thomas (M3) even said that Glenn and other previous coaches were "*passionately obsessed*" of winning. *Passion for activity* is an interesting psychological factor which might explain the mechanisms of our drive (Vallerand et al., 2003). These three coaches' statements regarding *drive*, *passion* and *motivation* will now be ending this discussion.

### 5.9.2 Passion for leading and performing

Each informant was asked about their background and education at the start of the interview. Thomas (M3) noted quite early in the interview that *”he had a ‘coach’ within him the whole time [when being a player]”*. Actually, he had been working as a coach a great deal of the time alongside playing on the highest level as well. He started as early as when he was about 16 years old and his team-players were only a few years younger. He had coached younger athletes on regional talent teams for a while. He said that he had been captain on the teams he played for, most of them that was. He had different instructor-roles within his second job next to handball, and he also worked as a leader there for a work-team. So after he had informed about all his roles involving leadership, which seemed to color everything he had done, a simple follow-up question was asked:

*Yes, so that is the thing it has been the whole time (student)?*

*- Yes it is. I think it is fun to get people to perform (Thomas M3).*

When he was summarizing about what his drive was at the end of the interview, he talked in the same way and about the same thing as earlier in the interview. Leading groups and making them perform.

*First of all, it is about working with players and working with people which drive me. And the job of making a team work. That is my passion. So far in my career, and I can talk about the first five years out of these six where I have been working full time as a coach, this has been successful. It has worked out very well. To make a team be able to play on everyone’s capabilities in order to get the best result! (Thomas M3).*

When explaining what it is about handball that he considers as interesting, he said that it had to do with the demands the sport sat for him as a leader:

*What I think is most fun is that it requires a few things for you as a leader and coach in terms of altering and changing! Sometimes you have to change some players and you have to pay attention yourself. “Maybe we should do that play, or we have to replace him”. You know, all those things. Living in the presence! That is the thing which is most fun... So that is my motivation for handball (Thomas M3).*

### 5.9.3 Passion for mastering tasks

When analyses were made and when one looked into the subject of passion in this project, some answers and data from the interviews show signs of this. Much of the data coded as *passion* was also coded as *task-involvement*.

When asked to sum up with a few words about his drive and what had made him work as a coach for such a long time [passion: strong attraction towards an activity], Glenn replied this:

*To make it! That is what I have said. I want to make it. I think I have said that to all the teams that I have coached. I want to make it with this group, I want to make it with that team and I want to make it with them. In my last period (with one special team) we lost the first qualifying match against a 3<sup>rd</sup> ranked team internationally. We lost by one goal.*

*Then we met a 13<sup>th</sup> ranked team and we lost again. We should have beaten them; although we were ranked 26<sup>th</sup> and they were 13<sup>th</sup>, should we have beaten them. And then*

*I thought: "Damn!" And then the press became critical and at that point I thought to myself that: "I can't take it"! Now there is only critique... So now... I'm quitting! What kept me going at that point was: I just want to make it, so damn much! And I believe in the group of players within the team, and I just, so badly, want to make it. This is the way it has been with everything... (pause)*

*I cannot work unless I have something which drives me, and with sport it has been that thing. To make it! (Glenn M1).*

When hearing and reading this statement from the informant, one might perceive it as a bit obsessive. In the analyses it was coded as *passionate*. The interviewer interpreted it as passionate and an explanation for it is no other than the way he said it. He repeated the same sentence about making it so many times, and with a dedication which the author have no other description for than *passion*. And since he had repeated the same words several times during the interview, it seemed as if the informant was very concerned about this "*I want to make it*" (Glenn). He stated that he also had thoughts about quitting because of the pressure and the criticism. The relationship between *making it* and *quitting* seems close in this case and in this statement which was coded as *passionate (obsessive)*. This is explained in research on *burn-out*: "*Burning bright and*

*burning out can thus be seen as two potential consequences for athletes driven by passion” (Gustafsson et al., 2011, p. 387).*

It seems as if this drive he is talking about is not specifically connected to handball because he states that this objective of *making it* has been the thing with sport in general. It might be that he holds a passion for process and not necessarily passion for handball as one could be lead to believe when hearing and reading this. The distinction between these two ways of committing is important. This serves as a good example to describe theory about passion. This may show how effective AGT might be, in terms of results connected to being highly task-oriented. When looking at the segments coded as *task-involvement* and *passion*, it seems as if the process of mastering tasks and handling more and more difficult tasks is the main *activity* Glenn (M1) has passion for. When asked about what it was about handball, Glenn (M1) said that it had to do with doing something right.

*It does not need to be that [handball]. The thing is that when I give a big lecture I wish to get it, make a lecture that will be received as something good. When I am going to hold a theme-course in handball about something, I want to do well! And then it often ends up with, this requires one thing a particular among other things; preparations!  
And I have been willing to use time on this (Glenn M1).*

#### **5.9.4 Passion for creating something and pushing yourself**

Anders (M2) replied in a similar matter. He also sort of noted that it did not necessarily had to be handball.

*Student: What is it about handball?*

*Well, nothing else than the thing that eh, that became my sport. I played soccer and was active in a few other sports and I mastered handball quite well, so that... It is a bit creative. It is a game where the creative is, is an important factor (Anders M2).*

His answer about motivation and drive for handball was:

*But... But I think that one thing about motivation is that... Is that one has an ideal that is, maybe an ideal regarding play which eh... which you want to see the shape of because you are working with shaping it yourself. It is a form of motivation to see that you are succeeding in creating something. To make something like that! Eh, so that is an important drive. That you develop, that you develop both a play and players. That is very, very... It is very good feedback to see that the thing you are working on becomes something. In the way you hoped it would be. haha (laughing because it could go wrong – interviewers interpretation). Not necessarily titles and such. I have not placed myself in a position where I can get titles, so I don't have that as drive (Anders M2).*

This thing about creativity and creating something was what he replied when he was asked about his drive for being a coach, in addition to his first response which concerned the importance of climate (environment). It indicates that he could be drawn to the *activity* of creating something. He noted early in the interview that his main passion for sport had to do with unfolding and pushing the limits for yourself and your capabilities. It could be interpreted as if he wanted the players to feel the same thing as he had felt when he was a professional international elite player himself. When asked about what he wanted to transfer to the players he coached, this seemed quite obvious.

*The first thing is about climate and that this is important. That I have a, eh, am able to transfer that joy of pushing yourself to the limit. Transferring the joy of pushing their body far physically and mentally! If they experience joy from that and they choose to quit playing handball after this and start playing curling instead, I don't care! But if they truly feel that "Damn, Anders gave me something which made me want to push those boundaries in the direction I wanted, as far as possible" ... I believe that if this happens, then I can say that I have contributed in a sensible form. (Anders M2)*

## 5.10 Limitations

The researcher of the current study works as a team handball coach for younger athletes. While this may be positive for understanding expressions and terms, it may challenge the interviewer in terms of being critical towards the data. To explore coaching legacy in this project, a retrospective research method was used. Prospective and longitudinal studies are needed. Other sports may demand different actions from coaches than the ones reported in this study. Coaching effectiveness has been related to coaches' age (Kavussanu et al., 2008), and could have implications for generalization and replications of results.

Only two coaches, and previous players of the first informant, were interviewed. The population in this case is estimated to around 15 players which make up on handball team. Most of these players became coaches, according to the main informant. Informants were only male. Gender differences regarding achievement goals have been found in previous research (Kavussanu & Roberts, 2001; Kavussanu & Ntoumanis, 2003). How, and if, coaching legacy is transferred for other genders should therefore be a subject for future research. The most interesting for team handball, may be to explore coaching legacy regarding female coach and female athletes considering the success of former national team handball coach Marit Breivik and the successful womens team. There are also less female coaches than male on elite level.

Despite of depth, generalization necessitates different research studies looking at coaching legacy for individuals of different genders, different age and different sports.

## 6. Conclusions

### 6.1 What does the legacy consist of?

This is a short conclusion regarding what the analyses and discussion found in terms of differences and similarities between the three coaches. Their reported actions and thoughts around the different topics define *coaching legacy*. Suggestions to what the research questions wanted answers to will be presented. These were:

1. Is there a coaching legacy being transferred from one coach and on to an athlete, who later become a coach himself?

The underlying content and aspects of this question will be:

2. What is transferred between coach and athlete (and the athlete who then later became a coach) regarding topics of achievement goal theory, psychosocial outcomes (moral development and performance anxiety), self-regulation, coaching-effectiveness and passion?

#### 6.1.1 Psychosocial outcomes

All three coaches reported that they had not experienced big problems in their team concerning actions and behavior one would consider low in moral. Everyone expressed that the coach held a key factor in this process. The team and the players' actions would be representative for how the coach acted and behaved. Glenn (M1) and Thomas (M2) thought that it had to do with wanting to win and that some teams and cultures were willing to go far in their attempt to reach this goal of performance. Anders (M2) just thought of it as sad if coaches encouraged players to behave in such ways. Winning was clearly important for all three coaches, but their statements indicate that they were not willing to do whatever it takes to win. According to Hardy (1997), previous research has shown that most elite performers (over 80%) would not intentionally cheat or foul (p. 285). This study suggests that these previous elite handball players created a climate where such behavior was not welcome either.

Glenn was very thorough when explaining that giving credit and praising players had nothing to do with performance outcomes. It had to do with mastering something on a

higher level. *Interpersonal competition* can have been avoided because of this. The goal was to become better, but credit was not given for becoming better than others. For Anders (M2) and Thomas (M3), no data was found for factors which can have facilitated interpersonal competition, although many statements concerning performance climate were found.

With performance anxiety in mind, it is more likely that these coaches may have contributed to fostering this. All three coaches expressed that their body language would tell they were concerned about winning. Or “*passionately obsessed by winning*” as Thomas (M3) described Glenn (M1). Anders (M2) explained that he believed he could have caused some form of pressure towards a couple of younger athletes. He said that he could have signaled to high expectations and felt he put too much pressure on them. Thomas (M3) and Glenn (M1) talked about one incident each of observed performance anxiety. They meant that it had to do with expectations from the environment and themselves. These coaches were most likely creating a performance climate through their behavior and focus on winning. As Anders (M2) said; this might have contributed in creating some form of performance anxiety.

### **6.1.2 Self-regulation and goal-setting**

The retrieved segments of data coded as *self-regulation* are quite positive when considering if *coaching legacy* can be detected. The work Glenn (M1) reported doing with statistics seems to have been picked up by Thomas (M3). He used this because he had been “measured” on the same things himself and found it useful. It was used as a tool in order to know what he as a coach needed to change, so that the team could improve. He also used it as a tool to help the players become aware of their play and what they needed to improve. Anders (M2) said that his absence of being systematic with these statistics and other writings was his big weakness. This was important but he was still quite sure he gave enough feedback although his athletes did not receive written statistics. Since this was a weakness, it is likely that he saw it as strength for his previous coach (Glenn M1). This indicates that a high task-focus could have been transferred which these coaches could have used to create a mastery climate.



Glenn (M1) explained that players would get credit if, and only if, they struggled to reach a higher level (one step up). *Effort-regulation* [self-regulation ability] should therefore have been strongly connected to demonstration of competence, thus creating a mastery climate. Two things in particular appear to have initiated this: *detailed monitoring* and diverse but *detailed goal-setting*. Their background as elite-players gave them a professional expertise and probably let them become extremely detailed in their goal-setting. Goal-setting was task-oriented and performance-oriented and the players were confronted with both. “*Rather, a number of different lines of research suggest that successful performers have multiple perceptions of competence and use outcome, performance, and process goals to good effect*” (Hardy, 1997, p. 283).

### **6.1.3 Relations**

Glenn (M1) meant that he had been showing a positive body language through his coaching, all though he said that he was known for the opposite. In line with what Glenn (M1) explained, both Thomas (M3) and Anders (M2) expressed that they thought their players would be happy if a player managed something in a match, which the player could not do before. Or if they worked on something together and then the team did this in a match. The coaches were quite sure that the players would be happy when they succeeded in their tasks. One reason for it was that they would be happy. All three coaches reported very similar behavior connected to the mastering of tasks and in how they expressed their feelings during practice and competition.

Glenn (M1) said that knowing each player personally was the most important factor for achieving success. Anders (M2) also expressed that this was important and added that the players should know that he cared for them. “*They must know that*”. Thomas (M3) meant that he got to know the players quite well through “*co-worker*” talks. These one on one talks were important for him, but he did not express as much importance of knowing each player personally as Glenn (M1) and Anders (M2).

#### **6.1.4 Passion for a form of activity**

Three different forms of *attraction to activity* are proposed as an explanation for these coaches' passion: *passion for creating*, *passion for leading* and *passion for mastering tasks*. All three constructs hold similarities in how this activity is carried out. A very high task-goal focus seems evident and is perhaps the most important common feature. The use of *self-regulation* facilitating strategies through *goal-setting* and *monitoring* seems to be a form of legacy. This project suggests that the concept of *passion* needs to explore which *activities* that we have *passion* for, and how this passion is carried out by physical educators. The activity could be more than just a sport.

## References:

- Abrahamsen, F. & Pensgaard, A-M. (2012). Longitudinal Changes in Performance Anxiety Among Elite Handball Players. *International Journal of Applied Sports Sciences*, 2012, Vol 24, NO 1, 31-42.
- Ames, C. (1992). Achievement goals, motivational climate, and motivational processes. In G. C. Roberts (Ed.), *Motivation in sport and exercise* (pp. 161-176). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Augste, C., & Lames, M. (2011). The relative age effect and success in German elite U-17 soccer teams, *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 29:9, 983-987
- Barnett, N. P., Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (1992). Effects of enhancing coach-athlete relationships on youth sport attrition. *The Sport Psychologist*, 6, 111-127.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1984). Choking under pressure: self-consciousness and paradoxical effects of incentives on skillful performance. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 46(3), 610.
- Beal, D. J., Cohen, R. R., Burke, M. J. & McLendon, C. L. (2003). Cohesion and performance in groups: a meta-analytic clarification of construct relations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(6), 989-1004.
- 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 & Coaching*, Volume 4, Number 1, 2009.
- Boiché, J., & Sarrazin, P. (2009). Proximal and distal factors associated with dropout out versus maintained participation in organized sport. *Journal of Sports Science and Medicine*, 8, 9-16.
- Carpenter, P. J., & Yates, B. (1997). Relationship between achievement goals and the perceived purposes of soccer for semiprofessional and amateur players. *Journal of sport & exercise psychology*, 19(3), 302-311.

Carron, A.V. (1982). Cohesiveness in sport groups: Interpretations and considerations. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 4, 123-138.

Carron, A. V., Bray, S. R., & Eys, M. A. (2002). Team cohesion and team success in sport. *Journal of sports sciences*, 20(2), 119-126.

Chaumeton, N. R., and Duda, J. L. (1988). Is it how you play the game or whether you win or loose? The effect of competitive level and situation on coaching behaviors. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 11, (p.157-173).

Covington, M. V. (1992). Making the grade: A self-worth perspective on motivation and school reform. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior. New York. Plenum

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2002). The paradox of achievement: The harder you push, the worse it gets. In J. Aronson (Ed.), *Improving academic achievement: Contribution of social psychology* (pp, 59-85) New York: Academic press.

Duda, J.L., Olson, L.K., & Templin, T.J. (1991). The relationship of task and ego orientation to sportsmanship attitudes and the perceived legitimacy of injurious acts. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 62, 79-87.

Duda, J. L. (2001). Achievement goal research in sport: Pushing the boundaries and clarifying some misconceptions. In G. C. Roberts (Ed.), *Advances in Motivation in Sport and Exercise* (p. 129 – 182). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, Inc.

Dunn, J.G.H., & Dunn, J.C. (1999). Goal orientations, perceptions of aggression, and sportpersonship in elite male youth ice hockey players. *The Sport Psychologist*, 13, 183-200.

Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A Social-Cognitive Approach to Motivation and Personality. *Psychological Review*, 95, 256-273.

- Faulkner, G. & Sparkes A. (1999). Exercise as therapy for schizophrenia: an Ethnographic Study. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology* 1999; 21:52-69.
- Gilberg, R. & Breivik, G. (1998). *Hvorfor ble de beste best?: Barndom, oppvekst og idrettslig utvikling hos 18 av Norges mestvinnende idrettsutøvere*. Norges Idrettshøgskole. Oslo.
- Gustafsson, H., Hassmén, P., & Hassmén, N. (2011). Are athletes burning out with passion?. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 11(6), 387-395.
- Hardy, L. (1997). The Coleman Roberts Griffith address: Three myths about applied consultancy work. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 9 (2), 277-294.
- Hauge, L. S. & Holgermes, B. (2005). *Vitenskap og språk – en innføring i vitenskapsfilosofi og logikk* (Science and language – an introduction to philosophy of science and logic). Høyskoleforlaget.
- Horn, T. S. (1985). Coaches' feedback and changes in children's perceptions of their physical competence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77, 174-186
- Horn, T. S. (2008). *Advances in sport psychology* (Third edition). Human Kinetics.
- Horn, T. S., Bloom, P., Berglund, K. M., & Packard, S. (2011). Relationship between collegiate athletes' psychological characteristics and their preferences for different types of coaching behavior. *Sport Psychologist*, 25(2), 190-211.
- Jones, R. L., & Wallace, M. (2006). Chapter 5: The coach as 'orchestrator': More realistically managing the complex coaching context. In Jones & Wallace (2006). *The sports Coach as Educator: Re-conceptualizing Sports coaching*. Routledge publishers.
- Jones, R. L. (2009). Coaching as caring (the smiling gallery): accessing hidden knowledge, *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 14:4, 377-390

Jordet, G. (2010). Choking under pressure as self-destructive behaviour. In A. Nicholls (ED.), *Coping in sport: Theory, methods, and related constructs*, (pp. 239-259), New York: Nova Science Publishers

Jowett, S. (2005). The coach-athlete partnership. *Psychologist*, 18(7), 412-415.

Jørgensen, M. W. & Philips, L. (2005). *Diskursanalyse som teori og metode*. Roskilde: Roskilde Universitetsforlag.

Kavussanu, M., & Ntoumanis, N. (2003). Participation in sport and moral functioning: Does ego orientation mediate their relationship?. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 25, 501-518.

Kavussanu, M. & Roberts, G. C. (2001). Moral functioning in sport: An Achievement goal perspective. *Journal of sport and Exercise Psychology*. 23, 37-54.

Kavussanu, M., Boardley, I. D., Jutkiewicz, N., Vincent, S. and Christopher Ring (2008). Coaching Efficacy and Coaching Effectiveness: Examining Their Predictors and Comparing Coaches' and Athletes' Reports. *The Sport Psychologist*, 2008, 22, 383-404

Mason, J. (1996). *Qualitative Researching*. London & Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Mullen, B., & Copper, C. (1995). The relation between group cohesiveness and performance: An integration. SYRACUSE UNIV. NY.

Nicholls, J. G., & Miller, A. T. (1983). The differentiation of the concepts of difficulty and ability. *Child Development*, 54, 951-959

Nicholls, J. G. (1984). *Psychological Review*, Vol. 91, No. 3, s.328-346.  
Copyright 1984 by the *American Psychological Association, Inc.*

Nicholls, J. G. (1989). *The competitive Ethos and Democratic Education*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Ntoumanis, N., & Biddle, S. J. (1999). A review of motivational climate in physical activity. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 17(8), 643-665.

Ommundsen, Y., Lemyre, P-N., Roberts, G. C. & Miller, B. W. (2005). Peer relationships in adolescent competitive soccer: Associations to perceived motivational climate, achievement goals and perfectionism. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 23(9): 977 – 989

Ommundsen, Y, Roberts, GC, Lemyre, P-N, & Miller, B. W. (2006). Parental and coach support or pressure on psychosocial outcomes of pediatric athletes in soccer. *Clinical Journal of Sports Medicine*. 16, 522-526.

Ommundsen, Y & Lemyre, P-N (2007). Self-regulation and strategic learning: The role of motivational beliefs and the learning environment in physical education.

Pensgaard, A-M. & Roberts, G. C. (2002). Elite athletes' experiences of the motivational climate: The coach matters. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sport*, 12, 54-60.

Rip, B., Fortin, S., & Vallerand, R. J. (2006). The relationship between passion and injury in dance students. *Journal of Dance Medicine & Science*, 10(1-2), 1-2.

Roberts, G. C. (1986). The Perception of Stress: A Potential Source and its Development.

In M. R. Weiss & D. Gould (Eds.), *Sport for Children and Youths* (pp. 119-126). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers, Inc

Roberts, G. C. (2001). Understanding the dynamics of motivation in physical activity: The influence of achievement goals and motivational processes. In G. C. Roberts (Ed.), *Advances in Motivation in Sport and Exercise* (pp. 1 – 50). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, Inc.

Roberts, G. C. (2012) Motivation in sport and exercise from an achievement goal theory perspective: After 30 years, where are we? Found in article-collection compendium in the subject MAS 445 – Sport psychology, at Norwegian School of Sport science.

Salling Larsen & Vejleskov (2006). *Vitenskaplig metode og statistikk (scientific method and statistics)*.

Sarrazin, P., Vallerand, R., Guillet, E., Pelletier, L., & Cury, F. (2002). Motivation and dropout in female handballers: A 21- month prospective study. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 32 (3), 395-418.

Schunk, D. H. (1995). Self-efficacy, motivation, and performance. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 7(2), 112-137.

Schunk, D. H. (2001). Self-regulation through Goal Setting. ERIC/CASS Digest

Smith, R. E., Smoll, F.L. & Curtis, B. (1979). Coach effectiveness training: A cognitive-behavioral approach to enhancing relationship skills in youth sports coaches. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 1, 59-75.

Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L., & Barnett, N. P. (1995). Reduction of children's sport performance anxiety through social support and stress-reduction training for coaches. *Journal of applied developmental psychology*, 16(1), 125-142.

Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L. & Cumming, S. P. (2007). Effects of a Motivational Climate Intervention for Coaches on Young Athletes' Sport Performance Anxiety. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 2007, 29, 39-59.

Smoll, F. L., Smith, R. E., Barnett, N. P., & Everett, J. J. (1993). Enhancement of children's self-esteem through social support training for youth sport coaches. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 602-610.

Son, V., Jackson, B., Grove, J. R., & Feltz, D. L. (2011). "I am" versus "we are": Effects of distinctive variants of self-talk on efficacy beliefs and motor performance. *Journal of sports sciences*, 29 (13), 1417-1424.

Stephens, D.E., & Bredemeier, B.J.L. (1996). Moral atmosphere and judgments about aggression in girls' soccer: Relationships among moral and motivational variables. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 18, 158-173.



- Thagaard, T. (2010) Systematikk og innlevelse. En innføring i kvalitativ metode. 3. utgave. Fagbokforlaget.
- Toering, T. T., Elferink-Gemser, M. T., Jordet, G., Pepping, G. J., & Visscher, C. (2011). Self-regulation of learning and relative age in elite youth soccer: International versus national level players. *Self-regulation of learning and the performance level of youth soccer players*.
- Treasure, D. C. & Roberts, G. C. (1994). Cognitive and affective concomitants of task and ego goal orientations during the middle school years. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 16, 15-28.
- Vallerand, R. J., Blanchard, C. M., Mageau, G. A., Koestner, R., Ratelle, C. F., Léonard, M. et al. (2003). Les passions de l'âme: On obsessive and harmonious passion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, 756–767.
- Vallerand, R. J. (2008). On the psychology of passion: In search of what makes people's lives most worth living. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 49(1), 1.
- Vandendriessche, J. B., Vaeyens, R., Vandorpe, B., Lenoir, M., Lefevre, J. & Renaat M. Philippaerts, (2012): Biological maturation, morphology, fitness, and motor coordination as part of a selection strategy in the search for international youth soccer players (age 15–16 years), *Journal of Sports Sciences*,  
*DOI:10.1080/02640414.2011.652654*
- Zimmerman, B.J. (2000). Attainment of self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P.R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 13-39). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (2006). Development and adaptation of expertise: The role of self-regulatory processes and beliefs. In K. A. Ericsson, N. Charness, P. J. Feltovich, & R. R. Hoffman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance* (pp. 705-722). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

## Appendices

- Appendix one: Interview guide to the first interview (main expert coach).
- Appendix two: Interview guide to the two last interviews (expert disciples).
- Appendix three: Approval by NSD (Norwegian social science database)
- Appendix four: Society's interest in this project: "The coach factory" (article from Aftenposten).

## **Appendix 1: Semi-strukturert dybde-intervju**

Forhåndsinformasjon til intervjuet:

Hei Jeg er her for å snakke med deg om dine erfaringer som håndballtrener og hva slags tanker du har om hvordan trenerarbeidet gjøres på best måte.

- Dersom du har noe å tillegge underveis så er det bare å gjøre det når du føler for det. Det er ingen riktige eller gale svar underveis i samtalen. Jeg er bare ute etter å få høre om noen erfaringer du har vedrørende arbeidet ditt som trener, som igjen kan gi meg noe informasjon til å bruke videre i arbeidet med min oppgave ved NIH.
- Du kan føle deg trygg på at alt du sier vil forbli konfidensielt. Ingen vil få vite at du har sagt noe spesifikt.
  - Det vil også si at dersom vi publiserer noe data så all informasjon om deg holdes hemmelig og detaljert informasjon vil ikke bli publisert. Ingen vil for eksempel, på et senere tidspunkt, ha mulighet til å finne ut hvem som har sagt hva om ulike emner. Det vil også være flere informanter i dette prosjektet.
- Deltagelse er frivillig, og dersom du skulle ønske å trekke deg underveis i intervjuet av en eller annen grunn så kan du når som helst gjøre det.

### **Introduksjon til emnet – min masteroppgave:**

- Utvikling for min egen del som håndballtrener og som lærer.
  - Både breddetankegang og toppidrettstankegang.
  - Skape gode miljøer.
  - Skape enda flere gode trenere.
- Skape litteratur om hvordan et idrettsmiljø bør fungere og hvorfor det bør gjøres slik. Basert på forskning innenfor coaching og idrettspsykologi.

### **Spørsmål til informanten eller fra informanten?:**

---

#### **Intervjuspørsmål og temaer:**

##### **Innledning til intervju:**

For å ta en rask oppsummering av din bakgrunn som trener og spiller i håndball.

Hvor gammel var du når du startet som trener?

Hvor lenge har du jobbet som trener? – Hvilke klubber – kan du nevne noen både for yngre/eldre?

Hva slags annen jobb/studier har du hatt samtidig/underveis som du har vært trener?

## 1. Miljøets innvirkning: hvordan det skapes og hvordan det fungerer

---

Ok! Jeg vil gjerne høre litt om miljøet rundt en treningsgruppe og hva du tenker om sammenhengen mellom miljø og prestasjon/utvikling og følgende spørsmål: (mastery-oriented climate and performance-oriented climate).

- a. *Hva tror du spillerne som du har vært trener for vil si at du er opptatt av som trener?*
  - *Opptatt av å vinne eller mest opptatt av andre prestasjonsindikatorer?*
- b. *Hvilke spillere får mest oppmerksomhet av deg som trener?*
  - *Hvor viktig er det å utvikle spillere som vinner mye (eller blir profesjonelle)?*
  - *Legger du vekt på dette i din egen vurdering av deg selv som trener?*
- c. *Hvordan ser du på resultater og for eksempel tabellposisjon?*
  - *Brukes den til noe?*
- d. *Er det viktig å sammenligne seg med andre lag, eller være bedre enn naboklubben?*
  - a. *Hva kjennetegner det miljøet du er opptatt av å skape?*

Jeg ønsker å spørre om noen problemstillinger som ofte oppstår sammen med idretten og om du har noen erfaringer med dette:

(utvikling av moral, prestasjonsangst og psykososiale ferdigheter)?

- a. *Har du hatt noe erfaring med spillere som har prestasjonsangst? (Kan du fortelle...)*
  - *Hva komm(er) det av tror du (Fokus på om miljø spiller inn)?*
- b. *Når du ser at en spiller gjør noe ulovlig med vilje, hvordan reagerer du på det?*
  - *Forsøker du som trener å påvirke den sosiale-moralske utviklingen til spillerne?*
- c. *Når du ser at spillere oppfører seg "umoralskt" på håndballbanen (både trening og kamp). Juksing, filming og handlinger som kan være potensielt skadende mot motspillere.*
  - *Hva er det første du tenker på?*
  - *Hvis det fører til mål og eventuelt seier, hvordan reagerer du?*
- d. *Hva tror du om miljøet i en gruppe og sammenheng oppførsel og riktig moral (en del av det som ligger under begrepet fair-play)?*
  - *Er det noen forskjell mellom lag som er gode/dårlige eller lag som spiller for moroskyld eller for å vinne?*
  - *Og hva er trenerens rolle i dette mener du?*

Flott! Med et fokus på mentale ferdigheter og prestasjoner så ønsker jeg å høre hva du tenker om hva som er gode prestasjoner og hva som er svake prestasjoner i lys av følgende (Ego-involvert/oppgave-involvert. Task/Ego-involvement):

- e. *Hva vil det si å prestere for en enkelt spiller, hva legger du i det (hvor er fokuset)?*
  - f. *Hva er det som gjør at laget presterer?*
  - g. **Uansett nivå;** *Hva er det viktig at spillerne er opptatt av på trening og i kamp?*
  - h. *Når du ser spillere som er ekstremt opptatt av å vinne kamper eller konkurranser, hva er dine første reaksjoner? – hva er ulempene eller fordelene (motsatte av svar).*
  - e. *Har du noe forhold til det å gi arbeidsoppgaver for enkeltspillerne?*
    - *Hvordan gjør du dette i så fall (fokus på hvorfor arbeidsoppgaver er viktig)?*
-

Når det gjelder den totale helheten av mentale egenskaper og håndballfaglige ferdigheter::

---

- a. *Hva er du opptatt av å videreføre til de du trener?*
- b. *Hvilke egenskaper må en spiller ha for å bli toppidrettsutøver/profesjonell spiller?*
  - *Hvordan forsøker du å implementere slike egenskaper?*
  - *Hva gjør du som trener for å stimulere til høy innsats?*
- c. *Hvilke egenskaper må en spiller ha for å holde på med håndball over lengre tid (bredde)?*
  - *Forsøker du å implementere slike egenskaper?*
  - *Hvordan gjør du dette?*

Med tanke på disse egenskapene du nevner (selv-reguleringsegenskaper og treners effekt):

- a. *På hvilken måte er treneren ansvarlig for utøverenes utvikling av disse egenskapene (spesifisere til håndballferdigheter)?*
  - *Skaper en trener spilleforståelse (og i så fall hvordan)?*

## Forholdet mellom trener og utøver (Coaching effectiveness)

---

Ok! Jeg vil gjerne høre om dine oppfatninger vedrørende forholdet mellom spiller og trener.

(*coaching effectiveness*, , (Becker: *it's not what they do but how they do it*))?

Men tanke på din egen atferd og oppførsel.

- a. Er du opptatt av å kjenne utøverene du er trener for utover det håndballfaglige?  
- Hvorfor eller hvorfor ikke (har du noe kontakt med tidligere utøvere)?
- b. Hvor tilgjengelig er du for spillerne på trening og kamp og før og etter trening og kamp?  
- Når prater du med spillerne dersom du gjør dette?  
- Har du opplevd å få utenomsportslige saker presentert for deg?
- c. Hvordan oppfatter du vanligvis ditt forhold til spillerne du trener?  
- Er du en veileder, venn, voksen eller leder eller en kombinasjon?  
- Hva er viktig for deg å være?
- d. Hva tenker du om synlig engasjement og entusiasme? (Hvorfor viktig/ikke viktig?)

Når det gjelder tilbakemeldinger til spillere i form av ris og ros og spesielle situasjoner (*autonomi-støttende atferd (Smith & Smoll)*):

- f. *Husker du en eller flere situasjoner i kamp eller på trening som gjorde deg ekstra misfornøyd med spillerne (hva har fått deg til å kjeft på spillere for eksempel)?*  
- *Hva var årsaken i disse tilfellene (fokus på hva treneren mener er riktig fokus)?*
- g. *Hva slags situasjoner i kamp eller trening gjør at du reagerer positivt og med skryt.*
- h. *Kan du beskrive formen og settingen disse tilbakemeldingene blir gitt på til spillerene?*  
- *Foran alle eller tar du en eller flere spillere vekk?*

*Hva slags situasjoner tror du vil føre til at en spiller tenker at; "nå gjorde jeg treneren fornøyd"?*

- *Er det i det hele tatt viktig for dine spillere tror du?*

Selv-regulering:

Hvordan virker en treners atferd inn på utøverenes evne til å ta ansvar for egen utvikling og læring ([connection between mastery-climate and self-regulation-abilities](#))?

Fokus på:

- |                      |                        |
|----------------------|------------------------|
| - Selv-monitorering  | - Atferd og motivasjon |
| - Innsats-regulering | - Målsetting           |
- 

Spørsmål:

Hvor viktig er innsats for deg som trener.

([innsats-regulering](#))?

- Hvordan forsøker du å skape innsats på trening og i kamp?*
- Er du bevisst på belønning og straff. Hva er din erfaring med dette?*

Utvikling og læring:

- Dersom en utøver ikke er konsentrert på trening og ikke følger instruksjer:  
- Hva er din vanlige reaksjon?*
- Er det viktig å få utøvere til å ta ansvar for seg selv underveis i en trening?  
- eller er det viktigere at treninga blir gjennomført på en god måte (utelate spiller?)*
- Hvordan jobber du med individuelle målsettinger ([målsetting](#))?*
- Hvordan tror du at en treners atferd kan spille inn på en utøvers evne til å ta ansvar for seg selv?  
- Hva innebærer en slik atferd spesifikt?*
- Hva tenker du om egen-trening for spillere?*
- Hvordan tenker du at egentrening skal foregå?*

Når det gjelder det håndballfaglige arbeidet på treninger:

- Har du brukt eller bruker du noen spesielle metoder for å få de til å forsøke "overvåke" seg selv eller hverandre i treningsarbeidet?*
- Har du opplevd at spillere er opptatt av å hjelpe hverandre underveis i treninger (Var dette i et spesielt miljø. Hva var spesielt med dette i så fall.)?  
([selv-monitorering](#), [lagkamerat-monitorering](#))?*

### Motivasjon:

Når det gjelder motivasjon på det personlige planet for deg:

---

- a. *Hva er drivkraften din for å jobbe som håndballtrener?*
- b. *Hva mener du gjør håndball interessant og hvordan forsøker du å overføre dette til de du er trener for?*
- c. *Hvordan har dine motiver og mål forandret seg fra den gang du startet som trener og til i dag?*
- d. *Hvilke deler av arbeidet som håndballtrener gjør at du mister noe av motivasjonen for arbeidet?*
- e. *Hvilke deler av arbeidet som håndballtrener gjør at du blir ekstra motivert for å dra på treninger?*
- f. *Hva er ditt personlige mål for håndball?*  
*- Er det det å vinne eller er det prestasjons-basert?*
- g. *Har du tenkt til å holde på som trener fremover?*

### Coaching legacy (trenerarv):

Du har vært trener i mange år og sånn jeg forstår det så har mange av de du har vært trener for blitt trenere selv.

---

Sett med dine øyne og med tanke på din påvirkning:

- a. *Hvorfor tror du at så mange av de du har trent har blitt trenere selv?*
- b. *Er de et produkt eller en reaksjon av måten du har vært på som trener?*  
*- Hvorfor og hvordan?*
- c. *Er det noen personer som utmerket seg på en positiv måte for din del da du var spiller?*  
*- Var det noen som inspirerte deg til å bli trener?*  
*- Hva var det den eller de personene gjorde?*

### Konklusjon:

For å oppsummere intervjuet så får du et par korte konklusjonsspørsmål

---

- a. *Hvordan vil du oppsummere ditt arbeid som trener hittil?*
- b. *Hvordan ser trenerframtida di ut?*

Tusen hjertelig takk for at du tok deg tid til å svare på disse spørsmålene!





## Appendix 2: Semi-strukturert intervju med Anders (M2) og Thomas (M3)

Forhåndsinformasjon til intervjuet:

Hei Jeg er her for å snakke med deg om dine erfaringer som håndballtrener og som håndballspiller, og for å høre hva slags tanker du har om hvordan trenerarbeidet gjøres på best måte.

- Dersom du har noe å tillegge underveis så er det bare å gjøre det når du føler for det. Det er ingen riktige eller gale svar underveis i samtalen. Jeg er bare ute etter å få høre om noen erfaringer du har vedrørende arbeidet ditt som trener og dine erfaringer som både spiller og trener. Dette håper jeg kan gi meg noe informasjon til å bruke videre i arbeidet med min oppgave ved NIH.
- Du kan føle deg trygg på at alt du sier vil forbli konfidensielt. Ingen vil få vite at du har sagt noe spesifikt.
  - Det vil også si at dersom vi publiserer noe data så all informasjon om deg holdes hemmelig og detaljert informasjon vil ikke bli publisert. Ingen vil for eksempel, på et senere tidspunkt, ha mulighet til å finne ut hvem som har sagt hva om ulike emner. Det vil også være flere informanter i dette prosjektet.
- Deltagelse er frivillig, og dersom du skulle ønske å trekke deg underveis i intervjuet av en eller annen grunn så kan du når som helst gjøre det.

### Introduksjon til emnet – min masteroppgave:

- Utvikling for min egen del som håndballtrener og som lærer.
  - Både breddeanlegg og toppidrettstankegang.
  - Skape gode miljøer.
  - Skape enda flere gode trenere.
- Skape litteratur om hvordan et idrettsmiljø bør fungere og hvorfor det bør gjøres slik. Basert på forskning innenfor coaching og idrettspsykologi.

### Spørsmål til informanten eller fra informanten?:

---

Bakgrunn og erfaring

For å ta en rask oppsummering av din bakgrunn som trener og spiller i håndball.

- Hvor gammel var du når du startet som trener?  
Hvor lenge har du jobbet som trener? – Hvilke klubber – Har du vært trener for både yngre og eldre?  
Hva slags annen jobb/studier har du hatt samtidig/underveis som du har vært trener?

### Miljøets innvirkning:

#### *Hvordan skapes miljø og hvordan fungerer miljøet?*

Ok! Jeg vil gjerne høre litt om miljøet rundt en treningsgruppe og hva du tenker om sammenhengen mellom miljø og prestasjon/utvikling og følgende spørsmål:

(*mastery-oriented climate and performance-oriented climate – climate and moral*).

- Hva tror du spillerne som du har vært trener for vil si at du er opptatt av som trener?*
  - Er det det du ønsker at de skal si også (forskjell mellom oppfatninger)?
  - Hva kjennetegner miljøet du er opptatt av å skape?
- Hva tror du spillerne vil si om ditt engasjement for håndball og som trener?*

- k. *Hvilke spillere får mest oppmerksomhet av deg som trener?*
  - *Hvor viktig er det å utvikle spillere som vinner mye (eller blir profesjonelle)?*
  - *Legger du vekt på dette i din egen vurdering av deg selv som trener?*
- l. *Hvordan er ditt forhold til resultater, tabell og statistikk generelt?*
  - *Bruker du noe av dette opp mot spillerne?*

Jeg ønsker å spørre om noen problemstillinger som ofte oppstår sammen med idretten og om du har noen erfaringer med dette: ([utvikling av moral og prestasjonsangst](#))?

- i. *Har du hatt noe erfaring med spillere som har prestasjonsangst? (Kan du fortelle...)*
  - *Hva kom(mer) det av tror du (Fokus på om miljø/personer spiller inn)?*
- j. *Hva er ditt forhold til juksing, filming og handlinger som kan være potensielt skadende mot motspillere (både trening og kamp).*
- k. *Hva er årsakene til at noen jukser, filmer eller spiller stygt tror du?*
  - *Er det noen forskjell mellom lag som er gode/dårlige eller lag som spiller for moroskyld eller for å vinne?*
  - *Hva er trenerens rolle i dette mener du?*

Flott! Med tanke på trening og det å skulle bli bedre eller vinne noe som stort sett er et mål for alle som konkurrerer. Kan du forklare litt rundt hva: ([AGT: Ego-involvert/oppgave-involvert. Task/Ego-involvement](#)):

- a. **Uansett nivå;** *Hva er det viktig at spillerne er opptatt av på trening og i kamp?*
- b. *Hvordan kommuniserer du med spillere på trening?*
  - *Har du noe forhold til det å gi arbeidsoppgaver for enkeltspillerne?*
- c. *Hvordan ser du på måten spillere utvikler spilleforståelse?*
  - *Har treneren noen rolle i dette og i så fall hva og hvordan?*



- h. Hva er drivkraften din for å jobbe som håndballtrener?
- i. Hva mener du gjør håndball interessant og forsøker du å overføre dette til de du er trener for?
- j. Hvordan har dine motiver og mål forandret seg fra den gang du startet som trener og til i dag?
- k. Hva er ditt personlige mål for håndball?  
- Er det det å vinne eller er det prestasjons-basert?
- l. Har du tenkt til å holde på som trener fremover?
- m. Påvirket Glenn din motivasjon som spiller (negativt, positivt eller begge deler)?

Coaching legacy (trenerarv):

Du har vært trener i endel år og du spilte selv under flere trenere – litt rundt Glenn (M1) og så må du gjerne skyte inn det du ønsker å få fram om andre trenere dersom du kommer på noe!

---

Sett med dine øyne og med tanke på din påvirkning:

- d. Hvorfor ble du håndballtrener selv?
- e. Hva var Glenn (M1) opptatt av som trener etter din mening?
- f. Er du et produkt eller en reaksjon av Glenn eller andre du har hatt som trenere?
- g. Er det noen andre personer som førte til at du blei trener?
- h. Hva skiller din "trenerarv" fra din tidligere treners arv?
- i. Hvordan oppfattet du at Glenn (M1) var med tanke på ulovligheter og dårlig moral, om vi kan kalle det det?
- j. Hva var viktig for Glenn på trening og kamp? (innsats, konsentrasjon?)  
- Fikk du arbeidsoppgaver av Glenn på trening og kamp?

**Engasjement (Passion)**

- a. Er det noen fellestrekk for de du har hatt som trenere og som du er mest påvirket av?
- b. Var det inspirerende å være spiller under han eller noen andre (Engasjert)?

Konklusjon:

For å oppsummere intervjuet så får du et par korte konklusjonsspørsmål

---

- c. Hvordan vil du oppsummere ditt arbeid som trener hittil?
- d. Hvordan ser trenerframtida di ut?

Tusen hjertelig takk for at du tok deg tid til å svare på disse spørsmålene! 😊

## Appendix 3: Approval NSD

Norsk samfunnsvitenskapelig datatjeneste AS  
NORWEGIAN SOCIAL SCIENCE DATA SERVICES



Oslo i Norge 0407 29  
N-0407 Bergen  
Kontor  
Tel: +47 55 58 21 17  
Fax: +47 55 58 96 50  
nsd@nsd.uib.no  
www.nsd.uib.no  
Org nr: 985 471 884

Pierre-Nicolas Lemyre  
Seksjon for coaching og psykologi  
Norges idrettshøgskole  
Postboks 4014 Ullensaker stadion  
0606 OSLO

Vår dato: 25.10.2012

Vår ref: 21880/17/B

Deres dato:

Deres ref:

### TILBAKEMELDING PÅ MELDING OM BEHANDLING AV PERSONOPPLYSNINGER

Vi viser til melding om behandling av personopplysninger, mottatt 19.10.2012. Meldingen gjelder prosjektet:

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| 31880                    | <i>Coaching legacy. An Achievement goal perspective</i>  |
| Behandlingsinstansartlig | Norges idrettshøgskole, ved institusjonens øverste leder |
| Daglig ansvarlig         | Pierre-Nicolas Lemyre                                    |
| Student                  | Per Marius Haugen  |

Personvernombudet har vurdert prosjektet og finner at behandlingen av personopplysninger er meldepliktig i henhold til personopplysningsloven § 31. Behandlingen tilfredsstiller kravene i personopplysningsloven.

Personvernombudets vurdering forutsetter at prosjektet gjennomføres i tråd med opplysningene gitt i melde skjemaet, korrespondanse med ombudet, eventuelle kommentarer samt personopplysningsloven og helseregisterloven med forskrifter. Behandlingen av personopplysninger kan settes i gang.

Det gjøres oppmerksom på at det skal gis ny melding dersom behandlingen endres i forhold til de opplysninger som ligger til grunn for personvernombudets vurdering. Endringsmeldinger gis via et eget skjema, [http://www.nsd.uib.no/personvern/foerk\\_stad/skjema.html](http://www.nsd.uib.no/personvern/foerk_stad/skjema.html). Det skal også gis melding etter tre år dersom prosjektet fortsatt pågår. Meldinger skal ske skriftlig til ombudet.

Personvernombudet har lagt ut opplysninger om prosjektet i en offentlig database, <http://pvn.nsd.no/prosjekt>.

Personvernombudet vil ved prosjektets avslutning, 31.08.2014, sette en henvendelse angående status for behandlingen av personopplysninger.

Vennlig hilsen

Vigdis Namsrøed Kvalheim

Inga Bruzaset

Inga Bruzaset tlf: 55 58 26 35  
Vedlegg: Prosjektvurdering  
Kopi: Per Marius Haugen, Tarveien 26, 2209 KONGSVINGER

Publiseringskontor i Oslo og Bergen

0201 NSD (Oslokontor) i Oslo, Postboks 105, Blindern, 0407 Oslo, tel: +47 22 86 52 11 nsd@nsd.no  
0202 NSD (Bergenkontor) i Bergen, Postboks 105, Strandgaten, 5017 Sandness, tel: +47 55 58 21 17 inga.namsroed@nsd.no  
0203 NSD (Oslo) i Oslo, Postboks 105, Blindern, tel: +47 22 86 52 11 nsd@nsd.no



## Appendix 4: Trenerfabrikken



Se godt på bildet over! Du burde kanskje ikke ha husket så mange av navnene. Men Sandefjords storlag i håndball fra drøyt halvannet tiår tilbake ble rene trenerfabrikken.

Sandefjords storlag fra starten på 1990-tallet. Bak fra venstre: trener Gunnar Pettersen, Henning Haug, Sergej Demidov, Oddvar Jakobsen og John P. Sando. Tredje rekke fra venstre: Stein O. Sando, Geir Oustorp, Johnny Jensen, Atle Larsen, Karl-Erik Bøhn og videomann Bjørnar Bruun. Annen rekke fra venstre: Oppmann Ole E. Olsen, Bjørn K. Bøe, Morten Schøfeldt, Erik Holmer,

Ørnulv Bjercke jr., Lasse Tollefsen og Tron Setlo. Foran fra venstre: Ole Gustav Gjekstad, Gunnar Fosseng, Per Ø. Gustavsen, Espen Olsen og Pål Cramer.

## Arne Hole

Publisert: 17.apr. 2007 00:05 Oppdatert: 20.okt. 2011 01:02

### [Share on email](#)

Av Norges fire mest profilerte håndballtrenere var tre av dem sammen på Sandefjord på slutten av 1980-tallet og begynnelsen av 1990-tallet; Gunnar Pettersen, Karl-Erik Bøhn og Ole Gustav Gjekstad. (Marit Breivik var ikke aktuell for laget). Men ytterligere åtte mann ble trenere.- Det hadde vel med typene å gjøre. Jeg tar i alle fall ikke æren, sier Gunnar Pettersen, som var trener for et av de beste klubblagene Norge noen gang har hatt.- Det er litt uvanlig at så mange spillere fra samme lag blir trenere på så høyt nivå, men det var treningsvillige karer som var opptatt av spillet. Av hvorfor vi gjorde ting. De var mer interessert i håndball enn bare å utøve idretten, sier "GP", som nå har vært trener over halve livet.- Jeg syns fortsatt det er veldig gøy, men i Norge er det uvanlig at trenere er over 50 år. Det har kanskje med jobbtilbudet å gjøre. Og det har vært usikkerhet rundt det økonomiske. I utlandet har det nok også gitt større status å være trener, sier Pettersen.

### **På alle nivåer.**

De tidligere SHK-gutta er i dag trenere på alle nivåer. Her følger oversikten. Gunnar Pettersen: Herrelandslaget Sergej Demidov: NTG. Tidligere Urædd, Kragerø, Nordstrand og yngre landslag. Oddvar Jakobsen: Sandefjord og Norrøna. John P. Sando: Bare observert på trenerkurs. Stein O. Sando: Nøtterøs herrelag i 1. divisjon. Geir Oustorp: Drammens damer, neste sesong Byåsen. Johnny Jensen: Skal bli trener når han gir seg i Flensburg. Karl-Erik Bøhn: Assistent på herrelandslaget under Harald Madsen, DHK, nå Larviks damer. Morten Schönfeldt: Pfadi Winterthur, Nordstrand. Fet, assistent i Haslum. Nå yngretrenere. Ørnulv Bjercke jr.: Yngretrener i Sandefjord. Tron Setlo: Har trent yngre lag i Sandar. Ole Gustav Gjekstad: Norrøna, Larvik, yngre landslag, nå Drammens herrer.

