

Morten Granerud

An Examination of Reciprocity among Coach and Athletes in Female Elite Junior Swimming

A Shared Reality Theory Perspective

Master thesis in Coaching and Psychology
Department of Sport and Social Sciences
Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, 2020

Sammendrag

Basert på antakelsen om at trener-utøver-relasjonen er på sitt beste når både trener og utøver bidrar til trener-utøver-relasjonsprosessen, hadde følgende masteroppgave som mål å utforske om Shared Reality Theory (SRT) kunne bidra med nye perspektiver på temaet. SRT hevder at mennesker er epistemisk og relasjonelt motivert for å oppleve en delt virkelighetsforståelse med andre om fenomener i verden, og at en delt virkelighetsforståelse angående en måloppnåelses-prosess fungerer som en sosial verifikasjon som gjør at måloppnåelses-prosessen oppleves som meningsfull. Basert på dette, er det sannsynlig å tro at personer i en trener-utøver-relasjon som opplever en delt virkelighetsforståelse med den andre ville oppleve (a) en sterk relasjon til den andre, og (b) være mer motivert av sitt nåværende treningsopplegg ettersom det erfarer som meningsfullt. Seks kvinnelige elite-juniorsvømmere og deres hovedtrener ble intervjuet tre ganger over ni måneder. Etter en tolkningsbasert, narrativ tematisk analyse, argumenterer den følgende masteroppgaven for at utøvere som opplevde en delt virkelighetsforståelse med treneren sin var mer motivert og uttrykte høyere psykologisk velvære. Det virket som om treneren opplevde en delt virkelighetsforståelse såfremt utøveres kommunikasjon ikke indikerte noe annet. For å etablere en delt virkelighetsforståelse, trengtes det gjensidig og ærlig kommunikasjon motivert av tillit til den andre. På grunn av ujevn maktbalanse i treneres favør, antas det å være spesielt viktig for trenere å oppføre seg støttende og tillitsvekkende for å motivere utøvere til å åpne seg opp så treneren og utøveren synergisk kan jobbe sammen i deres relasjon.

Abstract

Based on the proposition that the coach-athlete relationship is at its best when both coach and athlete contribute to the coach-athlete relationship process, the present master thesis set out to investigate if Shared Reality Theory (SRT) could provide new insights on the topic. SRT stipulates that human beings are epistemically and relationally motivated to experience a shared reality with others about a target referent, and that a shared reality about a goal pursuit serves as social verification which makes the goal pursuit experienced as worthwhile. As such, it seems likely that partners in a coach-athlete relationship who experience a shared reality with the other partner, would experience (a) a strong relationship with the other, and (b) being more motivated by their current training regime, as it is experienced as worthwhile. Six female elite junior swimmers and their head coach were interviewed three times over nine months. Based on an interpretive, narrative thematic analysis, the present master thesis argues that athletes who experience a shared reality with their coach are more motivated and report a higher sense of psychological well-being. The coach seems to experience a shared reality unless athletes' communication indicates otherwise. To establish the experience of a shared reality, reciprocal and honest communication motivated by trust in the other is needed. Due to power imbalance, it is deemed important for coaches to behave supportive and trustworthy to motivate athletes to open up so coach and athlete synergistically can work together in their coach-athlete relationship.

Table of Contents

Sammendrag	3
Abstract	4
Table of Contents	5
Acknowledgements	7
1. Theory	8
1.1 Youth Sports and Talent Development.....	8
1.2 Coaching and The Coach-Athlete Relationship	11
1.3 Shared Reality Theory.....	15
1.4 Purpose of the Present Study	25
2. Method	26
2.1 Paradigmatic Position.....	26
2.2 Methodology	27
2.2.1 Study Design.....	29
2.2.2 Participants	29
2.2.3 Procedure	30
2.2.4 Data Collection	30
2.2.5 Interview Guide	30
2.2.6 Data Analysis.....	31
2.2.7 Narrative Thematic Analysis	31
2.2.8 Constructing the Narratives as Research Text.....	33
2.2.9 Quality and Rigour	34
2.2.10 Ethical considerations	35
References	37
Presentation of Article	46
Abbreviations	80
Appendices	81
Appendix 1 – Notification Form for Processing Personal Data	81
Appendix 2 – NSD’s Assessment of the Project.....	86
Appendix 3 – Approval from The Ethical Committee of The Norwegian School of Sport Sciences.....	88

Appendix 4 – Purpose of Study & Declaration of Consent	90
Appendix 5 – Interview Guide at T1	93
Appendix 6 – Interview Guide at T2	97
Appendix 7 – Interview Guide at T3	105

Acknowledgements

It is now crazy to think back to the fact that I ever had my doubts regarding taking part in Bård Erlend Solstad's project for my master's thesis. Boy, am I glad I did! Bård, you have been an excellent supervisor from start to finish! Thank you for every encouraging word, for your kind and patient support, and your strong belief in my potential for development! You have pushed me out of my comfort zone; however, your ongoing, sincere support made those experiences greatly less horrific that they potentially could have been for a poor prevention-oriented guy. You have always been available, even just for unformal chit-chat, and for that I am forever grateful. A huge thanks to you, and also Pierre-Nicolas Lemyre, for trusting me enough to send me along with my co-students to the SCAPPS¹-conference presenting our study. In this regard, Kristin Andersen, you must be also be thanked for your logistical support of any kind!

Daniel Bjåen and Danielle C. S. Fredriksen, a big thanks goes to you as well! Being able to discuss theory, methods and findings with you have been a great addition to this process! It has always been a great relief both epistemically and relationally to experience a shared reality with you about difficult matters occurring along the way. And of course, thank you both for making our Canada trip as magnificent as it was!

Heidi M. Haraldsen, Henrik Gustafsson and Camilla J. Knight, thank you greatly for your comments and advice on my writings! It is no wonder that Bård holds you as high as he does! Eugénie De Castilla, Tom Henning Øvrebø and Yngvar Ommundsen, thanks for the inputs you provided when you sat in on some of our discussion meetings.

A master's thesis does not by any chance come to existence in a vacuum. As such, a great thanks must be sent to mom and dad for your everlasting, unconditional love and support! Anna, Anne Julie, Arne, Helene and Jon Olav, you know who you are! You have no idea how much it has meant for me that you patiently have sat and listened to me talking my way through both ups and downs for these last couple of months!

Morten Granerud

Bærum, 5. juni 2020

¹Canadian Society for Psychomotor Learning and Sport Psychology, www.scapps.org

1. Theory

1.1 *Youth Sports and Talent Development*

The goal is clear, Bergeron et al. (2015) on behalf of the IOC, stated. Youth sports should seek to: “Develop healthy, capable and resilient young athletes, while attaining widespread, inclusive, sustainable and enjoyable participation and success for all levels of individual athletic achievement” (Bergeron et al., 2015, p. 843). However, this is more easily said than done, as sports participation for youths are associated with both positive outcomes (e.g., well-being and health) and negative outcomes (e.g., injuries, burnout and negative affect) (Balish, McLaren, Rainham & Blanchard, 2014; Holt, 2008; Bergeron et al., 2015).

Possible antecedents for negative outcomes associated with youth sports are early specialisation, competitiveness, and professionalisation (Bergeron et al, 2015; Baker, Schorer, & Wattie, 2018). This can lead to a high volume of intensified training and competition, and insufficient time for recovery and rest (Bergeron et al., 2015). Early specialisation can in turn be tracked back to stakeholders in sports who are eager to identify and develop athletes who can achieve athletic success (Bergeron et al., 2015; Baker et al., 2018).

However, talent identification and selection in sports are no easy task and filled with uncertainty (Baker et al., 2018; Johnston, Wattie, Schorer, & Baker, 2018; Collins, MacNamara, & Cruickshank, 2019). Johnston et al., (2018), in a review on talent identification studies, found that within the factors which discriminated between skilled and less-skilled athletes, there was a high degree of variability, and thus concluded that predictors of athletic success were inconsistent and unreliable. Still, early talent identification seems to be the norm (Bergeron et al., 2015; Baker et al., 2018).

Baker et al. (2018) proposed several concerns with talent identification and selection in sport. They argued, for instance, that early talent selection assumes talent is fixed and early identifiable. However, support of this assumption is weak (Barreiros & Fonseca, 2012; Brouwers, De Bosscher, & Sotiriadou, 2012; Simonton, 1999). Moreover, even though some sports clubs use both extensive physical and psychological data collections and tests, the timeframe of those deciding athletes’ development is often short-sighted,

perhaps only thinking about the upcoming season (Baker et al., 2018). These short-term priorities are contrasting the long-term process of developing an athlete, and can even impede the development (e.g., a short-term goal leading to overtraining and then burnout and/or injury; Baker et al., 2018). Actually, one might view these types of tests as performance identification rather than talent identification as “Current performance is not necessarily an indication of future potential or ‘talent’ ” (Baker et al., 2018, p. 56; Barreiros, Côté, & Fonseca, 2014; Barreiros & Fonseca, 2012). There is also the possibility that the future of a sport brings different demands for success than those that are deemed important today, thus leading to coaches and administrators choosing to focus on the “wrong” athletes (Baker et al., 2018).

From a mental health perspective, early specialisation, competitiveness, and professionalisation, may increase the number of stressors for the young athletes as they may experience increased performance expectations, more travelling, and less time to take care of personal concerns (Moesch et al., 2018). Overtraining and injuries can lead to depression and mental disorders (Moesch et al., 2018; Reardon et al., 2019), and transitions from a training group to a higher-level training group may also contain threats to young athletes’ health and well-being (Schinke, Stambulova, Si & Moore, 2017)

Thus, it has been argued that quality of training, personal support, and talent *development* environments are more important than talent identification and selection for success in the long term (Baker et al, 2018; Bergeron et al, 2015; Moesch et al., 2018). When talent is viewed as something that can be developed through supportive behaviours, in contrast to something fixed and static, stakeholders are more likely to attribute success to effort, and thus putting in the necessary work to achieve high levels of athletic success (Baker & Young, 2014).

A term that encapsulates these just mentioned ideas, is the term *mastery-orientation* from Achievement Goal Theory (AGT; Nicholls, 1984, 1989). AGT is a motivation theory, which, briefly explained, differentiates between mastery-oriented environments (and persons), where success is self-referenced and the processes of mastery and development is emphasised, and ego-oriented environments (and persons), where success is other-referenced and thus outperforming others becomes the emphasis.

AGT has been a dominant theory within sport psychology research the last decades, hence a lot of research has been conducted using it as a framework (Clancy, Herring, MacIntyre & Campbell, 2016; Harwood, Keegan, Smith & Raine, 2015). A review on AGT research by Harwood et al. (2015) found that athletes that perceive the environment to be mastery-oriented are confident and high in self-esteem, utilise adaptive training/competition strategies, are intrinsically motivated, display positive affective states, and show increased performance on objective measures. As such, they concluded that “those perceiving a task-mastery motivational climate engage in sport and physical activity more favourably” (p. 19).

Considering methodology, this review revealed that most of the studies had a cross-sectional design, and that the few who did include repeated measures did so within a relatively small timeframe. This is not unproblematic, as motivational processes are dynamic (Stenling, Lindwall, & Hassmén, 2015), and that perceived motivational environments may change over time (Harwood et al., 2015). Further, only 12,5 % of the studies examined individual sports. This is also a weakness for the field, as motivational environments may be different within individual sports in contrast to team sports (Harwood et al., 2015).

Another review, not AGT-oriented but about motivation in sports in general by Clancy et al., (2016), also revealed several areas with potential for improvement within the field of motivational research. As with Harwood et al. (2015), Clancy et al. (2016) did too find a majority of cross-sectional research, while also noting that most of it was quantitative. They argue that more qualitative research is needed to fill a gap and increase knowledge within the field. Clancy et al. (2016) also found a gender imbalance among the reviewed studies as there were twice as many studies on male only as on females only. This is a challenge as there are reported motivational differences between males and females (e.g., Amorose & Horn, 2000; Kingston, Horrocs & Hanton, 2006; Møllerløgken, Lorås & Pedersen, 2017; Norman, 2015).

An interesting study in this regard, is a study by Kristiansen, Tomten, Hanstad and Roberts (2012). In this study, two female athletes were interviewed. They had both achieved international success “out of nowhere” through their own training programs, which they reported as playful and “without much pressure” (p. 159). However, after

their success they were picked up by their respective national teams to a stricter training regime and then experienced more pressure and expectations placed upon them. After this transition, both of their careers started to stagnate. Of the more significant factors, they argued, were poor coach-athlete relationships and coach miscommunication, which the athletes further felt stemmed from a culture most suited for typical male athlete-behaviours and a lack of willingness to adapt coaching style to suit individual females. (Kristiansen et al., 2012).

Regarding athletes' sporting experiences, the impact of coaches' interpersonal skills, the coach-athlete relationship, and coaches' influence on the motivational environment is well established in the literature (e.g., Langan, Blake, & Lonsdale, 2013; Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Pensgaard & Roberts, 2002; Rocchi & Pelletier, 2018).

1.2 Coaching and The Coach-Athlete Relationship

Among the pioneers on coaching and coach-athlete relationship research are Smith and Smoll, who started their research in the 1970s (Smoll & Smith, 2020). In their early phase, they were guided by a mediational model of coach-athlete interaction going: Coach Behaviours → Athlete Perception and Recall → Athlete's Evaluative Reactions, stipulating that “the ultimate effects of coaching behaviours are mediated by the meaning that athletes confer on them” (Smoll & Smith, 2020, p. 94).

Among their contributions to the field, is the “Coaching Behavior Assessment System”, made to observe coaching behaviours deemed to lead to positive (or negative) athlete reactions (Smith, Smoll & Hunt, 1977), and the “Motivational Climate Scale for Youth Sports”, a tool for measuring whether young athletes experience mastery-oriented or ego-involving coaching behaviours (Smith, Cumming & Smoll, 2008).

Furthermore, Smoll and Smith (2009) also developed the “Mastery Approach to Coaching”. It is a coach training programme which studies have shown that trained coaches have athletes whom perceive their climate to be mastery oriented and reported higher liking of their coach. These athletes showed increased self-esteem, lower performance anxiety, and were less likely to dropout from sports (Smoll & Smith, 2020).

From a Self-Determination Theory (SDT) perspective (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000), it has within the coaching context been argued that coaches should support the satisfaction of the three basic psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness for their athletes through what is called autonomy supporting coaching (ASC; Mageau & Vallerand, 2003). ASC is characterized by coaches offering athletes opportunities for input and decision making, giving athletes rationales for different tasks, and acknowledging athletes' perspectives and feelings (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003; Stebbings, Taylor & Spray, 2011). This is, in turn, argued to influence athletes' motivation to become intrinsic and self-determined (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003), which is associated with higher psychological well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2000), higher effort and persistence, and better performances (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003).

In contrast to ASC are controlling coaching behaviours, which is characterised by coaches using power-assertive techniques, pressuring athletes to comply, providing tangible rewards, and issuing punishments (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003; Stebbings et al., 2011). Athletes who perceive their coaches to be controlling have been found to have poor quality of motivation and being more likely to quit organised sports (Pelletier, Fortier, Vallerand & Briere, 2001).

More recent research has also investigated the effects of autonomy supportive and mastery-oriented coaching on the coaches themselves. Solstad, Ivarsson, Haug and Ommundsen (2018) in their study used a new conceptualization of coaching behaviours by Duda (2013). This conceptualization, which combines elements from both AGT and SDT, differentiates between *empowering coaching* (autonomy supporting, task involving, and socially supporting behaviours) and *disempowering coaching* (controlling and ego-involving behaviours). Solstad et al. (2018) found that coaches who utilised higher levels of empowering coaching and lower levels of disempowering coaching at the start of a season reported higher levels of well-being at the end of the season.

In a study that included both athletes and coaches in dyads, Stebbings, Taylor and Spray (2016) found that coaches who were in a negative state pre-session were perceived by the athletes to be more controlling during the session, leading to increased negative states among the athletes post-session. Conversely, a coach who was in a positive state

pre-session was perceived by the athletes to be more autonomy supportive during the session, leading to increased positive states among the athletes post-session. It was not found that athletes' positive or negative states pre-session influenced coaches' states post-session. However, an interesting finding was that there was a positive significant association between coaches' perceptions of in-session autonomy-supportive behaviours and their post-session well-being. The same was true for perceptions of in-session controlling behaviours and coaches' post-session ill-being (Stebbing et al., 2016).

The argument can therefore be made that a coach who coach mastery-oriented and autonomy-supportive has an increased well-being and a more positive state, which, in turn, increases athletes' positive states. Mageau and Vallerand (2003), in their motivational model of the coach-athlete relationship, propose that a factor that affects a coach's autonomy-supportive behaviours is coaches' perceptions of their athletes' behaviour and motivation. As such, it is an argument that indicates that coaches' behaviours, perceptions and experiences affect athletes' behaviours, perceptions, and experiences and vice versa. A study which strengthens this argument, is a study done by Solstad, van Hove, and Ommundsen (2015). They hypothesized that, among other factors, how soccer coaches perceived the social unity among athletes would positively associate with the coaches' provision of ASC. The rationale behind this hypothesis was that a coach that perceives his training group to be socially united, would feel more competent and also more related to his/her athletes. This would satisfy his/her psychological needs leading to higher levels of well-being (Deci & Ryan, 2000), which, in turn, would lead to ASC (Stebbing et al., 2016). This is exactly what Solstad et al. (2015) found. Along with coaches' self-determined motivation for coaching, perception of a socially united group was positively associated with coaches' ASC, which, in turn, was positively associated with coaches' total need satisfaction.

However, what presents itself as a challenge within the coach-athlete relationship, is that coaches tend to overreport their use of ASC and mastery-oriented coaching, and also perceive the motivational climate to be more mastery-oriented and autonomy supportive than their athletes, thus hindering the coach-athlete-relationship to live up to its potential (Gjesdal, Stenling, Solstad & Ommundsen, 2019; Mageau & Vallerand, 2003; Smoll & Smith, 2020; Møllerlørken et al., 2017; Rocchi & Pelletier, 2018). For instance, Rocchi and Pelletier (2018), in a study on both athletes and coaches, found

that approximately 1/3 of the coaches overreported their behaviours in comparison with their athletes. In these cases, athletes experienced high need frustration (i.e., their three SDT-stipulated basic psychological needs were not satisfied). Further, about 1/3 of the coaches underreported their coaching behaviour and about 1/3 of the coaches agreed with their athletes. In both these cases, athletes experienced high need satisfaction, indicating that athletes' perceptions have greater consequences on their satisfaction than coaches' actual behaviour (Smoll & Smith, 2020). In a similar vein, Gjesdal et al. (2019) found corresponding perceptual differences between coaches and their teams regarding the coach-created motivational climate as Rocchi and Pelletier (2018). What is more, Gjesdal et al. (2019) found that the most negative effects were present when the coach perceived the climate more favourably compared to the team.

Based on the presented research, if athletes could communicate to correct and enlighten their coaches so that coaches' and athletes' perceptions and experiences were to align, both parts would seem likely to benefit. Interestingly then, a study by Davis, Jowett, and Tafvelin (2019), did confirm the relationship between certain athletes' communication strategies (supporting, motivating, and conflict managing) on the quality of the coach-athlete-relationship. They found that communication strategies at time point 1 and time point 2 (six weeks later) both were positively related to relationship quality at time point 2. Even more, they found that relationship quality positively predicted how satisfied athletes were about personal treatment, instruction and training, and individual performance. However, this study did only measure athletes' perceptions, and Davis et al. (2019) suggest that due to "the dyadic nature of the coach-athlete relationship" (p. 7), future research should include both coaches and athletes.

Jowett and Poczwardowski (2007) proposes a three-layered coach-athlete relationship model. The first layer is the relationship's antecedent variables (such as coach's and athlete's individual characteristics, the wider sport context, and relationship characteristics). The second layer is the quality (or nature or contents) of the relationship (such as coach's and athlete's thoughts, feelings, and behaviours). Finally, the third layer is outcomes (including coach's and athlete's intrapersonal, interpersonal, and group outcomes). Between these three layers lies interpersonal communication which both affects and is affected by the quality of the coach-athlete relationship, and

thus further affects the outcomes (which again affects the relationship quality and creates new contents in the relationship).

Jowett (2017b) stipulates the coach-athlete relationship as a process “...in which a coach’s and an athlete’s cognitions, feelings, and behaviors are mutually and causally interrelated” (Jowett and Poczwardowski, 2007, p. 4). Further, Jowett (2017a) claims that neither the athlete nor the coach can do it alone, and that “When coaching is viewed as either athlete-centred or coach-centred (...), its scope, quality and functions become restricted, whereas, when coaching is viewed as coach–athlete-centred, its scope becomes readily inclusive and mutually empowering.” (Jowett, 2017b p. 154). For Jowett, an effective and successful coach-athlete relationship, focuses on establishing a shared vision, a shared goal, where the “coaches and athletes’ expertise, skills, interests and experiences are utilised to their fullest” (Jowett, 2017a, p. 63). To establish such a relationship, one needs trust, communication, good intentions, and a mutual, shared understanding that coach and athletes are in it together (Jowett 2017a, 2017b).

Considering the current thesis, based on the reviewed literature and Jowett’s (2017a) emphasis on “sharing” within the coach-athlete relationship, it is believed that the Shared Reality Theory (SRT; Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009) is a theory that may advance the field within coach-athlete relationship research. SRT may help to analyse the establishment and potential consequences of a well-functioning shared understanding within the coach-athlete relationship. As such, In the following section, an outline of this theory will be given.

1.3 Shared Reality Theory

A core human motivation is the motivation to know what is real and what is true about the world, so that one can make choices that are effective when striving towards a desired goal (Cornwell, Franks & Higgins, 2017; Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009; Higgins, 2019). However, to know what is real and what is true is no simple task. In a complicated world filled with uncertainty and ambiguity, SRT stipulates that to establish what is true about the world, humans seek to establish and experience a *shared reality* with significant others (Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009; Higgins, 2019). A shared reality implies that one experiences a commonality with (an)other’s inner states

about the world (Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009). Even more, as will be elaborated below, a shared reality with significant others is argued to be a verification of one's goals and means to reach them (Cornwell et al., 2017)

Following the conceptualization of SRT by Echterhoff, Higgins and Levine (2009), four conditions must be met for a shared reality to occur:

(a) that shared reality involves a (subjectively perceived) commonality of individuals' inner states (not just observable behaviors); (b) that shared reality is about some target referent; (c) that for a shared reality to occur, the commonality of inner states must be appropriately motivated; and (d) that shared reality involves the experience of a successful connection to other people's inner states (p. 496).

In the following, these four conditions will be briefly outlined (for an extensive explanation, see Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009).

The first condition is that shared reality involves a subjectively perceived commonality of individuals' inner states, and not just their overt behaviours. The term "inner states" refers to beliefs, judgements, feelings, attitudes, or evaluations about a target referent (Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009). The differentiation between inner states and overt behaviour is important. Consider for instance two people smiling after a speech at a conference has ended. Superficially, one might believe that they both are smiling because they felt the speech was good. However, one of them could be smiling because the speech is finally over and it is time for lunch! In that case, there would be no commonality of inner states, nor a shared reality of the experience of the speech.

To achieve this first condition, a process is required that allow people to pick up someone else's inner states. An obvious process is communication, both verbal and non-verbal (Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009).

The second condition is that shared reality is always about a target referent. For instance, sharing inner states, such as corresponding heart rates or being in the same mood is not sufficient for a shared reality to occur. The inner states must be about an aspect of the world. The target referent can be concrete, such as a person or an object, abstract, such as future desired end-states or philosophical issues, or everything in between as long as it is a phenomenon that is experienced as being part of the world

(Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009). In a sport-context, target referents can be training programs, goals, expected coach/athlete behaviour or desired sporting environments.

The third condition is that the shared reality must be appropriately motivated. There are two types of motivation that leads to a shared reality: *Epistemic motivation* and *relational motivation*. Epistemic motivation refers to humans' search for meaning and truth, and the desire to gain a valid and reliable understanding of the world. Increasing this type of knowledge is argued to increase subjective efficacy and feeling of predictability when acting in the world. When a target referent is surrounded by uncertainty and ambiguity, the epistemic motive will become stronger (Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009; Higgins, 2019).

Relational motivation refers to the desire to feel connected to and have a relationship with others. Further, this wish for feeling connected, can lead to an identification with a positively valued group or person, which might foster a person's feeling of identity and self-esteem (Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009; Higgins, 2019).

The fourth condition is that shared reality involves the experience of a successful connection to other people's inner states. It is not sufficient that there exists a commonality between two people that a third external observer can identify. The commonality must be subjectively experienced by one of the former two as in fact being established (Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2019).

However, there exist several challenges to the process of establishing a shared reality. In the following, I will try to address some of these.

As mentioned, a shared reality involves the commonality of inner states about a target referent. However, our instinctive inner states towards these target referents are very likely to differ based on different personal characteristics and earlier experiences (Higgins, 2019). One such difference, emphasised by Higgins (2019), is if humans are *promotion-oriented* or *prevention-oriented*. These two terms are of such significance, not only for the creation of a shared reality, but for the thesis in general, that they are given proper explanations before I come back to how they affect the creation of a shared reality.

Higgins (2019, p. 118) defines these two orientations as being “concerned with advancing from the current state toward a better state” (promotion) and being “concerned with maintaining a current satisfactory state against a worse state” (prevention). These two orientations have different views on what counts as success and failure. For a promotion-oriented person, advancement or improvement is a success, while remaining at status quo is a failure as it is a *non-gain*. From a prevention perspective, status quo (e.g., maintaining peace and order), would be a success because it is a *non-loss*, while failure would be a presence of something negative that “disturbs the peace” (Higgins, 2019). One way to think of it, is to imagine a three-point scale from -1 via 0 to +1 where -1 represent a presence of something negative, +1 represent a presence of something positive, and 0 represent a satisfactory status quo. For a prevention-oriented person, avoiding -1 is the emphasis, while reaching +1 is the emphasis for a promotion-oriented person (Higgins, 2019).

This does not mean, however, that only promotion-oriented persons set goals and seek improvement. It just affects how the striving towards a goal is experienced (Higgins, 2019). For those that are predominately promotion-oriented, a future end-state is viewed as something one *ideally* wants to achieve. Conversely, for those that are predominately prevention-oriented, a future end-state is viewed as something one *ought* to achieve (Higgins, 1997, 2019). Thus, the feelings associated with a potential failure or success will also differ between promotion- and prevention-oriented persons. Promotion-success would elicit feelings such as happiness, eagerness, and enthusiasm, while promotion-failure would elicit feelings such as sadness and discouragement. Conversely, prevention-success would elicit feelings such as relief, peacefulness, and decrease in vigilance, while prevention-failure would elicit nervousness, worry, and increase in vigilance (Higgins, 2019).

A final note on the prevention-promotion-orientations, is how one come to predominately be the one or the other. The answer is earlier interactions with significant others (Higgins, 1997, 2019; Manian, Papadakis, Strauman & Essex, 2006). Especially parents-interactions are of significant importance, most likely the most important (Higgins, 2019), but it could just as well be coaches, teachers and peers. The main point is how these significant others react to success and failure (Higgins, 2019). For instance, imagine potential responses to a child’s report card. If one’s report card consists of

mostly good grades, parents could behave so the child interprets the good grades as a presence of a positive (e.g., by rewarding or celebrating) and as a step towards an ideal future-self (“keep getting good grades, and you can choose any education you want!”). This behaviour sends out the message that one’s life can become better and better, and that the world is a place of mastery and growth. If the grades are bad, parents could behave so the child interpret the situation as an absence of a positive and a non-step towards an ideal future-self. This pair of behaviours teach children that life consists of possible gains (successes) and non-gains (failures), a promotion-orientation towards life (Higgins, 2019).

On the other hand, parents could react to their child’s good grades, so the child interprets the good grades as an absence of a negative, and as a defence for an ought future-self (“keep getting good grades, and you do not have to end up with a low-income job you do not like!”). This behaviour sends out the message that one’s life will remain fine only if you are careful, and that one must be on one’s guard and work to maintain peace and security. If the grades are bad, parents could behave so the child interpret the situation as a presence of a negative (e.g., by punishing or yelling), and a failure to defend one’s ought future-self. This pair of behaviour teach children that life consists of possible non-losses (successes) and losses (failures), a prevention-orientation towards life (Higgins, 2019). To translate this example to a sporting context, one only must change parents with coaches, and grades with sport performances.

Differences in prevention- and promotion-orientations are likely to complicate the establishment of a shared reality, especially when the target referent is a future goal and the means to get there (which often is the case in a sporting development context; Gould, 2015; Higgins, 2019). If the coach is promotion-oriented, while the athlete is prevention-oriented, the coach’s inner states towards an ambitious goal and the following training program might be feelings of enthusiasm and eagerness to succeed, while the athlete might feel worried and anxious to fail. Regarding inner states towards competition strategies, the coach may believe that the preferred strategy would be to ensure against errors of omissions (e.g., it is better that the athlete starts hard and risk blowing it rather than safeguarding), while the athlete conversely wants to safeguard and ensure against errors of commissions (Higgins, 1997, 2019).

When such a difference in orientations exists, is not dealt with, and the parties involved does not experience a shared reality concerning their strivings, the parties would experience a *regulatory nonfit* (Higgins, 2019). A regulatory nonfit stands in opposition to a *regulatory fit*, which is when a prevention-oriented person acts or strives towards a goal in a vigilant way, or when a promotion-oriented person acts or strives towards a goal in an eager way (Higgins, 2019). In a sport context, a regulatory nonfit can be experienced by both athletes (e.g., when the orientation of the coach and/or of the culture of the club differs from the orientation of the athlete), and coaches (e.g., when the orientation of a significant group of the athletes or the club board differ from the coach's orientation). A regulatory fit is to be preferred, as when there is a regulatory fit, the value of an activity will be intensified (Higgins, 2019). There have also been conducted studies, which show that performance at given tasks are increased when there is a regulatory fit (e.g., Förster, Higgins & Idson, 1998; Spiegel, Grant-Pillow & Higgins, 2004). When there exists a person-culture nonfit, in addition to missing the mentioned benefits, an individual's well-being might be reduced (Fulmer et al., 2010).

Concerning regulatory nonfits and lack of shared reality, the question becomes how to deal with and overcome the challenge of differences in predominately orientations and inner states. The answer is by communication (or any other processes that allow people to access or infer the inner states of others; Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009).

As mentioned, the fourth condition for a shared reality is a subjective experience of a successful connection to (an)other's inner states (Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009). This condition opens for the possibility for experiencing a shared reality even though assumptions of sharing objectively are wrong if communication is insufficient (Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009). For instance, a coach can believe that there is a shared reality about the training program, that there is a regulatory fit, and that everyone is happy, while the athlete, who do not communicate otherwise, actually have quite different inner states toward the current training program, experience a regulatory nonfit, and is unhappy. If the athlete honestly communicates her dissatisfaction, the coach could change his behaviour so the athlete doesn't experience a regulatory nonfit.

However, it might be objected that if the coach changes his behaviour to suit the athlete's inner states, that there still is not a shared reality as he now acts non-

accordingly with his own inner states regarding athlete development. SRT's answer to this objection would be that it is not the inner states that has changed, but the target referent:

A coach might have a dominant idea of the best way of developing athletes in general (e.g., in a promotion-oriented way). Thus, his/her inner states towards general athlete development will be that it is best to be ambitious, eager, and unafraid of taking risks. Such a coach is unlikely to ever develop a shared reality with a prevention-oriented athlete considering athlete development in general. However, if the target referent changes from athlete development in general, to *development of this particular athlete considering his/her orientation*, then they can establish the shared reality that the best way to develop is in a prevention-oriented way.

However, for honest communication with the goal of establishing a shared reality, the communicator-to-be needs to be appropriately motivated. That is, as mentioned, to be epistemologically or relationally motivated (Echterhoff, Higgins, & Levine, 2009; Higgins, 2019). Just as people have these motivations, other people which one may consider establishing a shared reality with can in turn be perceived as having different levels of *referent power* and *expert power*. These “powers” are likely to affect other people's motivation to create a shared reality with the “powerholders” (French, 1956; French & Raven, 1959; Higgins, 2019). Referent power refers to the degree the influencer causes the recipient of influence to want feel “oneness” with the influencer (relating to the relational motive), while expert power refers to the degree that the recipient perceives the influencer to have knowledge and expertise that the recipient lacks (relating to the epistemological motive; French, 1956; French & Raven, 1959; Higgins, 2019). Thus, one can say that how much person A is motivated to establish a shared reality with person B, depends on what level person A perceives person B to have referent and expert power (Higgins, 2019).

However, a study which nuances especially the significance of expert power, is a study done by Echterhoff, Lang, Krämer and Higgins (2009). In this study, briefly explained, they tested whether students were more likely to create a shared reality about a potential employee with an equal-status person (a student temp) or a higher-status person (a company board member). The result was that there was only established a shared reality

with the equal-status person, even though the higher-status person had more domain-specific knowledge. These findings indicate that domain-specific expertise and status (i.e., expert power) is not enough for persons to become motivated to establish a shared reality, but instead indicate that epistemic and relational *trustworthiness* is of higher significance. Echterhoff, Lang et al. (2009), referring to Hovland, Janis & Kelly (1953), states that “A person who has high expert power or expertise does not need to be perceived as trustworthy” (Echterhoff, Lang et al., p. 151).

Elaborating on these findings, Echterhoff, Lang et al. (2009) further argued that “Trust is assumed to combine both epistemic and relational aspects” (p. 151), while Echterhoff, Higgins and Levine (2009) add that “The feelings of general trust and the readiness to connect and affiliate (...) cannot be reduced to mere expertise. What matters is whether communicators want to make an epistemic and relational connection to the audience” (p. 505). These researchers do by no means undermine the importance of the epistemological motive or expert power, as that would go against no insignificant amount of shared reality research (for details, see Echterhoff, Higgins, & Levine 2009; Higgins, 2019). Instead, these findings may provide some support to the adage “they don’t care how much you know, until they know how much you care.”

The question therefore becomes: “How do you show that you care?” Or “How do you make people trust you so that they will become motivated to establish a shared reality with you?” As the current thesis focuses on the dyadic relationship between coach and athlete, I would like to highlight Simpson’s (2007) *The dyadic model of trust in relationship* when answering that question.

As the model proposes, a relationship consists of two persons. These two persons have their individual trust dispositions, which are made up by earlier experiences. For instance, persons whom in childhood receive need satisfaction and warm support when distressed develop positive working models containing positive expectations towards others, making them more likely to place greater trust in others. Conversely, those who experience ignorance, abuse, and overindulgence develop negative working models, which hinder development of trust in later relationships (Simpson, 2007). As such, a proposed definition of trust is *socially learned expectations* people hold about other people or social organizations (for details, see Barber, 1983)

In the model, these two persons with their dispositions and expectations enter a trust situation. Here they can behave to make outcomes MaxOwn, MaxOther or MaxJoint (Wieselquist, Rusbult, Foster, & Agnew, 1999) with the latter two behaviours proposed to increase trust the most (Simpson, 2007). These situations could vary in severeness, which, in turn, would affect their influence on the interpersonal trust. For instance, in what has been termed *strain test*, which is a situation where a person is “highly outcome dependent and specific actions or decisions that would promote his or her own best interests are at odds with those that would maximally benefit the partner” (Simpson, 2007, p. 589), if the other acts so to help the first, deprioritizing his/her own interest, trust would increase even more (Simpson, 2007). It is worth noting that those with positive working models are more likely to engage in MaxOther and MaxJoint behaviour.

After the trust situation, the next step is the persons’ attributions and interpretations of the behaviours. If the partner’s intentions are positively attributed, trust and perceived security is likely to increase. However, once again personal dispositions are argued to influence the attribution process, as those with positive working models more likely to attribute the other’s intention positively (Simpson, 2007).

The next two steps in the model is perceptions of trust and perceptions of felt security (Simpson, 2007). Positive outcomes of trust situations (i.e., MaxJoint and MaxOther behaviours) and positive attributions are likely to lead to increased perceptions of trust which, in turn, will lead to increased perceptions of felt security. However, dispositional vulnerabilities (e.g., negative working models), negative attributions, and MaxOwn behaviours are likely to diminish, or even eliminate and reverse, the effect on increased trust and felt security. In subsequent trust situations, the new level of trust and perceived security will then in turn influence the behaviours and attributions of the persons, making this a circular process always affected by personal dispositions, earlier experiences, and socially learned expectations of the persons involved (Simpson, 2007).

Based on this model, it could be argued that if person A frequently engages in MaxJoint and MaxOther behaviours, especially during strain tests, in such a way that person B attributes his/her behaviour positively, B’s trust and felt security with A is likely to become increased, making B more motivated to establish a shared reality with A.

Korsgaard, Brower, and Lester (2015) argued that increased interpersonal trust is likely to lead to increase in both willingness to make oneself vulnerable and information sharing. This is of great importance for establishing a shared reality as it will increase the communication of inner states (Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009).

Finally, some of the argued benefits of establishing a shared reality with significant others will be presented.

As mentioned, human beings are motivated to know what is true and what is real in the environment in which one acts, so that one can act in a way to reach desired end-states (Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009; Cornwell et al., 2017; Higgins, 2019). Further, humans want their life to be meaningful and going in the right direction (Cornwell et al., 2017). However, what makes a goal pursuit worthwhile and affirm that your life is going in the right direction is argued to be social verification (Cornwell et al., 2017; Hardin & Higgins, 1996). That is because when a single individual has an assumption about something in the world, it is regarded merely as a subjective opinion. However, when this assumption becomes agreed upon by several others, when it becomes a shared reality, it comes to be regarded as objective (Hardin & Higgins, 1996; Higgins, 2019).

The epistemic motivation to create a shared reality increases when the target referent is surrounded with ambiguity and uncertainty (Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009). A good example of an uncertain target referent is athletic development. There is a plethora of factors that affect athletic development, performance, motivation, and enjoyment of sport participation (Bergeron et al., 2015). Ranging from psychological factors (Abbot & Collins, 2004; Crane & Temple, 2005; Schinke et al., 2017) mental skills (Collins, Button & Richards, 2011), nutrition and lifestyle (Mountjoy et al., 2018; Manore, Meyer & Thompson, 2009), physical factors (Lorenz, Reiman, Lehecka, & Naylor, 2013), and technical skills (Coker, 2015), there is a jungle to navigate through for upcoming athletes and their coaches when they are setting goals and making plans. To complicate things even more, predictors of athletic success are uncertain (Baker et al., 2018; Johnston et al., 2018), not to mention that “athlete development is built on an individually unique and constantly changing base” (Bergeron et al., 2015, p. 843).

According to SRT, to reduce the uncertainty, humans look to significant and trusted other to create a shared reality, which can verify our way of dealing with the world (Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009). In sports, such trusted and significant others can be both coaches and athletes, as coaches are likely to have expert power considering sport science, while athletes are likely to have expert power considering themselves (e.g., bodily phenomenon and motivation; Saw, Main & Gastin, 2016). Hence, if a coach and an athlete can work together and establish a shared reality that their current development plan is favourable, this is likely to increase their self-efficacy and confidence in their plan (Cornwell et al., 2017; Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009), perhaps leading to a more determined execution and more effort given in the pursuit of athletic development.

However, there do undoubtedly exist a dark side to shared reality. Unfortunately, there is no certainty that the shared reality is a “good” one (Higgins, 2019). Perhaps the most horrific example of this, is the shared reality that exists within terrorist groups (Higgins, 2019). In sports, fortunately, the consequences of a maladaptive shared reality are very unlikely to be as dire. Still, poor training structures could lead to depression, coach and athlete burn-out and injuries (Balish et al., 2014; Moesch et al., 2018)

Finally, from a SDT-perspective, when one establishes a shared reality with a significant other perceived to be high in expert power, this seems likely to satisfy the psychological need for competence (Deci & Ryan, 2000), as a shared reality would verify your striving as a correct and competent one. Further, a shared reality with a person high in referent power, seems likely satisfy the need for relatedness (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

1.4 Purpose of the Present Study

Based on the reviewed literature, the purpose of the present study was to explore: (a) how a shared reality is established, or fails to be established, over the course of the sporting partnership between the coach and his/her athletes; and (b) how experiencing a shared reality (or not) in the coach-athlete relationship is related to the experienced quality of the relationship the coach and his/her athletes develop and maintain over the course of a 9-month period.

2. Method

2.1 Paradigmatic Position

A research paradigm is a basic set of beliefs that guides researchers' actions (Guba, as cited in Denzin & Lincoln, 2018, p. 19), a guide consisting of feelings and beliefs concerning how the world should be studied and understood (Denzin & Lincoln, 2018). The paradigmatic position of this study is within an interpretivist paradigm (Papathomas 2016; Smith & Sparkes 2009b, Smith, 1984). The interpretivist paradigm is characterized by ontological relativism (Casey, Fletcher, Schaefer & Gleddie, 2018; Guba, 1990; Papathomas, 2016) and epistemological social constructionism (Lincoln, Lynham, & Guba, 2018; Papathomas, 2016; Smith & McGannon, 2018).

Ontological relativism asserts that reality outside of the physical world; that is, the psychosocial reality (Papathomas, 2016) “exists in the form of multiple mental constructions, socially and experientially based, local and specific, dependent for their form and content on the persons who hold them” (Guba, 1990, p. 27). Indeed, John Dewey (1938/2015) characterised reality as living within an individual's experience. What humans see, feel, think, and hear (i.e., what humans experience) is all we must ground our understanding of the world in. How experiences are experienced, or how we experience reality, are, in turn, influenced by earlier experiences and how we relate to our sociocultural environment (Casey et al., 2018; Dewey, 1938/2015).

Further, epistemological social constructionism holds that there can be no theory-free knowledge, as a person's understanding of reality is only known through their experiences (Dewey, 1938/2015; Smith & McGannon, 2018). Epistemological social constructionism postulates that knowledge is constructed through cultural auspices and relational interactions, not something that is objectively observed, discovered or found (Burr, as cited in Papathomas, 2016, p. 37). Thus, research findings are a result of the interaction between the researcher(s) and the subject(s) (Lincoln et al., 2018).

Methodologically, within an interpretivist paradigm, qualitative methods are used. Interpretive approaches rely on heuristic and naturalistic methods, like interviews and analysis of texts (Lincoln et al., 2018; Smith, 2016).

The current research, due to its interpretivist paradigmatic positioning, cannot claim to present *the truth* or *reality as it really is*, nor that its propositions are infallible (Smith & McGannon, 2018; Smith 1984; Sparkes & Smith 2009). As Smith (1984) said: “interpretations are not about certitude or the discovery of how things really are – they are an attempt to enlarge the conversation and to keep it going” (p. 390).

2.2 Methodology

The present study makes use of narrative inquiry (Casey et al., 2018; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Riessman, 2008; Smith, 2016). To explain why this method was chosen, the phenomenon of *experience* must be discussed as a decisive factor.

Experience is a keyword within SRT (Echterhoff, Higgins, & Levine, 2009). Firstly, shared reality is about *experiencing* a commonality with other’s inner states about a target referent (Echterhoff, Higgins, & Levine, 2009). Secondly, people’s inner states are influenced by earlier *experiences* (Dewey, 1938/2015, Higgins, 1997, 2019, Manian et al., 2006). Thirdly, for a shared reality to be established, one of the conditions that must be fulfilled is that a person must *experience* a successful connection to another person’s inner states (Echterhoff, Higgins, & Levine, 2009). Unless two individuals instinctively have the same inner states about a target referent, a successful connection requires explicit and honest communication (Echterhoff, Higgins & Levine, 2009, Higgins, 2019). Hence, trust becomes an important factor, as it is argued that trust leads to information sharing (Korsgaard et al., 2015). Trust-behaviour and trust-perceptions are also strongly influenced by earlier *experiences*, both considering trust towards other humans in general (Barber, 1983; Simpson, 2007) and towards a specific person whom one is in a relationship with (Korsgaard et al., 2015; Simpson, 2007).

Additionally, within the sport context, *experiencing critical life events*, and more specifically how the person copes with these events is deemed crucial for talent development and how individual biographies and narrative identities are shaped (John, Gropper, & Thiel, 2019). As narrative inquiry is a way of understanding, interpreting, and investigating experience (Casey et al., 2018; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Riessman, 2008), it became an evident choice of research method for the current study.

Within narrative inquiry, participants' stories become the data (Casey et al., 2018). Because, when trying to understand others' experiences, stories become important as it "affords us a portal, a window, into how individuals understand their own experiences, how we may understand these experiences as researchers and, in turn, how these experiences make up people's lives" (Casey et al., 2018, p. 29). Thus, collecting stories from the participants to analyse and interpret became a focus in the present study (Casey et al., 2018; Riessman, 2008; Smith & Sparkes, 2009a, 2009b).

At this point, it would be wise to show how, in the current study, the terms *narrative* and *story* are defined to provide readers a sense of what they are meant to mean in the current study. Providing clear-cut definitions and differentiations of narrative and stories is difficult as there exist several suggestions in the literature (Riessman, 2008; Smith, 2016; Smith & Sparkes, 2009b). The definitions about to be given, which are based on thorough reading of several suggestions (e.g., Casey et al., 2018; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Riessman, 2008; Smith, 2016) are in no way claimed to be "the best," nor "the correct ones." As said, the intention is solely to provide readers a sense of what meaning that has been put in the words when used in the current study: A narrative is considered to be a *set of stories*, a sort of personal biography consisting of several stories. A story then, is a single event, or perhaps more precise, a single episode. It is a limited time period (within the narrative) in which within something happened to/with the person. A metaphor could be a TV-show. For instance, consider the TV-show *Friends*. The collected events throughout all seasons and episodes with a person, would make up, for instance, Chandler Bing's narrative. On the other hand, what happens with Chandler Bing in season 2, episode 3 would be a story.

As the research has placed itself within a research paradigm which emphasises experience (Casey et al, 2018; Dewey 1938/2015; Lincoln et al., 2018, Papatomas, 2016), is trying to investigate a theory which emphasises experience (Echterhoff, Higgins, & Levine, 2009; Higgins, 2019), studies persons within a sporting context where experiencing and coping with critical life events are crucial for talent development (John et al., 2019), and has used an inquiry form which emphasises experience (Casey et al., 2018; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), it is believed there is a strong methodological coherence within the study (Poucher, Tamminen, Caron, & Sweet, 2019).

2.2.1 Study Design

In addition to the qualitative nature of a narrative inquiry, a longitudinal research design was chosen for the current study (Hermanowicz, 2016; Yates, 2003). It has within the sport psychology literature been called for more longitudinal qualitative research (LQR) (Clancy et al., 2016; Collins, MacNamara, & Cruickshank, 2019; Norris, Didymus, & Kaiseler, 2017; Turnnidge & Coté, 2018), as a considerable amount of studies have been cross-sectional and correlational in nature (Balish et al., 2014; Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2009; Harwood et al., 2015). Benefits with LQR are that researchers can investigate how individuals experience events and social situations, and how experiences become different due to contextual changes and development over time (Calman, Brunton, & Molassiotis, 2013; Hermanowicz 2016; Thomson & Holland, 2003). As the coach-athlete-relationships is argued to be a dynamic temporal process influenced by both within-person and between-person changes (Jowett, 2017b; Jowett & Poczwardowski, 2007), in addition to SRT's emphasis on individual's past and ongoing present experiences (Echterhoff, Higgins, & Levine, 2009; Higgins, 2019), it was believed that a LQR design would benefit the present study's purpose. The present study had three data collections (henceforth referred to as T1, T2 and T3) over nine months. Due to logistical concerns (e.g., holidays, training camps), the time between T1 and T2 was three months, and it was six months between T2 and T3.

2.2.2 Participants

Due to a gender imbalance in prior motivational- and talent development-research (more males than females; Clancy et al., 2016; Johnston et al., 2018), purposeful sampling was used to select six *female* elite junior swimmers (M age = 15.5) and their head coach from a high performing swimming club in the southern part of Norway (Patton, 2015). All the athletes were ranked among the 20 best performing swimmers in the country in their age group. On average, they had been engaged in organized swimming for 7,5 years ($SD = 2.17$), trained about 20,67 hours a week ($SD = 2.66$), and had the interviewed coach as their head coach for 1,71 years ($SD = .75$). The interviewed coach was the head coach for all the athletes and had been working as a swimming coach for 29 years. Between T1 and T2 one of the selected athletes changed club, and another athlete decided to quit organized swimming. Still, they were asked if they wanted to continue to partake in the study. Both said yes, and both were interviewed at both T2 and T3.

2.2.3 Procedure

Approval to conduct the study was granted by the Norwegian Centre for Research Data (NSD) and The Ethical Committee of The Norwegian School of Sport Sciences (see Appendix 1-3). The interviews were scheduled over phone and by e-mail with the coach. The interviews were scheduled to a time, which suited the coach and the athletes, either right before or right after practice at the training location. The athletes who changed club or quit swimming after T1 were, after the coach had asked them if they wanted to continue to partake in the study, contacted directly by text messages to schedule interviews at a time and place which suited them. Participants were, in advance of the interviews, informed about the study, about their rights to anonymity, and provided written consent (see Appendix 4). For the athletes younger than 15 years, written consent was obtained from the parents.²

2.2.4 Data Collection

Across all data collections, data were collected using individual semi-structured interviews. At T1, the interviews lasted between 14 and 51 minutes (*M* time = 39.9 minutes). At T2, the interviews lasted between 24 and 81 minutes (*M* time = 48.5 minutes). At T3, the interviews lasted between 35 and 71 minutes (*M* time = 55.5 minutes). Across T1, T2, and T3, all interviews were audio-recorded and conducted at the swimming club's training facilities (i.e., club house), except two interviews which were conducted at the candidate's university.

2.2.5 Interview Guide

In the preparatory phases of constructing the interview guides, a research group read and discussed literature deemed relevant for the purpose of the study (e.g., sport psychology, SRT, trust, methodological). More specifically, the research group arranged a number of colloquium meetings, in which the group members read, presented, and discussed conceptual and methodological literature. This, in turn, resulted in a better and deeper understanding of the conceptual frameworks (e.g., Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Higgins, 2019; Jowett, 2017b; Simpson, 2007). Based on the reviewed literature, each interview guide was made in two versions, one for the coach and one for the athletes. The questions on both versions were similar trying to

² https://nsd.no/personvernombud/en/help/research_topics/schools_kindergartens.html
<https://nsd.no/personvernombud/en/help/faq.html?id=6>

capture the same concept, but with slightly different wording to suit the specific role (e.g., “*Can you describe your thoughts on developing young athletes?*” (coach version) versus “*Can you describe your thoughts on developing yourself as an athlete?*” (athlete version)). After each data collection, the interviews were analysed so the next interview guide could build on prior findings and investigate what needed to be investigated in the next data collection (e.g., Calman et al., 2013; Hermanowicz, 2016). Although the interview guides were developed in light of certain thematics, the participants were frequently asked if they could tell stories, which exemplified how the thematics manifested themselves in their everyday life as competitive swimmers (Casey et al., 2018; Riessman, 2008). This was emphasised across all data collections and interviews (for complete versions of the interview guides, see Appendix 5-7).

2.2.6 Data Analysis

All interviews were transcribed verbatim, yielding 87 pages of single-spaced data at T1, 127 pages of single-spaced data at T2, and 149 pages of single-spaced data at T3.

The analytical process was twofold: First, it was done a preliminary analysis at data collected at every interview round after each data collection (Calman et al., 2013). The data from T1 and T2 were analysed before the next data collection so the findings could influence the next interview guide (Calman et al., 2013; Hermanowicz, 2016). In this first phase, the main goal was to read and re-read the transcripts to familiarise and indwell with the data (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Riessman, 2008; Smith, 2016). Finally, after each interview round had been analysed separately, each participant’s total data were analysed as a single unit. This analysis was guided by the principles put forward by Riessman’s (2008) chapter on narrative thematic analysis.

2.2.7 Narrative Thematic Analysis

Narrative analysis, in general, is a category of methods for interpreting texts that have the form of stories (Riessman, 2008; Smith & Sparkes, 2009a, 2009b). Within qualitative research in sport and exercise psychology, according to Smith and Sparkes (2009a), a content/thematic analysis (e.g., Braun & Clarke, 2006) has become the model to follow for analysing data. However, Smith and Sparkes (2009a) argued:

By seeking common themes in the stories there is the danger a content/thematic analysis misses other possible messages that individual stories might hold. Its

use in isolation can also lead to an over-determination of the themes identified in the data, seemingly 'ironing out the pleats'. Indeed, core themes can often be underscored at the expense of variation, difference, and contradictions, and so lead the researcher to under-appreciate the fine-details of talk and the heterogeneity of experience. (p. 285).

While this approach is useful for making general statements across several subjects, it makes it difficult to honour individual agency and intentions as cases are pooled together to make general statements (for details, see Riessman, 2008). Narrative analysis, on the other hand, is more concerned with finding the range and variation within the data material (Riessman, 2008; Smith & Sparkes, 2009a, 2009b).

Narrative analysis is “grounded in the study of the particular” (Radley & Chamberlain, 2001, p. 331). It is a way of case-centred research (cases being, for instance, an individual’s narrative), and the accounts of the researched-upon individuals are “preserved and treated analytically as units, rather than fragmented into thematic categories” (Riessman, 2008, p. 12). In the result-section of narrative studies, the cases presented need not to represent the study’s findings statistically, as statistics and averages are not the locus of attention for narrative inquirers (Riessman, 2008; Smith & Sparkes, 2009a). The goal for narrative inquiry is to present the stories of the participants through which the participants show how they experience their experiences (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Riessman, 2008; Smith & Sparkes, 2009b). By presenting these stories where different persons tell how they subjectively experience experiences that outwardly might seem similar but inwardly is experienced very differently, one might challenge established practices and propose arguments for new and better (or at least more nuanced) intervention strategies (Riessman, 2008; Smith & Sparkes, 2009a). This might be especially true should there be any physical activity environments where one-size-fits-all-models are the reigning paradigm (Smith & Sparkes, 2009a). As Smith and Sparkes (2009b) argued: “The more stories a person has access to, the more flexibility and opportunities they have may have to potentially live differently” (p. 9). For practitioners, such as coaches and sport psychologists, knowing many different types of stories can prepare them for meeting and intervening with many different types of athletes (Smith & Sparkes, 2009a, 2009b).

Narrative Thematic Analysis, as Riessman (2008) proposed, pays primary attention to the “told”, the reports of the interviewees, rather than the aspects of “the telling”.

Further, Riessman (2008) suggests that in a narrative thematic analysis the data are interpreted through thematics developed by the researcher(s), and that these thematics are influenced by, for instance, prior and emergent theory, purpose of the study, and the data themselves. Riessman (2008) admits that this is similar to traditional thematic approaches but argues that a key difference is that a narrative thematic analysis “keep a story ‘intact’ by theorizing from the case rather than from component themes (categories) across cases” (p. 53). Applied to the final analysis in the current study, the data were interpreted by thematics developed by the research group. Regarding Smith and Sparkes (2009a) cited criticism towards thematic analysis, it must be admitted that this approach potentially has led to other themes being undervalued. However, an important emphasis has been not to be primarily interested in the thematics themselves. Rather, the current study has been interested in and wanted to highlight the *participants’ experiences* and the *lived manifestations* of these thematics (Casey et al 2018; Riessman, 2008). Thus, it has been no interest in “hiding” the variation across cases within these themes. On the contrary, the presentation of these interpersonal variations is of great importance to the study as they lead to a wider understanding of how shared reality both succeeds and fails to become established and the consequences of this success/failure on the participants’ sporting experiences.

Themes guided the final analysis and interpretation, are (a) earlier experiences leading to prevention- or promotion-orientation, (b) trust perceptions and experiences, (c) regulatory fit, (d) communication and collaboration, and (e) degree of shared reality (Echterhoff, Higgins, & Levine, 2009; Higgins 2019; Jowett & Poczwardowski, 2007; Simpson, 2007). During the analysis and interpretation of the participants interviews, although guided by the mentioned thematics, it was also emphasised to attain a sense of who *this person really is*. That is, being on the lookout for each individual’s *narrative theme*, patterns in the participants stories which gives an impression of how they construct and give meaning to their personal experiences (Smith, 2016).

2.2.8 Constructing the Narratives as Research Text

The analysis of all the athletes revealed three overarching types of narratives among the athletes: (a) a narrative of being prevention-oriented, (b) a narrative of being promotion-oriented, and (c) a narrative of struggling with illness. In the research text, three of the athletes were chosen to serve as exemplars that demonstrate these narratives, a strategy

typically used in narrative studies (e.g., Carless & Douglas, 2013; Phoenix & Smith, 2011; Sparkes & Smith, 2003). The narratives were not selected to be representative statistically, but to show, within three different athlete-narratives, how the process of establishing, or failing to establish, a high degree of shared reality might look like (Riessman, 2008). Further, it was desired to show how the degree of shared reality within the different narratives affected the collaboration between the coach and the athlete, and their engagement as elite junior swimmers.

As the focus of this research is on the reciprocity in the coach-athlete-relationship, and how *both* the coach *and* the athletes can experience increased quality in their sporting partnership, presenting the coach's narrative can give valuable insight in the coach's perspective as well (Jowett, 2017b; Mageau & Vallerand, 2003). Hence, the coach's narrative became a fourth narrative to present in the research text. Perhaps not surprisingly, this narrative provided a different perspective from those found among the athletes, as it stemmed from the other role in the coach-athlete relationship.

At this point, I started writing interim texts (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). When choosing which stories and citations from the interviews to include and write around, two criteria was applied: (a) They had to be related to the aforementioned thematics (see above), and (b) they had to be true to the overall impression of the participants (e.g., their narrative theme). These texts were critically read and discussed within the research group (Smith & McGannon, 2018), and narrowed down even further to the final drafts. Quotations from the interviews have been "cleaned up", as "(...)" indicates erases of dysfluencies, breakoffs, and interviewer utterances (Riessman, 2008).

2.2.9 Quality and Rigour

Judgements of quality and rigour in interpretive research is no simple task. Within the interpretivist research paradigm, a key assumption is that we cannot grasp (psychosocial) reality as it really is, as such grasping is a matter of biased interpretations (Riessman, 2008; Smith, 1984; Sparkes & Smith, 2009). Thus, the question arises: If one cannot grasp reality as it really is, can one then grasp what a criteria of research quality is? Smith (1984) argued that assumptions of the existence of such criteria is an epistemological foundational assumption, something which is incompatible with the non-foundational positioning of interpretive research (Smith 1984; Sparkes & Smith,

2009). This does not mean that “anything goes” (Smith & Sparkes, 2009a, p. 286) or that we should give up the quest for research quality. Instead, Sparkes and Smith (2009), while arguing that no technique is a definite sign of research quality (as research quality too is a matter of interpretation), encourages researchers to be open about their research process and characterising traits. As such, adding to what has been elaborated above, I would like to highlight the current study’s applied strategies of *wakefulness* (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) and *critical friends* (Smith & McGannon, 2018):

Wakefulness, as described and encouraged by Clandinin and Connelly (2000) is ongoing, critical reflections where narrative researchers are aware of, for instance, inauthenticity, narcissism, simplistic plots, and unidimensional characters throughout the research process. Next, critical friends is a characterising trait urged to by Smith and McGannon (2018) which is “a process of critical dialogue between people, with researchers giving voice to their interpretations in relation to other people who listen and offer critical feedback” (Smith & McGannon, 2018, p. 113). In the present study, this is a strategy which have been frequently utilised throughout the whole research process. At the core of the process of the current study, there has been a research group consisting of three graduate students and their supervisor who frequently and extensively has met discussing theory, data collection, data analysis, interpretations, findings, and writing of research texts.

2.2.10 Ethical considerations

Throughout the entire research process, ethical considerations have maintained a key emphasis. The considerations utilised have been mentioned throughout the method chapter, but I would like to shortly recapitulate them here.

Approval from NSD and The Ethical Committee of The Norwegian School of Sport Sciences regarding the study were granted (see Appendix 1-3). Second, the interview guides were developed with help from a clinical psychologist who also gave advice on how to respond to potential challenging responses. Additionally, he also provided contact information for counselling organizations, which could be given to the participants if necessary. Third, all the participants were informed about the purpose of study, their right to anonymity, the voluntarism of their participation, and their right to quit and have all their data removed from the study before engaging in interviews (see

Appendix 4). Finally, every participant provided written consent to partake in the study. According to the regulations of NSD (see above), written consent from the parents were gathered from the participants who were younger than 15 years old.

References

- Abbott, A., & Collins, D. (2004). Eliminating the dichotomy between theory and practice in talent identification and development: considering the role of psychology. *Journal of sports sciences*, 22(5), 395-408. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640410410001675324>
- Amorose, A. J. & Horn, T. S. (2000). Intrinsic motivation relationships with collegiate athletes gender, scholarship status, and perceptions of their coaches behavior. *Journal of sport & exercise psychology*, 22(1-4), 63-84. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.22.1.63>
- Baker, J., & Young, B. (2014). 20 years later: Deliberate practice and the development of expertise in sport. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 7, 135–157. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2014.896024>
- Baker, J., Schorer, J., & Wattie, N. (2018). Compromising talent: Issues in identifying and selecting talent in sport. *Quest*, 70(1), 48-63. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2017.1333438>
- Balish, S. M., McLaren, C., Rainham, D., & Blanchard, C. (2014). Correlates of youth sport attrition: A review and future directions. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 15(4), 429-439. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.04.003>
- Barber, B. (1983). *The logic and limits of trust*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Barreiros, A., Côté, J., & Fonseca, A. M. (2014). From early to adult sport success: Analysing athletes' progression in national squads. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 14(sup1), S178–S182. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17461391.2012.671368>
- Barreiros, A. N., & Fonseca, A. M. (2012). A retrospective analysis of Portuguese elite athletes' involvement in international competitions. *International Journal of Sport Science and Coaching*, 7, 593–600. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1260/1747-9541.7.3.593>
- Bergeron, M. F., Mountjoy, M., Armstrong, N., Chia, M., Côté, J., Emery, C. A., ... & Malina, R. M. (2015). International Olympic Committee consensus statement on youth athletic development. *Br J Sports Med*, 49(13), 843-851. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2015-094962>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brouwers, J., De Bosscher, V., & Sotiriadou, P. (2012). An examination of the importance of performances in youth and junior competition as an indicator of later success in tennis. *Sport Management Review*, 15, 461–475. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2012.05.002>

- Calman, L., Brunton, L., & Molassiotis, A. (2013). Developing longitudinal qualitative designs: lessons learned and recommendations for health services research. *BMC medical research methodology*, *13*(1), 14. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-13-14>
- Carless, D., & Douglas, K. (2013). Living, resisting, and playing the part of athlete: Narrative tensions in elite sport. *Psychology of sport and exercise*, *14*(5), 701-708. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.05.003>
- Casey, A., Fletcher, T., Schaefer, L. & Gleddie, D. (2018). *Conducting Practitioner Research in Physical Education and Youth Sport*. Abingdon: Routledge
- Clancy, R. B., Herring, M. P., MacIntyre, T. E., & Campbell, M. J. (2016). A review of competitive sport motivation research. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *27*, 232-242. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.09.003>
- Clandinin, D. J. & Connelly, F. M. (2000). *Narrative inquiry: Experience and story in qualitative research*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Coker, C. A. (2015). Motor Skill Learning for Effective Coaching and Performance. In J. Williams & V. Krane (Eds.), *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (7th ed.) (p. 19-39). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Collins, D. J., Button, A. & Richards, H. (Eds.). (2011). *Performance psychology: A practitioner's guide*. Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone Elsevier.
- Collins, D., MacNamara, Á., & Cruickshank, A. (2019). Research and practice in talent identification and development—Some thoughts on the state of play. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *31*(3), 340-351. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2018.1475430>
- Cornwell, J. F., Franks, B., & Higgins, E. T. (2017). Shared reality makes life meaningful: Are we really going in the right direction? *Motivation Science*, *3*(3), 260. DOI: 10.1037/mot0000071
- Côté, J., & Gilbert, W. (2009). An integrative definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise. *International journal of sports science & coaching*, *4*(3), 307-323. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1260/174795409789623892>
- Crane, J., & Temple, V. (2015). A systematic review of dropout from organized sport among children and youth. *European physical education review*, *21*(1), 114-131. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356336X14555294>
- Davis, L., Jowett, S., & Tafvelin, S. (2019). Communication strategies: The fuel for quality coach-athlete relationships and athlete satisfaction. *Frontiers in psychology*, *10*. 1-12. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02156
- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. New York: Plenum Press.

- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (2000). The 'what' and 'why' of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227–268. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y. S. (2018). Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues*. (pp. 1-26). Los Angeles, California: Sage.
- Dewey, J. (2015). *Experience & Education*. New York: Free press.
- Duda, J.L. (2013). The conceptual and empirical foundations of Empowering Coaching™: Setting the stage for the PAPA project. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11, 311–318. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2013.839414>
- Echterhoff, G., Higgins, E. T., & Levine, J. M. (2009). Shared reality: Experiencing commonality with others' inner states about the world. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4(5), 496-521. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01161.x>
- Echterhoff, G., Lang, S., Krämer, N., & Higgins, E. T. (2009). Audience-tuning effects on memory: The role of audience status in sharing reality. *Social Psychology*, 40(3), 150-163. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335.40.3.150>
- French, J. R. P. (1956). A formal theory of social power. *Psychological review*, 63(3), 181. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0046123>
- French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in Social Power* (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute of Social Relations
- Förster, J., Higgins, E. T., & Idson, L. C. (1998). Approach and avoidance strength during goal attainment: regulatory focus and the "goal looms larger" effect. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 75(5), 1115-1131. DOI: 10.1037/0022-3514.75.5.1115
- Fulmer, C. A., Gelfand, M. J., Kruglanski, A. W., Kim-Prieto, C., Diener, E., Pierro, A., & Higgins, E. T. (2010). On "feeling right" in cultural contexts: How person-culture match affects self-esteem and subjective well-being. *Psychological Science*, 21(11), 1563-1569. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610384742>
- Gjesdal, S., Stenling, A., Solstad, B. E., & Ommundsen, Y. (2019). A study of coach-team perceptual distance concerning the coach-created motivational climate in youth sport. *Scandinavian journal of medicine & science in sports*, 29(1), 132-143. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.13306>
- Gould, D. (2015) Goal Setting for Peak Performance. In J. Williams & V. Krane (Eds.), *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (7th ed.) (p. 188-206). Boston: McGraw Hill.
- Guba, E. G. (Ed). (1990). *The paradigm dialog*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

- Hardin, C. D., & Higgins, E. T. (1996). Shared reality: How social verification makes the subjective objective. In R. M. Sorrentino & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of motivation and cognition*, Vol. 3: The interpersonal context (pp. 28–84). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Harwood, C. G., Keegan, R. J., Smith, J. M., & Raine, A. S. (2015). A systematic review of the intrapersonal correlates of motivational climate perceptions in sport and physical activity. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *18*, 9-25. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.11.005>
- Hagger, M. S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. (2009). Assumptions in research in sport and exercise psychology. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *10*(5), 511-519. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2009.01.004>
- Hermanowicz J.C. (2016). Longitudinal Qualitative Research. In: M. Shanahan, J. Mortimer, & M. Kirkpatrick Johnson (Eds.) *Handbook of the Life Course. Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research* (pp. 491-513). Cham: Springer
- Higgins, E. T. (1997). Beyond pleasure and pain. *American psychologist*, *52*(12), 1280-1300. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.12.1280>.
- Higgins, E. T. (2019). *Shared Reality: What Makes Us Strong and Tears Us Apart*. New York: Oxford University Press
- Holt, N. L. (Ed.). (2008). *Positive youth development through sport*. London: Routledge.
- Hovland, C.I., Janis, I.L., & Kelley, H.H. (1953). *Communication and persuasion: psychological studies of opinion change*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- John, J. M., Gropper, H., & Thiel, A. (2019). The role of critical life events in the talent development pathways of athletes and musicians: A systematic review. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *45*, 1-19. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2019.101565>
- Johnston, K., Wattie, N., Schorer, J., & Baker, J. (2018). Talent identification in sport: a systematic review. *Sports Medicine*, *48*(1), 97-109. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-017-0803-2>
- Jowett, S., & Poczwardowski, A. (2007). Understanding the Coach-Athlete Relationship. In S. Jowette & D. Lavallee (Eds.), *Social Psychology in Sport* (p. 3–14). Human Kinetics.
- Jowett, S. (2017a). At the heart of effective sport leadership lies the dyadic coach-athlete relationship. *Sport and Exercise Psychology Review* *13*(1), 62-64. DOI: [10.13140/RG.2.1.2427.5449](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.2427.5449)
- Jowett, S (2017b). Coaching effectiveness: the coach–athlete relationship at its heart. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *16*, 154-158. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.05.006>
- Kingston, K. M., Horrocks, C. S., & Hanton, S. (2006). Do multidimensional intrinsic and extrinsic motivation profiles discriminate between athlete scholarship status and

gender? *European journal of sport science*, 6(01), 53-63. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17461390500440889>

Korsgaard, M. A., Brower, H. H., & Lester, S. W. (2015). It isn't always mutual: A critical review of dyadic trust. *Journal of Management*, 41(1), 47-70. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314547521>

Kristiansen, E., Tomten, S. E., Hanstad, D. V., & Roberts, G. C. (2012). Coaching communication issues with elite female athletes: Two Norwegian case studies. *Scandinavian journal of medicine & science in sports*, 22(6), 156-167. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0838.2012.01521.x>

Langan, E., Blake, C., & Lonsdale, C. (2013). Systematic review of the effectiveness of interpersonal coach education interventions on athlete outcomes. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 14(1), 37-49. DOI:
<https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2012.06.007>

Lincoln, Y.S., Lynham, S.A., Guba, E.G. (2018). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues*. (pp. 108-150). Los Angeles, California: Sage.

Lorenz, D. S., Reiman, M. P., Lehecka, B. J., & Naylor, A. (2013). What performance characteristics determine elite versus nonelite athletes in the same sport?. *Sports health*, 5(6), 542-547. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1941738113479763>

Mageau, G. A., & Vallerand, R. J. (2003). The coach–athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of sports science*, 21(11), 883-904. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0264041031000140374>

Manian, N., Papadakis, A. A., Strauman, T. J., & Essex, M. J. (2006). The development of children's ideal and ought self-guides: Parenting, temperament, and individual differences in guide strength. *Journal of personality*, 74(6), 1619-1646. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2006.00422.x>

Manore, M. M., Meyer, N. L., & Thompson, J. L. (2009). *Sport nutrition for health and performance*. Human Kinetics.

Moesch, K., Kenttä, G., Kleinert, J., Quignon-Fleuret, C., Cecil, S., & Bertollo, M. (2018). FEPSAC position statement: mental health disorders in elite athletes and models of service provision. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 38, 61-71. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.05.013>

Møllerlækken, N. E., Lorås, H., & Pedersen, A. V. (2017). A comparison of players' and coaches' perceptions of the coach-created motivational climate within youth soccer teams. *Frontiers in psychology*, 8, 109. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00109>

Mountjoy, M., Sundgot-Borgen, J.K., Burke, L.M., Ackerman, K.E., Blauwet, C., Constantini, N., ... Budgett, R. (2018). IOC consensus statement on relative energy deficiency in sport (RED-S): 2018 update. *International Journal of Sport Nutrition and Exercise Metabolism*, 28(4). DOI: 10.1123/ijsem.2018-0136

- Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement motivation: conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychol. Rev.* 91, 328–346. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.91.3.328>
- Nicholls, J. G. (1989). *The competitive ethos and democratic education*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Norman, L. (2015). The Coaching Needs of High Performance Female Athletes Within the Coach-Athlete Dyad. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 2, 15-28. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2013-0037>
- Norris, L. A., Didymus, F. F., & Kaiseler, M. (2017). Stressors, coping, and well-being among sports coaches: A systematic review. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 33, 93-112. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.08.005>
- Papathomas, A. (2016). Narrative inquiry: from cardinal to marginal . . . and back? In B. Smith & A. C. Sparks (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise*. (pp. 37-48). London: Routledge.
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Pelletier, L.G., Fortier, M.S., Vallerand, R.J., & Brière, N.M. (2001). Associations among perceived autonomy support, forms of self-regulation, and persistence: A prospective study. *Motivation and Emotion*, 25, 279–306. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1014805132406>
- Pensgaard, A. M., & Roberts, G. C. (2002). Elite athletes' experiences of the motivational climate: The coach matters. *Scandinavian journal of medicine & science in sports*, 12(1), 54-59. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0838.2002.120110.x>
- Phoenix, C., & Smith, B. (2011). Telling a (good?) counterstory of aging: Natural bodybuilding meets the narrative of decline. *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences*, 66(5), 628-639. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbr077>
- Poucher, Z. A., Tamminen, K. A., Caron, J. G., & Sweet, S. N. (2019). Thinking through and designing qualitative research studies: a focused mapping review of 30 years of qualitative research in sport psychology. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 1-24. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2019.1656276>
- Radley, A., & Chamberlain, K. (2001). Health psychology and the study of the case: From method to analytic concern. *Social science & medicine*, 53(3), 321-332. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536\(00\)00320-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0277-9536(00)00320-8)
- Reardon, C. L., Hainline, B., Aron, C. M., Baron, D., Baum, A. L., Bindra, A., ... & Derevensky, J. L. (2019). Mental health in elite athletes: International Olympic Committee consensus statement (2019). *British journal of sports medicine*, 53(11), 667-699. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2019-100715>
- Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences*. London: Sage.

- Rocchi, M., & Pelletier, L. (2018). How does coaches' reported interpersonal behavior align with athletes' perceptions? Consequences for female athletes' psychological needs in sport. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 7(2), 141. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000116>
- Saw, A. E., Main, L. C., & Gatin, P. B. (2016). Monitoring the athlete training response: subjective self-reported measures trump commonly used objective measures: a systematic review. *Br J Sports Med*, 50(5), 281-291. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2015-094758>
- Schinke, R. J., Stambulova, N. B., Si, G., & Moore, Z. (2017). International society of sport psychology position stand: Athletes' mental health, performance, and development. *International journal of sport and exercise psychology*, 16(6), 622-639. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2017.1295557>
- Simonton, D. K. (1999). Talent and its development: An emergenic and epigenetic model. *Psychological Review*, 106, 435-457. DOI: 10.1037/0033-295X.106.3.435
- Simpson, J. A. (2007). Foundations of interpersonal trust. In A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (2nd ed., pp. 587-607). New York, NY: Guilford Press
- Smith, B. (2016). Narrative analysis. In E. Lyons & A. Coyle (Eds.). *Analysing qualitative data in psychology* (2nd ed) (pp. 202-221). London: Sage.
- Smith, B. & McGannon, K. R. (2018) Developing rigor in qualitative research: problems and opportunities within sport and exercise psychology. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11:1, 101-121. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2017.1317357>
- Smith, B. & Sparkes, A. C. (2009a). Narrative analysis and sport and exercise psychology: Understanding lives in diverse ways. *Psychology of sport and exercise*, 10(2), 279-288. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2008.07.012>
- Smith, B., & Sparkes, A. C. (2009b). Narrative inquiry in sport and exercise psychology: What can it mean, and why might we do it?. *Psychology of sport and exercise*, 10(1), 1-11. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2008.01.004>
- Smith, J. K. (1984). The problem of criteria for judging interpretive inquiry. *Educational evaluation and policy analysis*, 6(4), 379-391. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737006004379>
- Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L., & Hunt, E. B. (1977). A system for the behavioral assessment of athletic coaches. *Research Quarterly*, 48, 401-407. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10671315.1977.10615438>
- Smith, R. E., Cumming, S. P., & Smoll, F. L. (2008). Development and validation of the motivational climate scale for youth sports. *Journal of applied sport psychology*, 20(1), 116-136. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200701790558>
- Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (1989). Leadership Behaviors in Sport: A Theoretical Model and Research Paradigm 1. *Journal of applied social psychology*, 19(18), 1522-1551.

- Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (2009). *Mastery Approach to Coaching: A leadership guide for youth sports*. Seattle, WA: Youth Enrichment in Sports.
- Smoll, F. L. & Smith, R. E. (2020). Education Youth Sport Coaches: An Empirically Supported Training Program. In: K. Dieffenbach & M. Thompson (Eds.), *Coach Education Essentials: Your Guide to Developing Sport Coaches* (p. 93-110). Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- Solstad, B. E., van Hoya, A., & Ommundsen, Y. (2015). Social-contextual and intrapersonal antecedents of coaches' basic need satisfaction: The intervening variable effect of providing autonomy-supportive coaching. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 20, 84-93. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.05.001>
- Solstad, B. E., Ivarsson, A., Haug, E. M., & Ommundsen, Y. (2018). Youth sport coaches' well-being across the season: The psychological costs and benefits of giving empowering and disempowering sports coaching to athletes. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 5(2), 124-135. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2017-0026>
- Sparkes, A. C., & Smith, B. (2003). Men, sport, spinal cord injury and narrative time. *Qualitative research*, 3(3), 295-320. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794103033002>
- Sparkes, A. C., & Smith, B. (2009). Judging the quality of qualitative inquiry: Criteriology and relativism in action. *Psychology of sport and exercise*, 10(5), 491-497. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2009.02.006>
- Spiegel, S., Grant-Pillow, H., & Higgins, E. T. (2004). How regulatory fit enhances motivational strength during goal pursuit. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 34(1), 39-54. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.180>
- Stebbing, J., Taylor, I. M., & Spray, C. M. (2011). Antecedents of perceived coach autonomy supportive and controlling behaviors: Coach psychological need satisfaction and well-being. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 33(2), 255-272. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.33.2.255>
- Stebbing, J., Taylor, I. M., & Spray, C. M. (2016). Interpersonal mechanisms explaining the transfer of well-and ill-being in coach-athlete dyads. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 38(3), 292-304. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2015-0172>
- Stenling, A., Lindwall, M., & Hassmén, P. (2015). Changes in perceived autonomy support, need satisfaction, motivation, and well-being in young elite athletes. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 4(1), 50-61. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000027>
- Thomson, R., & Holland, J. (2003). Hindsight, foresight and insight: The challenges of longitudinal qualitative research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 6(3), 233-244. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000091833>
- Turnnidge, J., & Côté, J. (2018). Applying transformational leadership theory to coaching research in youth sport: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 16(3), 327-342. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2016.1189948>

Wieselquist, J., Rusbult, C. E., Foster, C. A., & Agnew, C. R. (1999). Commitment, pro-relationship behavior, and trust in close relationships. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 77(5), 942. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.5.942>

Yates, L. (2003). Interpretive claims and methodological warrant in small-number qualitative, longitudinal research. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 6(3), 223-232. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000091824>

Presentation of Article

The following article is to be submitted to the journal “Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health”, and is presented following the journal’s desired guidelines.³

3

<https://www.tandfonline.com/action/authorSubmission?show=instructions&journalCode=rqrs21&fbclid=IwAR0HgcU5o8IT-Zj53rWiLAF-vH8iJDVUAfiJRVHsHKX9fVLdS7AvEzHS15Q#prep>

An Examination of Reciprocity among Coach and Athletes in Female Elite Junior Swimming: A Shared Reality Theory Perspective.

Morten Granerud^a, B. E. Solstad^{b,c}, H. M. Haraldsen^{c,d}, H. Gustafsson^{a,e} and C. J. Knight^f

^aDepartment of Sport and Social Sciences, Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, Oslo, Norway; ^bDepartment of Sport Science and Physical Education, University of Agder, Kristiansand, Norway; ^cResearch Centre for Children and Youth Sports, Oslo, Norway; ^dOslo National Academy of the Arts, Oslo, Norway; ^eKarlstad University, Karlstad, Sweden; ^fSchool of Sport and Exercise Science, Swansea University Bay Campus, Wales, United Kingdom

Based on the proposition that the coach-athlete relationship is at its best when both coach and athlete contribute to the coach-athlete relationship process, the present study set out to investigate if Shared Reality Theory (SRT) could provide new insights on the topic. SRT stipulates that human beings are epistemically and relationally motivated to experience a shared reality with others about a target referent, and that a shared reality about a goal pursuit serves as social verification which makes the goal pursuit experienced as worthwhile. As such, it seems likely that partners in a coach-athlete relationship who experience a shared reality with the other partner, would experience (a) a strong relationship with the other, and (b) being more motivated by their current training regime, as it is experienced as worthwhile. Six female elite junior swimmers and their head coach were interviewed three times over nine months. Based on an interpretive, narrative thematic analysis, the present master thesis argues that athletes who experience a shared reality with their coach are more motivated and report a higher sense of psychological well-being. The coach seems to experience a shared reality unless athletes' communication indicates otherwise. To establish the experience of a shared reality, reciprocal and honest communication motivated by trust in the other is needed. Due to power imbalance, it is deemed important for coaches to behave supportive and trustworthy to motivate athletes to open up so coach and athlete synergistically can work together in their coach-athlete relationship

Keywords: coach-athlete relationship; shared reality theory; reciprocity; narrative thematic analysis; prospective cohort design; swimming; trust

Introduction

The Coach-Athlete Relationship

The coach-athlete relationship is an ongoing process (Jowett 2017b) which has been defined as ‘a situation in which a coach’s and an athlete’s cognitions, feelings, and behaviors are mutually and causally interrelated’ (Jowett and Poczwardowski 2007, 4). Evidence supporting this definition is clear. For instance, Smoll and Smith, through decades of research has demonstrated how different types of coaching behaviours elicit different types of athlete’s reactions (e.g., Smith, Smoll, and Hunt 1977; Smoll and Smith 1989, 2020). More recently, there have been conducted several studies which has shown that how the coach-athlete relationship plays out also affect the coach (e.g., Solstad et al. 2018; Solstad, Hoye, and Ommundsen 2015; Stebbings, Taylor, and Spray 2016). As such, it is well-established that coaches’ perceptions of the athletes’ behaviour affect coaches’ behaviours and vice versa (Jowett and Poczwardowski 2007; Mageau and Vallerand 2003; Smoll and Smith 1989; Solstad, Hoye, and Ommundsen 2015). A challenge is, however, that studies shows that coaches and athletes tend to differ in their perceptions of the motivational climate (Gjesdal et al. 2019; Møllerløkken, Lorås, and Pedersen 2017; Rocchi and Pelletier 2018), thus hindering the coach-athlete-relationship to live up to its potential (Mageau and Vallerand, 2003; Smoll and Smith 2020). Interestingly, then, a study by Davis, Jowett and Tafvelin (2019) found that athletes’ communication was positively related to relationship quality, which in turn positively predicted how satisfied athletes were about personal treatment, instruction and training, and individual performance. Their study did, however, only

measure athletes' perceptions, and the authors suggests that due to 'the dyadic nature of the coach-athlete relationship' (Davis, Jowett, and Tafvelin 2019, 7), future research should include both coaches and athletes.

Jowett (2017a) argues that a well-functioning coach-athlete relationship, focuses on establishing a shared vision in which both the coach's and the athlete's skills, experiences and interests are synergistically utilised. To establish such a relationship, one needs trust, communication, good intentions, and a mutual, shared understanding that coach and athletes are in it together (Jowett 2017a, 2017b; Jowett and Poczwardowski 2007). Hence, based on the assumption regarding the importance of shared understanding and mutual trust in the coach-athlete relationship, the current study set out to investigate if the *Shared Reality Theory* (SRT; Echterhoff, Higgins, and Levine 2009; Higgins 2019) may advance the field of coach-athlete relationship research by helping to analyse the establishment and consequences of a well-functioning shared reality within the coach-athlete relationship.

Shared Reality Theory

SRT stipulates that to establish what is true about the world, human beings seek to establish a *shared reality* with significant others (Echterhoff, Higgins, and Levine 2009; Higgins 2019). A shared reality implies that one experiences a commonality with other's inner states about a target referent in the world (Echterhoff, Higgins, and Levine 2009). Additionally, humans want their life to be meaningful and going the right direction (Cornwell, Franks, and Higgins 2017). What makes a goal pursuit worthwhile and affirms that your life is going in the right direction is argued to be social verification (Cornwell, Franks, and Higgins 2017; Hardin and Higgins 1996). That is

because when a single individual has an assumption about something, it is regarded merely as a subjective opinion. Conversely, when an assumption becomes shared by several others it becomes regarded as objective (Hardin and Higgins 1996; Higgins 2019).

In the complex world of athletic development where predictors of future athletic success are uncertain (Johnston et al. 2018; Baker, Schorer, and Wattie 2018), and where each and every athlete's developmental path is unique and dynamic, (Bergeron et al. 2015), having a coach and an athlete experience a shared reality about their goal and training regime would make them experience their joint strivings as more worthwhile (Cornwell, Franks, and Higgins 2017).

Following the conceptualization of SRT by Echterhoff, Higgins, and Levine (2009), four conditions must be met for a shared reality to be established. The first condition is that shared reality involves a subjectively perceived commonality of individuals' inner states, and not just overt behaviours. The term 'inner states' refers to beliefs, judgements, feelings, attitudes, or evaluations about a target referent. The second condition is that shared reality is always about a target referent. The target referent can be concrete or abstract, as long as it is a phenomenon that is experienced as being part of the world. The third condition is that the commonality of inner states must be appropriately motivated. That is, either relationally motivated (e.g., to feel connected to and have relationship with others), or epistemically motivated (e.g., search for meaning, truth and understanding). The fourth condition is that shared reality involves the experience of a successful connection to other people's inner states. It is not sufficient that there exists a commonality between two people observable by a third person. The commonality must be subjectively experienced by one of the former two persons as being established (Echterhoff, Higgins, and Levine 2009).

Several challenges exist to the process of experiencing a shared reality. One of them is that due to earlier experiences and different personal characteristics, humans' instinctive inner states towards target referents are likely to differ from one another (Higgins, 2019). One such difference, emphasised by Higgins (2019), is if humans have become either predominately *promotion-oriented* or *prevention-oriented*. Higgins (2019, 118) defined these two orientations as being 'concerned with advancing from the current state toward a better state' (promotion) and being 'concerned with maintaining a current satisfactory state against a worse state' (prevention). To explain how these two orientations differ, imagine a three-point scale from -1 to 0 to +1 where -1 represents a presence of something negative, +1 represents a presence of something positive, and 0 represents status quo. From a promotion perspective, +1 is a success as it is a gain, whereas 0 is a failure as it is a non-gain (absence of something positive). Conversely, from a prevention perspective, 0 is a success as it is a non-loss (absence of something negative), whereas -1 is a failure as it is a loss (Higgins 2019).

However, this does not mean that only promotion-oriented persons set goals and seek improvement, it just affects how the striving towards a goal is experienced (Higgins 2019). For those who are predominately promotion-oriented, a future end-state is viewed as something one *ideally* wants to achieve. Conversely, for those who are predominately prevention-oriented, a future end-state is viewed as something one *ought* to achieve (Higgins 1997, 2019). Thus, the feelings associated with a potential failure or success will also differ between promotion- and prevention-oriented persons.

Promotion-success would elicit feelings such as happiness, eagerness and enthusiasm, while promotion-failure would elicit feelings such as sadness and discouragement. Conversely, prevention-success would elicit feelings such as relief, peacefulness and

decrease in vigilance, while prevention-failure would elicit nervousness, worry and increase in vigilance (Higgins 2019).

Therefore, in a coach-athlete relationship, if the coach is predominately promotion-oriented and the athlete is prevention-oriented, they are likely to have quite different inner states towards training, goals and competitions, and there will be no shared reality regarding their strivings (Higgins 2019). In such a situation, the coach, athlete, or both would experience what is called a *regulatory nonfit* (Higgins 2000, 2019). A regulatory nonfit stands in opposition to a *regulatory fit*, which is when a prevention-oriented person acts or strive towards a goal in a vigilant way, or when a promotion-oriented person acts or strive towards a goal in an eager way (Higgins 2019). A regulatory fit is to be preferred, as when there is a regulatory fit, the value of an activity will be intensified (Higgins 2000, 2019). There have also been conducted studies which show that performance at given tasks are increased when there is a regulatory fit (e.g., Förster, Higgins, and Idson 1998; Spiegel, Grant-Pillow, and Higgins 2004). When there exists a person-culture regulatory nonfit, in addition to missing the mentioned benefits, an individual's sense of well-being might be reduced (Fulmer et al. 2010).

To establish a shared reality and a regulatory fit when there is none, communication is key (Echterhoff, Higgins, and Levine 2009). To remain with the coach-athlete example, if the athlete honestly communicates her needs and interests, the coach may change his attitude (and behaviour) regarding the optimal training regime for this specific athlete (the target referent). However, for honest communication to occur with the goal of establishing a shared reality, the communicator-to-be needs to be appropriately motivated. That is, as mentioned, to be epistemologically or relationally motivated (Echterhoff, Higgins, and Levine, 2009; Higgins 2019). In this regard,

Echterhoff, Lang et al. (2009) found, to some surprise, that high status and domain-specific expertise were not sufficient to motivate persons to establish a shared reality. Referring to Hovland, Janis, and Kelly (1953), Echterhoff, Lang et al. (2009) states that ‘A person who has high expert power or expertise does not need to be perceived as trustworthy’ (151), and further, that ‘Trust is assumed to combine both epistemic and relational aspects’ (Echterhoff, Lang et al. 2009, 151). Thus, evidence seems to imply that to want to establish a shared reality with a person, one must trust this person. It may indeed be the case, as the adage goes, that ‘they don’t care how much you know, until they know how much you care’. Consequently, the question becomes how to develop interpersonal trust. As such, Simpson’s (2007) *dyadic model of trust in relationships* will be highlighted:

The model describes that in a relationship, the partners enter with their trust-dispositions formed by earlier experiences. Then they enter a trust situation. Here they can behave to make outcomes MaxOwn, MaxOther or MaxJoint (for details, see Wieselquist et al. 1999) with the latter two behaviours proposed to increase trust (Simpson 2007). These situations could vary in severeness, which in turn would affect their influence on the interpersonal trust. For instance, in what has been termed a *strain test*, which is a situation where a person is ‘highly outcome dependent and specific actions or decisions that would promote his or her own best interests are at odds with those that would maximally benefit the partner’ (Simpson 2007, 589), if the other acts so to help the first, deprioritizing his own interest, trust would increase even more (Simpson, 2007). After the trust situation, behaviours are attributed. If the partner’s intentions are positively attributed, trust and perceived security is likely to increase. In subsequent trust situations, the new level of trust and perceived security is likely to then influence the behaviours and attributions of the persons, making this a circular process

continually affected by personal dispositions and earlier experiences of the persons involved (Simpson 2007). Based on this model, it could be argued that if person A frequently engages in MaxJoint and MaxOther behaviours, especially during strain tests, so that person B attributes his behaviour positively, B's trust toward A are likely to increase, making B more motivated to establish a shared reality with A.

The present study

Based on the reviewed literature, the purpose of the present study was to explore: (a) how a shared reality is established, or fails to be established, over the course of the sporting partnership between the coach and his/her athletes; and (b) how experiencing a shared reality (or not) in the coach-athlete relationship is related to the experienced quality of the relationship the coach and his/her athletes develop and maintain over the course of a 9-month period.

Method

Paradigmatic position

The paradigmatic position of this study is within an interpretivist research paradigm (Papathomas 2016; Smith and Sparkes 2009b, Smith 1984). The interpretivist paradigm is characterised by ontological relativism (Casey et al. 2018; Guba 1990; Papathomas 2016) and epistemological social constructionism (Lincoln, Lynham, and Guba 2018; Papathomas 2016; Smith and McGannon 2018). This paradigmatic positioning means that the current study cannot claim to present *the truth* or *reality as it really is*, nor that it's propositions are infallible (Smith and McGannon, 2018; Smith 1984; Sparkes and Smith 2009). However, we do hope that the study's findings and it's interpretations will

cause reflections within the reader and lead to improved, or at least more nuanced practices (Riessman 2008; Smith and Sparkes 2009a, 2009b; Smith 1984).

Study design

A longitudinal qualitative research (LQR) design was chosen for the current study (Hermanowicz 2016; Yates 2003). It has within the sport psychology literature been called for more LQR (Clancy et al. 2016; Collins, MacNamara, and Cruickshank 2019; Norris, Didymus, and Kaiseler 2017; Turnnidge and Coté 2018), as a considerable amount of studies have been cross-sectional and correlational in nature (Balish et al. 2014; Hagger and Chatzisarantis 2009; Harwood et al. 2015). Benefits with LQR are that researchers can investigate how individuals experience events and social situations, and how experiences become different due to contextual changes and development over time (Calman, Brunton, and Molassiotis 2013; Hermanowicz 2016; Thomson and Holland 2003). As the coach-athlete-relationships is argued to be a dynamic temporal process influenced by both within-person and between-person changes (Jowett 2017b; Jowett and Poczwardowski 2007), in addition to SRT's emphasis on individual's both past and ongoing present experiences (Echterhoff, Higgins, and Levine 2009; Higgins 2019), it was believed a LQR design would benefit the present study's purpose. The present study had three data collections (henceforth referred to as T1, T2 and T3) over nine months. Due to logistical concerns (e.g., holidays, training camps), the time between T1 and T2 was three months, and six months between T2 and T3.

Participants

Due to a gender imbalance in prior motivational- and talent development-research (Clancy et al., 2016; Johnston et al., 2018), purposeful sampling was used to select six *female* elite junior swimmers (M age = 15.5) and their head coach from a high performing swimming club in the southern part of Norway (Patton 2015). All the athletes were ranked among the 20 best performing swimmers in the country in their age group. On average, they had been engaged in organised swimming for 7,5 years ($SD = 2.17$), trained about 20,67 hours a week ($SD = 2.66$) and had the interviewed coach as their head coach for 1,71 years ($SD = .75$). The coach interviewed was the head coach for all the athletes and had been working as a swimming coach for 29 years.

Between T1 and T2 one of the selected athletes changed club, and another athlete decided to quit organised swimming. However, they were asked if they wanted to continue to partake in the study. Both said yes, and both were interviewed at both T2 and T3.

Procedure

Approval to conduct the study was granted by the Norwegian Centre for Research Data and The Ethical Committee of The Norwegian School of Sport Sciences. Each interview guide was made in two versions, one for the coach and one for the athletes. The questions on both versions were similar trying to capture the same concept (e.g., Echterhoff, Higgins, and Levine 2009; Higgins 2019), but with slightly different wording to suit the specific role (e.g., ‘*Can you describe your thoughts on developing young athletes?*’ (coach version) versus ‘*Can you describe your thoughts on developing yourself as an athlete?*’ (athlete version)).

Participants were provided written consent and informed about their right to anonymity before the data collection at T1 took place. Interviews were audio-recorded

and conducted at the swimming club's training facilities (i.e., club house), except two interviews which were conducted at the first author's university. At T1, the interviews lasted between 14 and 51 minutes (M time = 39.9 minutes). At T2, the interviews lasted between 24 and 81 minutes (M time = 48.5 minutes). At T3, the interviews lasted between 35 and 71 minutes (M time = 55.5 minutes).

Data analysis

All interviews were transcribed verbatim, yielding 87 pages of single-spaced data at T1, 127 pages of single-spaced data at T2, and 149 pages of single-spaced data at T3.

The analytical process was twofold: First, we did a preliminary analysis at data collected at every interview round after each data collection (Calman, Brunton and Molassiotis 2013). Finally, each interviewee's total data was analysed as a single unit. The analytical strategy employed was narrative thematic analysis (Riessman, 2008). Hence, the data across cases were interpreted through the same thematics developed by the researchers (e.g., Echterhoff, Higgins, and Levine 2009; Higgins 2019). However, when planning the findings-section, it was emphasised to highlight the interpersonal differences regarding how these thematics are experienced and manifested in the interviewees' stories (Casey et al. 2018; Riessman 2008).

Findings

The analysis of the athletes revealed three overarching narratives: (a) a narrative of being prevention-oriented, (b) a narrative of being promotion-oriented, and (c) a narrative of struggling with illness. Three of the athletes were chosen to serve as exemplars that demonstrate these narratives, a strategy typically used in previous

narrative studies (e.g., Carless and Douglas 2013; Phoenix and Smith 2011; Sparkes and Smith 2003).

As the present study focuses on the reciprocity in the coach-athlete-relationship, and on how both coaches and athletes can experience increased quality in their sporting partnership, presenting the coach's narrative can give valuable insight in the coach's perspective as well (Jowett 2017b; Mageau and Vallerand 2003). Hence, the coach's narrative became a fourth narrative to present in the findings.

The Narrative of Coach Gary – The Eager and Positive One

When Gary told about earlier important experiences that shaped him to be the coach he is today, the first thing that came to his mind where talks with his dad (who also coached swimming). These talks have played a major role in developing his coaching philosophy. Gary summarised: 'I think it is very much about respecting everyone, (...) contribute to making everyone feel well, (...) and typical value-decisions, like it is more important to educate people to cope with the world than to educate world champions' (T3).

Beyond his conversations with his dad, Gary also emphasised two of his former coaching colleagues. From one he was inspired by 'His ability to believe in his possibilities and look for solutions instead of challenges' (T3), while the other impressed Gary with: 'His enormous dedication to seek development (...) so good at engaging with the athlete who desires to reach the top' (T3).

Through his earlier experiences and interactions with significant others, Gary has learned to value a mastery and promotion orientation, something which now affects how he gives feedback to his athletes: 'When I point out mistakes it is primarily by

pointing out (...) that there is something they can get even better at. That there is an unresolved potential that is conveyed from me, not what they failed to do' (T1). He told about an athlete who asked for a different approach: 'I've heard sometimes: "You have to be tougher with me, (...) you have to punish me for me to succeed." And I thought "Then you might unfortunately have the wrong coach because I will never punish you to perform better" ' (T3).

Gary is fond of his athletes, and sincerely desires coaching in adherence to their interests. However, a challenge for him, as he coaches several young swimmers, is that it is difficult for him to know the different interests of the swimmers without the interests being conveyed. Gary unfortunately does not have time to initiate talks with his athletes as much as he would like. Hence, a significant part of his coaching philosophy is to teach the athletes how they can behave and communicate to make him the best coach for each of them. As he said: 'It's important to get to know what each one wants (...). What I usually say to them (...) is that my job is to try to help you realise your wishes, and then I have to know what they are' (T1). Athletes who do this are more likely to receive better and more frequent feedback:

There are some who are better (...) to ask questions and receive feedback and communicate actively. They will often receive more and better feedback. In that way I can be a better coach for the athletes who show some initiative in the communication themselves than for the ones who are a bit more passive.

Especially when there are larger groups (T1).

And indeed, one of the athletes said that she once had talked with Gary for an hour and a half after a practice, confirming that Gary do provide time when asked to do so.

However, as Gary is aware of the power he holds as a coach, he is conscious about the importance of building trust between himself and his athletes. For Gary, trust means having positive expectations to one another. Moreover: 'Trusting someone, it depends on how you have been treated in previous situations. And you build this trust by repeatedly showing that you want the best for someone else, that you are present and do what you say you would do.' (T2). Congruent with this statement, he reported that the relationships with the athletes he had worked with the longest, were the relationships in which he experienced the highest levels of trust.

When trust is lacking, Gary reported difficulties with coaching: 'I still have athletes that I've coached many months, which I still don't feel like I've reached the point where they can let loose and talk about their own weaknesses (...). They are more concerned with performing than receiving help' (T2).

The Narrative of Swimmer Ann – The Worried and Lying One

Ann is a talented young swimmer, one of the best in the country at her age. Still, when I started to talk to her, I couldn't avoid feeling that something in her life was not ideal. When we came to the question: 'If you should encounter any challenges, do you have anyone who cares about you and with whom you can talk to?', a question which all of the other athletes typically answered with parents, siblings and/or friends, Ann answered quite differently. She said: 'No, not really. But... it usually ends well. It's all right. (...) I don't want to talk to mum and dad, they don't understand' (T1).

Ann had started swimming around the age of 11, following a couple of years playing handball. She had not enjoyed her time playing handball because: ‘Those on the team weren’t any nice’. Particularly: ‘The coach’s daughter was just mean, (...) and I had like nobody to be with. (...) So, then I thought: “Okay, then I’ll just quit” ’ (T3).

Unfortunately, swimming has not been all roses either. Ann has experienced coaches that have been very shaming in their feedback to her. Ann argued: ‘It was worst during training camps. (...) They didn’t realise I was trying my best, so when I wasn’t swimming at the times they expected, they just got mad and said like: “Why did we bring you at all?” ’ (T2). Moreover, when Ann did perform at the expected level, she didn’t receive any positive feedback: ‘They never said that (...) we were swimming well. (...) It was just like that when we swam well, they just said like, “Yeah, okay”. Like, it was like (...) they just waited for us to swim poorly’ (T2).

Conversely, Gary, who started coaching her about a year and a half ago, was well liked by Ann. She highlighted that she looked forward to seeing him at practice, perceived him to care about her, and often asked him for feedback. Still, Ann experienced their relationship as ambivalent. While Gary seems to be promotion-oriented, Ann’s earlier experiences seems to have made her prevention-oriented, creating a regulatory nonfit between them. For instance, Ann highlighted: ‘Sometimes I feel he is like: “So, in three months you can post this time.” And then I think like: “It’s very fast, I can’t do it”. (...) It’s often the case that I can’t swim as fast as he thinks’ (T1).

Ann perceived that Gary had a major influence on her swimming career. Given this feeling, she was afraid of being thought of as the swimmer who didn’t put in the required effort, and thus being transferred to another training group. It was something

Ann would like to prevent. Accordingly, when Gary came with a suggestion for her training program, she was afraid to reject it:

He says like: “Yes, but you have to do this and this and this and this”. Also, it’s a bit my fault, because I kind of pretend and I’m saying like, “Yeah, but I think I can do that”. But then, next time I will not be able to, and I know that I will not make it either when I talk to him. But I pretend, so that is stupid of me. (...) But you know, I want to seem better too, and he becomes, when I say like, “Oh, but then I do that and that and that” then he becomes happy. I just say it. But then he’ll get disappointed again afterwards when I can’t do it (T3).

Ann accepted suggestions from Gary that she believed she would fail to fulfil in fear of being perceived as lacking dedication and not putting in the required effort. She also admitted lying to Gary: ‘He asks: “Are you ready to go hard?” and hits me on the shoulder. Then I get stressed and lie and say: “I feel great!” And then I become happy. And then later he becomes disappointed and I become disappointed’ (T3).

In competitive settings, Ann admitted she faked her behaviour to please Gary:

I wanted to show him that I was disappointed if I performed poorly so that he would think: “Oh, but then she’ll do better next time”. And stressed because, (...) before a tournament, if you become to stressed or nervous, sometimes I perform poorly because (...) I can’t concentrate. So sometimes I put a little extra in it so, if it went bad, I had an excuse, like “Ah, but I was so stressed out before I swam!” I did that sometimes. And if I swam well, well, then I swam well. But you know, just to be sure. (...) If I before the race had thoughts like: “I won’t

make it”, Like thought negatively, I wouldn’t say it. Instead I would say: “Oh, I did my best, but it didn’t work out and now I’m so sorry”. (...) And then he would think like: “Well then she will do it better next time”. Then he became happy and I had to do the same thing next time (T3).

Ann experienced thinking quite differently than Gary. A final story she told, which underscored this, was a story from a training camp, which took place after a running session where she was very tired and broke down:

He was like: “How are you doing Ann?” And I just started crying and said: “I hate swimming!” (...) And then he said: “Ok, let’s talk about this”. We sat down, but then he managed to turn the conversation around, and it ended up with me having an extra training session per week. And afterwards I was like: “Wait, what? How...?” (...) Because that was not my plan (T3).

Between T1 and T2, Ann chose to change club. Despite the ambivalence and their differences, Ann firmly claimed it had nothing to do with Gary. On the contrary, she said ‘If only I could have continued having Gary as a coach, I would have stayed’ (T2). The reason, she reported, was that as she was getting to old for her current training group, she had to move up to the next. And the head coaches for that group were coaches who Ann had negative experiences with. In her new swimming club, Ann said she enjoyed going to practice more. There are possibly many reasons for this, but it might be that the type of failure-feedback plays a role. Ann said: ‘In [new club] it’s like they say we shall swim something, and if we fail, (...) they’re just like: “Well, it’s you who won’t get any better”. But in [old club] it was like: “okay, penalty” ’ (T3). In other

words, when she failed in the new swimming club, there was an absence of positive rather than a presence of negative.

The Narrative of Swimmer Cathy – The Sick and Quietly Hardworking One

Before we start talking about Cathy, a little background information is necessary: In the swimming club, there were three training groups that were relevant for the interviewed swimmers. In the following, these groups are referred to as group A, group B and group C. To stay in group A, there were four requirements: (a) being 13-16 years old, (b) manage 7-8 workouts per week, (c) less than 10% absence over time, and (d) qualify to national championships. After being in this group, the athletes are either moved to group B or group C. Group B is the elite group in the club. When an athlete went from group A to group B, Gary called it the 'fast-track' (T1). However, Gary said that the fast track is not necessarily beneficial for all athletes. Some athletes need more time to become ready to take that final step. Therefore, they have group C, for athletes to 'buy themselves some time' (T1). In group C, the training is more individualised, and the goal is to: 'Provide athletes an opportunity to keep training to keep developing' (T1).

Now back to Cathy: Cathy had the recent year struggled with illness. As such, she did not meet requirement b and c, while she soon also would be too old for group A. Therefore, she was moved from group A to group C. From Gary's perspective, it was nothing but good intentions. In group C Cathy could train in a manner that would suit her health situation better. However, Cathy did not perceive it this way: 'We have been moved down. Even though they don't call it moved down, we were moved down. Because we got less training' (T1). Additionally, she said: 'I feel that (...) if I had continued with the training I had, I could have had more development than now when I have two workouts less than before and less hours in the water' (T1).

After the first interview, Cathy chose to quit swimming. She was clear that she did not quit because of Gary. On the contrary, she said she did trust him, and that she perceived him to care for her as a person. On why she quitted, she stressed: ‘I’ve struggled with my motivation and did not get the results that I wanted. (...) I went to the doctor and found I had some deficiencies and fixed it, but things didn’t get any better. I just felt tired’ (T2).

Perhaps explanatory for her recent struggles, is Cathy’s elaboration on how she experiences her life as a young Norwegian girl in general. She said: ‘We are youths in today’s society, and it’s not easy because we have, or at least I have set very high standards for myself. Both school, training, like everything’ (T1). Further, she admitted that: ‘I have given the impression that things are better than they really are’ (T2), adding: ‘I’m the kind of person who’s like: “it’s all right”. I can move on even though I am not feeling well. It’s like: “I won’t get up from the water. I shall complete the training session” ’ (T2).

When I asked her if she talked about these kinds of stress with somebody, she said: ‘No, not really. I’m not that kind of talk-about-stuff-person, I’m not so good at it.’ (T2).

The Narrative of Swimmer Bethany – The Honest and Unworried One

Bethany’s parents have been very supportive throughout her life. Before swimming competitions, Bethany’s mother regularly told her: ‘ “I love you no matter how you perform!” ’ (T3). Considering school, Bethany have always been concerned about getting good grades. However, her parents: ‘Have been supportive and said that “you don’t have to get top grades in every class. You can do worse and still get places in life

despite of that” ’ (T3). Bethany has experienced to fail to do what significant others have expected from her, but support from her parents have blunted the impact of such experiences: ‘Oh, yes I have felt that. But again, my mom has been there and said: “Don’t let it upset you, it will be okay.” And then I have managed to leave it behind, don’t let it upset me.’ (T3).

Bethany’s teammates have also been supportive: ‘If I didn’t do so well on the national championship for instance, the group has supported me. (...) And that makes me (...) feel that I can perform poorly too. And don’t put so much pressure on myself’ (T3).

Looking back at the start of her relationship with Gary, Bethany emphasised: ‘In the beginning I had no problems and just swam. Never really talked to him. Asked about swimming technique sometimes’ (T2). Since then, their relationship has grown: ‘Now we have been through several championships and he has seen me both at my worst and at my best, so he has been able to understand more of my thoughts. Afterwards, we have been able to communicate much better’ (T2).

Bethany and Gary seem to collaborate and communicate well. For instance, if Bethany had swum poorly during a training session, she exemplified: ‘Then he has asked: “Is something going on?” and then I have explained it and he has come with a solution to the problem at hand’ (T2). If there have been any challenges, they try to solve it together: ‘He’s like: “What do you think of this?” Then I ask some questions, say something, and then I say like: “Well, what do you think?” And then he answers, (...) then we try to come up with a solution together’ (T1). Similarly, Bethany is proactive in her collaboration with Gary: ‘I often grab him and ask for technical feedback’ (T1). When asked how she makes herself understood, she simply stated: ‘I

just say it as it is' (T1). A practical example of how the honest communication influences Bethany's motivation and well-being, is the following story:

There was this junior tournament. (...) There it were some specific events. And I'm not good at them. (...) I didn't want to swim those events. (...) So, we talked together, and I said that I didn't want to swim those events. (...) That I would rather specialise in crawl than medley. (...) And then we came up with alternatives during training so I could avoid those exercises I didn't like. (...) We had another coach, (...) and he made me swim these exercises. (...) So, one day after training I started crying. (...) I couldn't do it anymore. And Gary saw it, he came up to me and asked what was going on. And I explained it to him, and it was then he actually realised how much I didn't want to go to that tournament. And then we came up with other solutions (T2).

After the first time I interviewed Bethany, she became sick. But as with everything else, she spoke honestly about it to Gary: 'I have spoken a lot with Gary because of [the disease]. (...) I've talked to Gary about the pauses in between the different workouts, that I must be careful to relax properly' (T2). At the last interview, Bethany highlighted that Gary once had suggested that she should leave the practice due to her illness. At the same time, she also recounted another coach who had asked her to leave when she swam poorly due to illness. The latter one though, did it in a more negative manner. Hence, she attributed their intentions very differently. She emphasised: 'I think Gary cares about me, while the other coach seemed to care more about my performance. He didn't care about me as me' (T3).

When she is competing at tournaments, Bethany wants to insure against errors of omission: 'If I'm going to swim a 200-meter race, I go out hard, and would rather blow it (...) than end up thinking 'I didn't give it my all' (T3). She believes that this mindset is similar to what the coaches want them to have: 'They regularly say that they don't want us to have anything left in the end. Because if you do, you probably could have gone even harder' (T3).

Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to explore: (a) how a shared reality is established, or fails to be established, over the course of the sporting partnership between the coach and his/her athletes; and (b) how experiencing a shared reality (or not) in the coach-athlete relationship is related to the experienced quality of the relationship the coach and his/her athletes develop and maintain over the course of a 9-month period. Our interpretations of the data indicated reciprocal and honest communication as a precursor of experiencing a shared reality, and further, that the relationship where both coach and athlete experienced a shared reality was the most functional relationship with the best performance development outcomes (e.g., well-being, perceived security, sustained engagement; Balish et al. 2014; Bergeron. et al 2015; Higgins 2019; Simpson 2007). Experiencing strain tests with the coach with a positive outcome seems to explain athletes' different trust levels towards the coach. Indeed, trust levels towards the coach did influence athlete communication.

It seems that Bethany experienced a high degree of shared reality with Gary. They communicate actively and honestly with each other, which makes it easy for them to know each other's inner states towards target referents (Echterhoff, Higgins, and Levine 2009). Their communication indicates that they are appropriately motivated to create a shared reality: Bethany is epistemically motivated to create a shared reality with

Gary as he is an experienced swimming coach, while Gary is epistemologically motivated to create a shared reality with Bethany as she is the expert regarding her interests and needs (Saw, Main, and Gustin 2016). Gary has proved for Bethany that he is to be trusted during strain tests (e.g., competitions where she was at her worst), thus increasing his perceived trustworthiness, and Bethany attributes his behaviour towards her as a result of him sincerely caring about her as a person (Simpson 2007). There seems to be a regulatory fit, as both Gary and Bethany seem to be predominately promotion-oriented (Higgins 2019).

What seems to be the main concern for Ann, is the regulatory nonfit. Due to a predominately prevention orientation, she has different inner states than Gary concerning goals and strivings (Higgins 2019). Even more, she fails to communicate her inner states which makes Gary believe there is a shared reality while there actually is none (Echterhoff, Higgins, and Levine 2009). The motives seem to be in order; however, it might be that due to earlier negative experiences (e.g., prior coaches) and a lack of perceived social support that Ann is afraid to say against Gary as she is afraid of him rejecting her or getting mad. Consequently, she accepts everything Gary says even though she disagrees. Meaning; Ann does not experience a shared reality. Unlike Bethany, Ann has not gone through any strain tests with Gary which potentially could have increased Ann's trust in Gary and strengthened their relationship (Simpson 2007).

Cathy is not alone being an adolescent girl experiencing pressure in Norway. A recent national survey found that 24% of adolescent girls experience pressure to perform well at sport, while 45 % experience pressure to perform well at school (Bakken 2019). High training loads and a stressful lifestyle is a risk factor potentially leading to injuries and decreased well-being (Moesch et al. 2018; Reardon et al. 2019; Schinke et al. 2017). Hence, when Gary decided to move Cathy to another training

group, in which she would receive a more suitable training load, it probably was for Cathy's best. However, considering Cathy's high standards to herself, she did not like what she perceived as being moved down. As with Ann, Cathy did not talk about her concerns with Gary. Gary then probably experienced a shared reality with Cathy that training with group C was unproblematic, while it challenged Cathy's motivation.

So far, findings have indicated that when athletes communicate dishonest or hold back relevant information, athletes do not experience a shared reality. Without experiencing a shared reality, outcomes of the coach-athlete relationship seem to be negative (Jowett and Poczwardowski 2007). Ann kept on lying, and in the end changed club, while Cathy's quiet struggle with sickness and pressure in the end made her quit organised swimming. Conversely, Bethany communicated actively with Gary and was always open and honest. Thus, she experienced a high degree of shared reality (Echterhoff, Higgins, and Levine 2009). She reported few problems even though performance was poor or if she was sick, likely due to trusting Gary and believing he wants the best for her as a person (Simpson 2007). Bethany was also the only one of these three who told about situations similar to strain tests (Simpson 2007), in which she experienced Gary behaving positively throughout, something that likely increased her willingness to eagerly communicate with Gary. This finding indicates the importance of coach support through bad times for youth athletic development (Bergeron et al. 2015, Mageau and Vallerand 2003).

From Gary's perspective, it may be that he believed there was a shared reality until proven otherwise (as may have been the case with Ann and Cathy). His emphasis on encouraging athletes to communicate their wishes shows that he was motivated to create a shared reality regarding swim training based on their contributions and opinions as well, not just his standard thoughts on athletic development (Echterhoff, Higgins, and

Levine 2009). However, verbal encouraging alone does not seem to be enough for athletes to open up honestly. This may be due to the power imbalance between athletes and coaches (Denison Mills, and Konoval 2017). Deutsch (1973) argued that those who perceive their partner to have greater power, are either more trusting or more suspicious. That is, power has an amplification effect on trust-perceptions. That could imply that athletes who have low level of trust towards their coach (i.e., is suspicious) withstand even more from behaviours that would make them vulnerable, for instance, honest communication (Korsgaard, Brower, and Lester 2015). However, Simpson (2007) argues that if the high-power partner consistently over time acts in a way that benefit the low-power partner, it could over time create a relationship very high on trust (i.e., a positive amplification effect). This is critical during strain tests (Simpson 2007). Neither Ann nor Cathy told about any strain tests with Gary. Perhaps the lack of increased trust and perceived security following a successful strain test is what made them withhold information or lying when communicating with Gary.

A comment must also be made on the coach's role regarding to whether the athletes experienced a regulatory fit or not, as it seems to have played a significant role regarding how the two narratives of Ann and Bethany turned out so differently (Higgins 2019). For instance, considering their competition strategies. Bethany is unafraid to be risky as she feels she has the support of family, friends, and Gary anyways. If she fails, she is likely to perceive it merely as an absence of something positive (Higgins 2019). Conversely, Ann, with her earlier negative coach experiences, is afraid of failing as she believes it will be followed by a presence of something negative (e.g., punishment; Higgins 2019). Thus, the lying and self-handicapping. Or consider the conversation at the training camp ending with Ann getting an extra workout per week, contrary to what she really wanted. From her perspective, the current training regime probably

represented a presence of something negative, and maybe a little rest would have done her well (Saw, Main, and Gastin 2016). From Gary's perspective, Ann's current training regime had an absence of something positive. The extra workout he suggested was supposed to fill this absence, while Ann perhaps experienced it as making the situation even worse. Finally, when Gary, ambitiously says to Ann that he believes she can post a certain time in three months, he mostly sees a potential success. Ann, on the other hand, mostly sees a potential failure (Higgins 2019). These stories show the importance of coaches thinking outside their predominately 'coaching-box' (Cushion 2018; Denison, Mills, and Konoval 2017). Gary may have experienced his promotion-style serving past athletes well. However, if unable to behave differently, there will occasionally be athletes like Ann who experience a regulatory nonfit. If coaches can reflect on their coaching behaviour regardless of their predominant orientation, they can see how different types of interactions suit different types of athletes.

Practical Implications

First, the narrative of Ann showed how experiences with earlier coaches reduced her willingness to make herself vulnerable with Gary, thus reducing the potential of the relationship (Korsgaard, Bower, and Lester 2015). It supports Dewey's (1938/2015) proposition that earlier experiences influence later experiences, and also aligns with John, Gropper, and Thiel (2019) findings that critical life events and how these are coped with are likely to influence how subsequent sport participation is experienced. Consequently, our call to all coaches, especially those coaching young athletes, is to be mindful of their coaching behaviour as it will likely have a major influence on how the athlete is likely to experience later coach-athlete relationships and thus sports engagement itself (Smoll and Smith 2020).

This notion actualises the next implication, which is, to use the Danish philosopher Søren Kierkegaard's words on the art of helping, to 'find him where he is and begin there (...) understand what he understands' (Kierkegaard 1859/1998, 45). Unfortunately, Gary did not seem to be aware of Ann's or Cathy's struggles, thus rendering him unable to help them. If coaches and athletes can honestly share their concerns and inner states, it enables the other to help, and then hopefully joint outcomes will become positive (Jowett and Poczwardowski 2007).

This brings us to the third implication, namely behaving in such a way that the interpersonal trust increases (Korsgaard, Brower, and Lester 2015; Simpson 2007). This is especially important for the coach, due to his greater power (Denison, Mills, and Konoval 2017; Deutsch 1973; Simpson 2007). Showing support through strain test seems to be of utmost importance, as our findings indicate that they are likely to make or break the motivation to share inner states.

Finally, on the behalf of the coach, findings from the current study remind of the importance of coach-reflection and to think outside the box (Cushion 2018; Denison, Mills, and Konoval 2017). Especially the relationship between Ann and Gary could benefit from Gary thinking and behaving outside of his 'promotion-box' so that Ann could have experienced a regulatory fit. The current study cannot say whether a promotion or prevention orientation is most beneficial for talent development; however it does seem to confirm prior research that a regulatory fit is advantageous (Fulmer et al. 201; Förster, Higgins, and Idson 1998; Higgins 2019; Spiegel, Grant-Pillow, and Higgins 2004).

Conclusion

Interpretations of participants stories indicates that experiencing a shared reality strengthens the relationship between coach and athlete, keeps both motivated and make them feel their strivings as worthwhile. Athletes who did not experience a shared reality seemed to be more dissatisfied with the relationship and their sporting engagement. For a shared reality to be experienced, honest communication, motivated by trust in the other, must be frequently utilised by both parties. Due to the power imbalance, it is especially important for coaches to behave supportive and trustworthy to advance the relationship. Finally, we believe that using SRT as a conceptual framework can prove to be a new, advancing avenue regarding research on the coach-athlete relationship (for details, see Echterhoff, Higgins, and Levine, 2009; Higgins, 2019). It is our opinion that SRT seems to encapsulate central elements for a profound coach-athlete relationship.

Declaration of interest statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

References

- Baker, Joseph, Jörg Schorer, and Nick Wattie. 2018. "Compromising talent: Issues in identifying and selecting talent in sport." *Quest* 70 (1):48-63. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2017.1333438>.
- Bakken, Anders. 2019. "Ungdata. Nasjonale resultater 2019, NOVA Rapport 9/19." In. Oslo: NOVA, OsloMet.
- Balish, Shea M, Colin McLaren, Daniel Rainham, and Chris Blanchard. 2014. "Correlates of youth sport attrition: A review and future directions." *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 15 (4):429-39. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.04.003>.
- Bergeron, Michael F, Margo Mountjoy, Neil Armstrong, Michael Chia, Jean Côté, Carolyn A Emery, Avery Faigenbaum, et al. 2015. "International Olympic Committee consensus statement on youth athletic development." *Br J Sports Med* 49 (13):843-51. doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2015-094962.

- Calman, Lynn, Lisa Brunton, and Alex Molassiotis. 2013. "Developing longitudinal qualitative designs: lessons learned and recommendations for health services research." *BMC medical research methodology* 13 (1):14. doi: 10.1186/1471-2288-13-14.
- Carless, David, and Kitrina Douglas. 2013. "Living, resisting, and playing the part of athlete: Narrative tensions in elite sport." *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 14 (5):701-8. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.05.003>.
- Casey, Ashley, Tim Fletcher, Lee Schaefer, and Doug Gleddie. 2018. *Conducting practitioner research in physical education and youth sport: Reflecting on practice*: Routledge.
- Clancy, Rachel B, Matthew P Herring, Tadhg Eoghan MacIntyre, and Mark J Campbell. 2016. "A review of competitive sport motivation research." *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 27:232-42. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.09.003>.
- Collins, Dave, Áine MacNamara, and Andrew Cruickshank. 2019. "Research and practice in talent identification and development—Some thoughts on the state of play." *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology* 31 (3):340-51. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2018.1475430>.
- Cornwell, James FM, Becca Franks, and E Tory Higgins. 2017. "Shared reality makes life meaningful: Are we really going in the right direction?" *Motivation Science* 3 (3):260. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/mot0000071>.
- Cushion, Christopher J. 2018. "Reflection and reflective practice discourses in coaching: A critical analysis." *Sport, Education and Society* 23 (1):82-94. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2016.1142961>.
- Davis, Louise, Sophia Jowett, and Susanne Tafvelin. 2019. "Communication strategies: The fuel for quality coach-athlete relationships and athlete satisfaction." *Frontiers in psychology* 10. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02156.
- Denison, Jim, Joseph P Mills, and Timothy Konoval. 2017. "Sports' disciplinary legacy and the challenge of 'coaching differently'." *Sport, Education and Society* 22 (6):772-83. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2015.1061986>.
- Deutsch, Morton. 1973. *The resolution of conflict: Constructive and destructive processes*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Dewey, John. 2015. *Experience & Education*. New York: Free Press.
- Echterhoff, Gerald, E Tory Higgins, and John M Levine. 2009. "Shared reality: Experiencing commonality with others' inner states about the world." *Perspectives on Psychological Science* 4 (5):496-521. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2009.01161.x>.
- Echterhoff, Gerald, Sonja Lang, Nicole Krämer, and E Tory Higgins. 2009. "Audience-tuning effects on memory: The role of audience status in sharing reality." *Social Psychology* 40 (3):150-63. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335.40.3.150>.
- Fulmer, C Ashley, Michele J Gelfand, Arie W Kruglanski, Chu Kim-Prieto, Ed Diener, Antonio Pierro, and E Tory Higgins. 2010. "On "feeling right" in cultural contexts: How person-culture match affects self-esteem and subjective well-being." *Psychological Science* 21 (11):1563-9. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610384742>.
- Förster, Jens, E Tory Higgins, and Lorraine Chen Idson. 1998. "Approach and avoidance strength during goal attainment: regulatory focus and the "goal looms larger" effect." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 75 (5):1115-31.
- Gjesdal, Siv, Andreas Stenling, Bård E Solstad, and Yngvar Ommundsen. 2019. "A study of coach-team perceptual distance concerning the coach-created

- motivational climate in youth sport." *Scandinavian journal of medicine & science in sports* 29 (1):132-43. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/sms.13306>.
- Guba, Egon G. 1990. *The paradigm dialog, The paradigm dialog*. Thousand Oaks, CA, US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Hagger, Martin S, and Nikos LD Chatzisarantis. 2009. "Assumptions in research in sport and exercise psychology." *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 10 (5):511-9. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2009.01.004>.
- Hardin, Curtis D., and E. Tory Higgins. 1996. "Shared reality: How social verification makes the subjective objective." In *Handbook of motivation and cognition, Vol. 3: The interpersonal context.*, edited by Richard M Sorrentino and E Tory Higgins, 28-84. New York, NY, US: The Guilford Press.
- Harwood, Chris G, Richard J Keegan, Jonathan MJ Smith, and Adam S Raine. 2015. "A systematic review of the intrapersonal correlates of motivational climate perceptions in sport and physical activity." *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 18:9-25. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.11.005>.
- Hermanowicz, Joseph C. 2016. "Longitudinal qualitative research." In *Handbook of the Life Course. Handbooks of Sociology and Social Research*, edited by Shanahan M., Mortimer J. and Kirkpatrick Johnson M., 491-513. Cham: Springer.
- Higgins, E Tory. 1997. "Beyond pleasure and pain." *American psychologist* 52 (12):1280-300. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.12.1280>.
- . 2000. "Making a good decision: value from fit." *American psychologist* 55 (11):1217-30. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.11.1217>.
- . 2019. *Shared reality: What makes us strong and tears us apart*: Oxford University Press.
- Hovland, Carl I, Irving Lester Janis, and Harold H Kelley. 1953. *Communication and persuasion: Psychological studies of opinion change*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- John, Jannika M, Hannes Gropper, and Ansgar Thiel. 2019. "The role of critical life events in the talent development pathways of athletes and musicians: A systematic review." *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*:101565. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2019.101565>.
- Johnston, Kathryn, Nick Wattie, Jörg Schorer, and Joseph Baker. 2018. "Talent identification in sport: a systematic review." *Sports Medicine* 48 (1):97-109. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40279-017-0803-2>.
- Jowett, Sophia. 2017a. "At the heart of effective sport leadership lies the dyadic coach-athlete relationship." *Sport and Exercise Psychology Review* 13 (1):62-4. doi: 10.13140/RG.2.1.2427.5449.
- . 2017b. "Coaching effectiveness: The coach–athlete relationship at its heart." *Current Opinion in Psychology* 16:154-8. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.05.006>.
- Jowett, Sophia, and Artur Poczwardowski. 2007. "Understanding the Coach-Athlete Relationship." In *Social Psychology in Sport*, edited by Sophia Jowett and David Lavallee, 3-14. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Kierkegaard, Søren. 1998. *The point of view*. Translated by H. V. Hong and E. H. Hong. Edited by H. V. Hong and E. H. Hong. Vol. 22, *Kierkegaard's Writings*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Korsgaard, M Audrey, Holly H Brower, and Scott W Lester. 2015. "It isn't always mutual: A critical review of dyadic trust." *Journal of management* 41 (1):47-70. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314547521>.

- Lincoln, Yvonna S., Susan A. Lynham, and Egon G. Guba. 2018. "Paradigmatic controversies contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited." In *The Sage handbook of qualitative research landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues*, edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln, 108-50. Los Angeles, California: Sage.
- Mageau, Geneviève A, and Robert J Vallerand. 2003. "The coach–athlete relationship: A motivational model." *Journal of sports science* 21 (11):883-904. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0264041031000140374>.
- Moesch, Karin, Göran Kenttä, Jens Kleinert, Cédric Quignon-Fleuret, Sarah Cecil, and Maurizio Bertollo. 2018. "FEPSAC position statement: mental health disorders in elite athletes and models of service provision." *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 38:61-71. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.05.013>.
- Møllerløkken, Nina Elise, Håvard Lorås, and Arve Vorland Pedersen. 2017. "A comparison of players' and coaches' perceptions of the coach-created motivational climate within youth soccer teams." *Frontiers in psychology* 8:109. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00109>.
- Norris, Luke A, Faye F Didymus, and Mariana Kaiseler. 2017. "Stressors, coping, and well-being among sports coaches: A systematic review." *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 33:93-112. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.08.005>.
- Papathomas, Anthony. 2016. "Narrative inquiry: From cardinal to marginal... and back?" In *Routledge handbook of qualitative research in sport and exercise*, edited by Brett Smith and Andrew C Sparkes, 37-48. London: Routledge.
- Patton, Michael Quinn. 2015. *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice*: Sage publications.
- Phoenix, Cassandra, and Brett Smith. 2011. "Telling a (good?) counterstory of aging: Natural bodybuilding meets the narrative of decline." *Journals of Gerontology Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences* 66 (5):628-39. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/geronb/gbr077>.
- Rearidon, Claudia L, Brian Hainline, Cindy Miller Aron, David Baron, Antonia L Baum, Abhinav Bindra, Richard Budgett, et al. 2019. "Mental health in elite athletes: International Olympic Committee consensus statement (2019)." *British journal of sports medicine* 53 (11):667-99. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2019-100715>.
- Riessman, Catherine Kohler. 2008. *Narrative methods for the human sciences*: Sage.
- Rocchi, Meredith, and Luc Pelletier. 2018. "How does coaches' reported interpersonal behavior align with athletes' perceptions? Consequences for female athletes' psychological needs in sport." *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology* 7 (2):141. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000116>.
- Saw, Anna E, Luana C Main, and Paul B Gustin. 2016. "Monitoring the athlete training response: subjective self-reported measures trump commonly used objective measures: a systematic review." *Br J Sports Med* 50 (5):281-91. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bjsports-2015-094758>.
- Schinke, Robert J, Natalia B Stambulova, Gangyan Si, and Zella Moore. 2017. "International society of sport psychology position stand: Athletes' mental health, performance, and development." *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology* 16 (6):622-39. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2017.1295557>.
- Simpson, Jeffrey A. 2007. "Foundations of interpersonal trust." In *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles*, edited by E Tory Higgins, 587-607. New York: Guilford.

- Smith, Brett, and Kerry R McGannon. 2018. "Developing rigor in qualitative research: Problems and opportunities within sport and exercise psychology." *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology* 11 (1):101-21. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2017.1317357>.
- Smith, Brett, and Andrew C Sparkes. 2009a. "Narrative analysis and sport and exercise psychology: Understanding lives in diverse ways." *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 10 (2):279-88. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2008.07.012>.
- . 2009b. "Narrative inquiry in sport and exercise psychology: What can it mean, and why might we do it?" *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 10 (1):1-11. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2008.01.004>.
- Smith, John K. 1984. "The problem of criteria for judging interpretive inquiry." *Educational evaluation and policy analysis* 6 (4):379-91. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3102/01623737006004379>.
- Smith, Ronald E, Frank L Smoll, and Earl Hunt. 1977. "A system for the behavioral assessment of athletic coaches." *Research Quarterly. American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation* 48 (2):401-7. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10671315.1977.10615438>.
- Smoll, Frank L, and Ronald E Smith. 1989. "Leadership Behaviors in Sport: A Theoretical Model and Research Paradigm 1." *Journal of applied social psychology* 19 (18):1522-51.
- . 2020. "Educating Youth Sports Coaches: An Empirically Supported Training Program." In *Coach Education Essentials: Your Guide to Developing Sport Coaches*, edited by Kristen Dieffenbach and Melissa Thompson, 93-110. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Solstad, Bård Erlend, Andreas Ivarsson, Ellen Merethe Haug, and Yngvar Ommundsen. 2018. "Youth sport coaches' well-being across the season: The psychological costs and benefits of giving empowering and disempowering sports coaching to athletes." *International Sport Coaching Journal* 5 (2):124-35. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1123/iscj.2017-0026>.
- Solstad, Bård Erlend, Aurélie van Hoye, and Yngvar Ommundsen. 2015. "Social-contextual and intrapersonal antecedents of coaches' basic need satisfaction: The intervening variable effect of providing autonomy-supportive coaching." *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 20:84-93. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.05.001>.
- Sparkes, Andrew C, and Brett Smith. 2003. "Men, sport, spinal cord injury and narrative time." *Qualitative research* 3 (3):295-320. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794103033002>.
- . 2009. "Judging the quality of qualitative inquiry: Criteriology and relativism in action." *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* 10 (5):491-7. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2009.02.006>.
- Spiegel, Scott, Heidi Grant-Pillow, and E Tory Higgins. 2004. "How regulatory fit enhances motivational strength during goal pursuit." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 34 (1):39-54. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.180>.
- Stebbing, Juliette, Ian M Taylor, and Christopher M Spray. 2016. "Interpersonal mechanisms explaining the transfer of well-and ill-being in coach-athlete dyads." *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology* 38 (3):292-304. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.2015-0172>.
- Thomson, Rachel, and Janet Holland. 2003. "Hindsight, foresight and insight: The challenges of longitudinal qualitative research." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 6 (3):233-44. doi: 10.1080/1364557032000091833.

- Turnnidge, Jennifer, and Jean Côté. 2018. "Applying transformational leadership theory to coaching research in youth sport: A systematic literature review." *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology* 16 (3):327-42. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2016.1189948>.
- Wieselquist, Jennifer, Caryl E Rusbult, Craig A Foster, and Christopher R Agnew. 1999. "Commitment, pro-relationship behavior, and trust in close relationships." *Journal of personality and social psychology* 77 (5):942-66. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.5.942>.
- Yates, Lyn. 2003. "Interpretive claims and methodological warrant in small-number qualitative, longitudinal research." *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 6 (3):223-32. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000091824>.

Abbreviations

AGT	Achievement Goal Theory
ASC	Autonomy supportive coaching
IOC	International Olympic Committee
LQR	Longitudinal Qualitative Research
NSD	The Norwegian Centre for Research Data (Norsk Senter for Forskningsdata)
SDT	Self-Determination Theory
SRT	Shared Reality Theory
T1	The first round of the present study's data collection
T2	The second round of the present study's data collection
T3	The third round of the present study's data collection

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Notification Form for Processing Personal Data

5.5.2020

Meldeskjema for behandling av personopplysninger



Meldeskjema 510337

Sist oppdatert

29.01.2020

Hvilke personopplysninger skal du behandle?

- Navn (også ved signatur/samtykke)
- E-postadresse, IP-adresse eller annen nettidentifikator
- Bilder eller videoopptak av personer
- Lydopptak av personer
- Bakgrunnsopplysninger som vil kunne identifisere en person

Type opplysninger

Du har svart ja til at du skal behandle bakgrunnsopplysninger, beskriv hvilke

Fødselsår, kjønn, alder, erfaring fra sone/krets/landslag, trener-utøver-relasjon over tid, trener bakgrunn/erfaring/utdanning

Skal du behandle særlige kategorier personopplysninger eller personopplysninger om straffedommer eller lovovertridelser?

Nei

Prosjektinformasjon

Prosjektittel

Trener-utøver-relasjonen over tid.

Begrunn behovet for å behandle personopplysningene

Innsamlingsformålet er å samle inn data til å se på hvordan trener-utøverrelasjonen erfarer ledelse over tid. Vi vil se på nivå (kretslag/landslag), lederskikkelser i utøvergruppen.

Ekstern finansiering

Type prosjekt

Studentprosjekt, masterstudium

Kontaktinformasjon, student

Morten Granerud, morten_granerud@hotmail.com, tlf: 48078340

Behandlingsansvar

Behandlingsansvarlig institusjon

Norges idrettshøgskole / Seksjon for coaching og psykologi

Prosjektansvarlig (vitenskapelig ansatt/veileder eller stipendiat)

Bård Erlend Solstad, b.e.solstad@nih.no, tlf: 23262429

Skal behandlingsansvaret deles med andre institusjoner (felles behandlingsansvarlige)?

Nei

Utvalg 1

Beskriv utvalget

Utøverutvalget er fra 16-19 år og 20-30 år. Trenerutvalget vil være 20-50 år. Alle utvalg vil bli fulgt maksimalt fire målinger.

Rekruttering eller trekking av utvalget

Kontakte klubber

Alder

16 - 50

Inngår det voksne (18 år +) i utvalget som ikke kan samtykke selv?

Nei

Personopplysninger for utvalg 1

- Navn (også ved signatur/samtykke)
- E-postadresse, IP-adresse eller annen nettidentifikator
- Bilder eller videoopptak av personer
- Lydopptak av personer
- Bakgrunnsopplysninger som vil kunne identifisere en person

Hvordan samler du inn data fra utvalg 1?

Personlig intervju

Grunnlag for å behandle alminnelige kategorier av personopplysninger

Samtykke (art. 6 nr. 1 bokstav a)

Hvem samtykker for ungdom 16 og 17 år?

Ungdom

Papirbasert spørreskjema**Grunnlag for å behandle alminnelige kategorier av personopplysninger**

Samtykke (art. 6 nr. 1 bokstav a)

Hvem samtykker for ungdom 16 og 17 år?

Ungdom

Informasjon for utvalg 1**Informerer du utvalget om behandlingen av opplysningene?**

Ja

Hvordan?

Skriftlig informasjon (papir eller elektronisk)

Tredjepersoner

Skal du behandle personopplysninger om tredjepersoner?

Nei

Dokumentasjon

Hvordan dokumenteres samtykkene?

- Elektronisk (e-post, e-skjema, digital signatur)
- Manuelt (papir)

Hvordan kan samtykket trekkes tilbake?

En registrert som ikke ønsker å være med på studien har rett til å trekke seg når han/hun vil. Dette er noe som blir presisert i informasjonen de skal få. Forsøkspersoner kan sende direkte melding til de som er ansvarlige for å trekke seg eller si det muntlig når som helst.

Hvordan kan de registrerte få innsyn, rettet eller slettet opplysninger om seg selv?

En registrert kan få innsyn ved å kontakte de ansvarlige for prosjektet og spørre om å få kontrollere egne persondata. Alle deltakere får et ID nummer. De kontakter forskningsgruppen og ber oss endre informasjon om deltaker X.

Totalt antall registrerte i prosjektet

1-99

Tillatelser

Skal du innhente følgende godkjenninger eller tillatelser for prosjektet?

- Annen godkjenning

Annen godkjenning

Etisk komité for idrettsvitenskapelig forskning på mennesker ved Norges Idrettshøyskole (Vedlegget er bare et eksempel).

Behandling

Hvor behandles opplysningene?

- Mobile enheter tilhørende behandlingsansvarlig institusjon
- Fysisk isolert maskinvare tilhørende behandlingsansvarlig institusjon

Hvem behandler/har tilgang til opplysningene?

- Prosjektansvarlig
- Student (studentprosjekt)

Tilgjengeliggjøres opplysningene utenfor EU/EØS til en tredjestat eller internasjonal organisasjon?

Nei

Sikkerhet

Oppbevares personopplysningene atskilt fra øvrige data (kodenøkkel)?

Ja

Hvilke tekniske og fysiske tiltak sikrer personopplysningene?

- Opplysningene anonymiseres
- Adgangsbegrensning
- Andre sikkerhetstiltak

Hvilke

Forsøkspersonene og informasjonen som bli inhentet kodes med tall og/eller bokstaver

Varighet

Prosjektperiode

01.03.2019 - 30.06.2020

Skal data med personopplysninger oppbevares utover prosjektperioden?

Nei, data vil bli oppbevart uten personopplysninger (anonymisering)

Hvor oppbevares opplysningene?

Internt ved behandlingsansvarlig institusjon

Hvilke anonymiseringstiltak vil bli foretatt?

- Lyd- eller bildeopptak slettes
- Personidentifiserbare opplysninger fjernes, omskrives eller grovkategoriseres

Vil de registrerte kunne identifiseres (direkte eller indirekte) i oppgave/avhandling/øvrige publikasjoner fra prosjektet?

Nei

Tilleggsopplysninger

Appendix 2 – NSD's Assessment of the Project

19.5.2020

Meldeskjema for behandling av personopplysninger

Kontaktperson hos NSD: Kajsa Amundsen
Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

11.11.2019 - Assessed

NSD har vurdert endringen registrert 11.11.2019.

Vi har nå registrert 31.12.2019 som ny sluttdato for forskningsperioden. Vi gjør oppmerksom på at ytterligere forlengelse ikke kan påregnes uten at utvalget informeres om forlengelsen.

NSD vil følge opp ved ny planlagt avslutning for å avklare om behandlingen av personopplysningene er avsluttet.

Lykke til videre med prosjektet!

Kontaktperson hos NSD: Kajsa Amundsen
Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

04.03.2019 - Assessed

NSD har vurdert endringene registrert 26.02.2019.

Det er vår vurdering at behandlingen av personopplysninger i prosjektet vil være i samsvar med personvernlovgivningen så fremt den gjennomføres i tråd med det som er dokumentert i meldeskjemaet med vedlegg den 04.03.2019. Behandlingen kan fortsette.

OPPFØLGING AV PROSJEKTET

NSD vil følge opp ved planlagt avslutning for å avklare om behandlingen av personopplysningene er avsluttet.

Lykke til med prosjektet!

Kontaktperson hos NSD: Kajsa Amundsen
Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

21.02.2019 - Assessed

Det er vår vurdering at behandlingen av personopplysninger i prosjektet vil være i samsvar med personvernlovgivningen så fremt den gjennomføres i tråd med det som er dokumentert i meldeskjemaet med vedlegg den 21.02.2019, samt i meldingsdialogen mellom innmelder og NSD. Behandlingen kan starte.

MELD ENDRINGER

Dersom behandlingen av personopplysninger endrer seg, kan det være nødvendig å melde dette til NSD ved å oppdatere meldeskjemaet. På våre nettsider informerer vi om hvilke endringer som må meldes. Vent på svar før endringer gjennomføres.

TYPE OPPLYSNINGER OG VARIGHET

Prosjektet vil behandle alminnelige kategorier av personopplysninger frem til 30.06.2020.

LOVLIG GRUNNLAG

Prosjektet vil innhente samtykke fra de registrerte til behandlingen av personopplysninger. Vår vurdering er at prosjektet legger opp til et samtykke i samsvar med kravene i art. 4 og 7, ved at det er en frivillig, spesifikk, informert og utvetydig bekreftelse som kan dokumenteres, og som den registrerte kan trekke tilbake. Lovlig grunnlag for behandlingen vil dermed være den registrertes samtykke, jf. personvernforordningen art. 6 nr. 1 bokstav a.

PERSONVERNPRINSIPPER

NSD vurderer at den planlagte behandlingen av personopplysninger vil følge prinsippene i

<https://meldeskjema.nsd.no/vurdering/5c347396-12d6-41bd-b293-f8020f4d8b29>

2/3

personvernforordningen om:

- lovlighet, rettferdighet og åpenhet (art. 5.1 a), ved at de registrerte får tilfredsstillende informasjon om og samtykker til behandlingen
- formålsbegrensning (art. 5.1 b), ved at personopplysninger samles inn for spesifikke, uttrykkelig angitte og berettigede formål, og ikke behandles til nye, uforenlige formål
- dataminimering (art. 5.1 c), ved at det kun behandles opplysninger som er adekvate, relevante og nødvendige for formålet med prosjektet
- lagringsbegrensning (art. 5.1 e), ved at personopplysningene ikke lagres lengre enn nødvendig for å oppfylle formålet

DE REGISTRERTES RETTIGHETER

Så lenge de registrerte kan identifiseres i datamaterialet vil de ha følgende rettigheter: åpenhet (art. 12), informasjon (art. 13), innsyn (art. 15), retting (art. 16), sletting (art. 17), begrensning (art. 18), underretning (art. 19), dataportabilitet (art. 20).

NSD vurderer at informasjonen om behandlingen som de registrerte vil motta oppfyller lovens krav til form og innhold, jf. art. 12.1 og art. 13.

Vi minner om at hvis en registrert tar kontakt om sine rettigheter, har behandlingsansvarlig institusjon plikt til å svare innen en måned.

FØLG DIN INSTITUSJONS RETNINGSLINJER

NSD legger til grunn at behandlingen oppfyller kravene i personvernforordningen om riktighet (art. 5.1 d), integritet og konfidensialitet (art. 5.1. f) og sikkerhet (art. 32).

For å forsikre dere om at kravene oppfylles, må dere følge interne retningslinjer og/eller rådføre dere med behandlingsansvarlig institusjon.

OPPFØLGING AV PROSJEKTET

NSD vil følge opp ved planlagt avslutning for å avklare om behandlingen av personopplysningene er avsluttet.

Lykke til med prosjektet!

Kontaktperson hos NSD: Kajsa Amundsen
Tlf. Personverntjenester: 55 58 21 17 (tast 1)

Appendix 3 – Approval from The Ethical Committee of The Norwegian School of Sport Sciences

Bård Erlend Solstad
Seksjon for coaching og psykologi

OSLO 26. februar 2019

Søknad 88 -131218 – 070319 -Trener-utøver relasjon over tid

Vi viser til tidligere innsendt søknad, vedtak datert 16. desember 2018, mail datert 24. januar 2019, revidert søknad, prosjektbeskrivelse, informasjonsskriv, samtykkeskjema og innsendte meldinger til NSD. Det vises også til dialog mellom prosjektleder.

Vurdering

Punkt 1.6 Prosjektmedarbeidere i søknadsskjemaet er ikke fullstendig i forhold til redegjørelsen for prosjektdeltakere i prosjektplanen.

Forskningsdata ved NIH skal lagres i 5 år etter prosjektslutt for etterprøvnbarhet og kontroll. Samtykkeskjemaet mangler denne opplysningen. Samtykkeskjemaene og intervjuguiden som er sendt til NSD for masterprosjektene til Granerud og Fredriksen er ulike dokumentene som fulgte søknaden til etisk komite. Prosjektleder har bekreftet at det er samtykkeskjemaet og intervjuguiden som fulgte søknaden til etisk komite som skal benyttes.

Antall forskningsdeltakere er 3-4 utøvere for hver idrettsgren og 3 trenere. Utvalget er lite, og det er derfor viktig at en vurderer hvordan anonymitet sikres ved publisering av resultatene. Det bemerkes at unge utøvere kan oppleve det noe ubehagelig å snakke om relasjonen til sin trener. Prosjektleder har et selvstendig ansvar for å påse at dette håndteres på en forsvarlig måte.

I henhold til retningslinjer for behandling av søknad til etisk komite for idrettsvitenskapelig forskning på mennesker, har leder av komiteen på fullmakt konkludert med følgende:

Vedtak

På bakgrunn av forelagte dokumentasjon anses prosjektet forsvarlig. Til vedtaket er følgende forutsetning til grunn:

- *At samtykkeskjemaet oppdateres med 5 års lagringstid – OK.*
- *At det sendes inn endringsmelding til NSD om samtykkeskjema og intervjuguide (skjema/guide som var vedlagt søknaden til etisk komite) – OK.*

- *At vilkår fra NSD følges – OK.*
- *At prosjektbeskrivelsen oppdateres med en vurdering av hvordan en skal sikre anonymitet ved publisering og hvordan ev ubehag for unge utøvere ved å snakke om trener-relasjonen kan håndteres*

Det gjøres oppmerksom på at vedtaket er avgrenset i tråd med fremlagte dokumentasjon. Dersom det gjøres vesentlige endringer i prosjektet som kan ha betydning for deltakernes helse og sikkerhet, skal dette legges fram for komiteen før eventuelle endringer kan iverksettes.

Med vennlig hilsen

Professor Sigmund Loland
Leder, Etisk komite, Norges idrettshøgskole

Appendix 4 – Purpose of Study & Declaration of Consent

Forskningsprosjekt ved Norges idrettshøgskole: “Gjensidighet i trener-utøver relasjonen i svømming”?

Dette er et spørsmål til deg om å delta [som trener eller utøver i svømming] i et forskningsprosjekt, hvor formålet er å undersøke hvordan trener og utøver i svømming opplever hverandre i løpet av en sesong. I dette skrivet gir vi deg informasjon om målene for prosjektet og hva deltakelse vil innebære for trener og utøver.

Formål

Formålet med prosjektet er å følge en gruppe svømmere og deres trener gjennom en sesong med hensikt å undersøke gjensidighet i trener-utøver relasjonen. Studiens primære mål vil være å undersøke hvordan trener og hans/hennes utøvere opplever hverandre i løpet av en sesong. I tillegg vil studien undersøke variasjon i et utvalg psykososiale utfallsvariabler. Det er mye som rører seg i hverdagslivet til unge utøvere. Det er derfor av stor interesse å få tak i treneres og utøveres egne opplevelser og erfaringer fra å delta i et talentutviklingsmiljø i Norge.

Problemstilling 1: Hvordan foregår selve interaksjonen mellom trener og utøver i løpet av en sesong?

Problemstilling 2: Hvordan er sammenhengen mellom interaksjonen mellom trener og utøvere og trivselen til treneren og utøverne i løpet av en sesong?

Dette er et forskningsprosjekt som er knyttet til seksjon for coaching og psykologi ved Norges idrettshøgskole. Opplysningene som forskningsprosjektet samler inn vil bli brukt i internasjonale publikasjoner som drøfter utfordringer rundt deltakelse i junior elite idrett.

Hvem er ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet?

Bård Erlend Solstad (Ph.D.) er ansvarlig for dette prosjektet.

Hvorfor får du spørsmål om å delta?

Lambertseter svømmeklubb har blitt spurt om å delta i et prosjekt som ønsker å undersøke trener-utøver relasjonen i løpet av en sesong. Grunnen til dette er hovedsakelig knyttet til ønsket om å sammenligne junior elite utøvere innenfor ulike prestasjonsdomener (f.eks. idrett og kunst).

Kontaktopplysningene har vi fått tilgang til via Norges Svømmeforbund.

Hva innebærer det for deg å delta?

- Det vil bli samlet inn data flere ganger i løpet av 2019:
 - Uke 12: Dybdeintervju med trener.
 - Uke 13: Dybdeintervju med hver enkelt utøver.
 - Uke 24: Dybdeintervju med trener.
 - Uke 24: Dybdeintervju med hver enkelt utøver.
 - Uke 49: Dybdeintervju med trener.
 - Uke 49: Dybdeintervju med hver enkelt utøver.
- Intervjuene vil ha en varighet på ca. 45 minutter, og omhandler spørsmål omkring deltakelse i svømming og trener-utøver relasjonen.
- Deltakerne kan få se intervjuguiden på forhånd ved å ta kontakt med ansvarlig for forskningsprosjektet (Forsker Bård Erlend Solstad).

Det er frivillig å delta

Det er frivillig å delta i forskningsprosjektet. Hvis trener/utøver velger å delta, kan trener/utøver når som helst trekke samtykke tilbake uten å oppgi noen grunn. Alle opplysninger om trener/utøver vil da bli anonymisert. Det vil ikke ha noen negative konsekvenser for trener/utøver hvis trener/utøver ikke vil delta eller senere velger å trekke seg.

Ditt personvern – hvordan vi oppbevarer og bruker dine opplysninger

Vi vil bare bruke opplysningene om trener/utøver til formålene vi har fortalt om i dette informasjonsskrivet. Vi behandler opplysningene konfidensielt og i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

- Alle personopplysninger vil bli behandlet konfidensielt. Det er kun forskergruppen ved Norges idrettshøgskole som vil få tilgang til personopplysningene. Personopplysningene vil lagres i et brannsikkert skap som vil være adskilt fra øvrige data ved hjelp av en koblingsnøkkel. Forskergruppen kommer også til å lagre datamaterialet på en egen forskningsserver.
- I tillegg er det verdt å nevne at det vil være umulig å gjenkjenne deltakerne i publikasjoner, da synonymer vil bli brukt på alle deltakere.
- Det er også viktig å påpeke at verken navn på svømmeklubb, eller treningsgruppe på deltakerne, kommer til å nevnes i fremtidige publikasjoner.
- Før studien blir sendt inn til publisering, vil alle deltakerne få mulighet til å se igjennom sitatene og godkjenne brukte sitater.
- I denne studien vil trenere og utøvere omtale hverandre. Ved å samtykke godtar du at dere omtaler hverandre i løpet av prosjektperioden. Det som blir sagt, vil ikke bli delt med den omtalte av forskergruppen.

Hva skjer med personopplysningene når vi avslutter forskningsprosjektet?

Prosjektet skal etter planen avsluttes 30.06.20. Etter endt datainnsamling, vil innsamlet data bli anonymisert. Prosjektleder vil derfor: **(a)** slette koblingsnøkkelen, **(b)** omskrive indirekte identifiserbare opplysninger, og **(c)** slette lydopptak. I tillegg er det verdt å merke seg at forskningsdata ved NIH skal lagres i 5 år etter prosjektslutt for etterprøvbarehet og kontroll.

Dine rettigheter

Så lenge du kan identifiseres i datamaterialet, har du rett til:

- innsyn i hvilke personopplysninger som er registrert om deg,
- å få rettet personopplysninger om deg,
- få slettet personopplysninger om deg,
- få utlevert en kopi av dine personopplysninger (dataportabilitet), og
- å sende klage til personvernombudet eller Datatilsynet om behandlingen av dine personopplysninger.

Hva gir oss rett til å behandle personopplysninger om deg?

Vi behandler opplysninger om deg basert på ditt samtykke.

På oppdrag fra *Norges idrettshøgskole* har NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS vurdert at behandlingen av personopplysninger i dette prosjektet er i samsvar med personvernregelverket.

Hvor kan jeg, som trener og utøver, finne ut mer?

Hvis du har spørsmål til studien, eller ønsker å benytte deg av dine rettigheter, ta kontakt med:

- Norges idrettshøgskole ved Bård Erlend Solstad, tlf: 90 11 42 08 eller epost: b.e.solstad@nih.no.
- Vårt personvernombud: Karine Justad, tlf: 23 26 20 89 eller epost: karine.justad@nih.no.
- NSD – Norsk senter for forskningsdata AS, på epost (personverntjenester@nsd.no) eller telefon: 55 58 21 17.

Med vennlig hilsen

Bård Erlend Solstad (Ph.D.)
Prosjektansvarlig (Forsker, Forskningscenteret for Barne- og Ungdomsidrett)

Samtykkeerklæring

Jeg har mottatt og forstått informasjon om prosjektet *gjensidighet i trener-utøver relasjonen i svømming*, og har fått anledning til å stille spørsmål. Jeg samtykker til:

- å delta i tre dybdeintervjuer

Jeg samtykker til at mine opplysninger behandles frem til prosjektet er avsluttet, ca. november 2019

(Signert av prosjektdeltaker, sted, dato)

(Signert av foresatte, sted dato)

Appendix 5 – Interview Guide at T1

1

Spørsmål som starter med **x.** skal ikke brukes i løpet av intervjuet. Disse spørsmålene skal **kun** brukes som en kontroll av den som intervjuer.

Intervjuguide til trenere

Den indre tilstanden:

- 1) Kan du beskrive dine tanker (overbevisning) når det gjelder å utvikle unge utøvere?
Hvor kommer disse tankene fra?
 - a. **x.** Definisjon av overbevisning: Gjør det tydelig for treneren.
 - b. **x.** OLT, klubb, foreldre, venner, kjæreste, osv.
- 2) Kan du beskrive hvilke verdier du har som trener?
 - a. I hvilken grad preger disse verdiene dine trener-utøver relasjoner?
- 3) Kan du beskrive samspillet ditt med dine utøvere på treningsfeltet?
 - i. **x.** Samspill: Må følges opp med tilleggsord/begreper (f.eks. samarbeid, komme overens, bry seg, sette seg inn i den andres sted).
 - b. Trenere kan ha forskjellige forventninger og holdninger til sine utøvere. Hva tenker du om dette når det gjelder deg og dine egne utøvere?

Utvikling av felles mål:

- 4) Kan du beskrive hvilke overordnede mål du har som trener?
 - a. **x.** Langsiktige og kortsiktige mål.
- 5) Når man jobber over tid i en trener-utøver relasjon, vil man muligens utvikle sammenfallende og/eller ulike typer mål. Hvordan er dette for deg?
 - a. **x.** Meg: Hvilke mål har du som trener?
 - b. **x.** Deg: Hvilke mål har utøverne dine?
 - c. **x.** Oss - metaperspektiv: Har treneren og utøverne de samme målene? I hvilken grad samsvarer disse målene?

- 6) Kan du beskrive hvilke mål som er satt for den kommende sesongen? Kan du utdype med tanke på hver enkelt utøver?
- 7) Kan du beskrive hvilke krav (standard) du har til utøverne dine på treningsfeltet?
- a. Mental
 - b. Fysisk
 - c. Teknisk
 - d. Taktisk
 - e. Livsstil

Prosessen:

- 8) Hva er motivasjonen din for å trene utøverne dine? Hva motiverer deg for å gå på trening hver dag, uke og måned?
- 9) Hvorfor planlegger og gjennomfører du de ulike treningsøktene (økt, ukentlig, månedlig og sesong), slik som du gjør?
- a. Individuelt og lag.
 - b. Sett i lys av mentalt, fysisk, teknisk, taktisk og livsstil perspektiver.
- 10) Kan du beskrive hvordan dere (trener-utøver) jobber sammen i treningsprosessen? Hvordan sørger du for at samspillet mellom deg og utøverne dine blir best mulig?
- 11) Kommunikasjon er noe som er sentralt i trener-utøver relasjonen. Hvordan gjør du deg forstått hos dine utøvere?
- a. Hvordan kommuniserer du med dem?
- 12) Hvordan ser samspillet og kommunikasjonen mellom deg og dine utøvere ut på en vanlig hverdag på treningsfeltet?

Intervjuguide til utøvere

Den indre tilstanden:

- 1) Kan du beskrive dine tanker når det gjelder å utvikle deg selv som utøver? Hvor kommer disse tankene fra?
 - a. Definisjon av overbevisning: Gjør det tydelig for utøveren.
 - b. OLT, klubb, foreldre, venner, kjæreste, osv.
- 2) Kan du beskrive hvilke verdier (holdninger) du har som utøver med tanke på å utvikle ditt eget idrettslige potensial?
 - a. I hvilken grad er disse verdiene til stede i din trener-utøver relasjon?
- 3) Kan du beskrive samspillet ditt med din trener på treningsfeltet?
 - a. Unge utøvere har ulike forventninger og holdninger til sine trenere. Hvordan ser dette ut for deg med tanke på din trener?
 - b. Samspill: Må følges opp med tilleggsord/begreper (f.eks. samarbeid, komme overens, bry seg, sette seg inn i den andres sted).

Utvikling av felles mål:

- 4) Kan du beskrive hvilke overordnede mål du har som utøver?
 - a. Langsiktige og kortsiktige mål.
- 5) Når du jobber med trener-utøver relasjon over tid, vil dere muligens kunne utvikle like eller ulike typer mål. Har du noen erfaringer med dette (hvordan er det i din situasjon)?
 - a. Meg: Hvilke mål har du?
 - b. Deg: Hvilke mål har treneren din?
 - c. Oss - metaperspektiv: Har utøveren og treneren de samme målene? I hvilken grad samsvarer disse målene?

- 6) Kan du beskrive hvilke mål som er satt for deg (din treningsgruppe) den kommende sesongen?
- 7) Kan du beskrive hvilke krav (standard) du har til deg selv som utøver på treningsfeltet (hvilke krav som stilles av treneren)?
- a. Mental.
 - b. Fysisk.
 - c. Teknisk.
 - d. Taktisk.
 - e. Livsstil.

Prosessen:

- 8) Hva er motivasjonen din for å holde på med [idrett]? Hva motiverer deg for å gå på trening hver dag, uke og måned?
- 9) Har du påvirkning på planleggingen og gjennomføringen av de ulike treningsøktene (økt, ukentlig, månedlig og sesong)? I så fall hva slags type påvirkning?
- a. Individuelt og lag.
 - b. Sett i lys av mentalt, fysisk, teknisk, taktisk og livsstil perspektiver.
- 10) Kan du beskrive hvordan dere (trener-utøver) jobber sammen i treningsprosessen? Hvordan sørger du for at samspillet mellom deg og treneren din blir best mulig?
- 11) Kommunikasjon er noe som er sentralt i trener-utøver relasjonen (forholdet dere imellom). Hvordan gjør du deg forstått til treneren din?
- a. Hvordan kommuniserer du med din trener?
- 12) Hvordan ser samspillet og kommunikasjonen ut mellom deg og din trener (utøvergruppen og din trener) på en vanlig dag på treningsfeltet?

Appendix 6 – Interview Guide at T2

1

Intervjuguide SRT – T2 (trener perspektivet)

Del 1 - Psykologisk velvære

1. Hvordan har du hatt det siden sist gang vi møttes?
 - a. Hvis nei ...

Hva er det som ikke er bra?

Vil du si noe om det som ikke er bra?
 - b. Hvis ja ...

Hva er det som er bra?

Vil du si noe om det som er bra?
2. Er du fornøyd med hverdagen slik den er nå (som trener, som privatperson)?
 - a. Hvis ja, hva er du særlig fornøyd med?
 - b. Hvis nei, hva skulle du ønske var annerledes?
3. Har du tro på at du kan håndtere de utfordringene som venter deg de neste 2-3 ukene (både på og utenfor idrettsbanen)?
 - a. Hvis nei, kan du nevne noen årsaker som hindrer deg i dette?
 - b. Hvis ja, hvilke kloke grep vil du bruke (benytte deg av)?
4. Har du noen, som bryr seg om hvordan du har det og som du kan snakke med når du opplever utfordringer som er vanskelig å håndtere - enten disse er på eller utenfor idrettsbanen? Har dette endret seg siden sist gang vi møttes?

Del 2 - Generell interpersonell tillit

5. Hvordan ser et trygt trenings- og konkurransemiljø ut for deg som trener?
 - a. Hvilke konsekvenser har et trygt trenings- og konkurransemiljø for deg som trener?
6. Hva legger du i begrepet “å stole på andre personer”?

- a. Hva legger du i begrepet “å ha tillit til andre personer”?
- b. Kan du gi eksempler på “stole på/tillit” i ditt eget liv?
 - i. Er dette noe du tenker har endret seg i løpet av de siste årene?
- c. **Oppsummering:** Kan du gi meg en kort oppsummering av det du har sagt til nå?
 - i. Har jeg forstått deg riktig hvis ...?

7. Nå vil det bli presentert en rekke påstander for deg. Du skal svare ja og nei, og du skal bare si det som faller deg inn med minst mulig betenkningstid. Er du klar? Bra.

- a. Folk er alltid til å stole på. **JA/NEI**
- b. Du er alltid til å stole på. **JA/NEI**
- c. Du er mer til å stole på nå enn da du var yngre. **JA/NEI**
- d. Du har lettere for å stole på andre personer nå enn da du var yngre. **JA/NEI**
- e. De valgene som du har tatt den siste måneden viser at du er til å stole på.
JA/NEI
- f. Du er alltid til å stole på i dine nærmeste relasjoner. **JA/NEI**
- g. Du stoler mer på noen personer enn på andre. **JA/NEI**
- h. Det varierer hvor mye forskjellige personer stoler på deg. **JA/NEI**
- i. **Avhengig av svar på ALLTID-spørsmålene:** Hva legger du i disse svarene?
 - i. Satte disse spørsmålene i gang noen tankeprosesser hos deg? Hva tenker du etter disse spørsmålene?
- j. **Påstanden: Du stoler mer på noen personer enn på andre.** Kan du utdype dine synspunkter rundt denne påstanden?

Del 3 - Interpersonell tillit mellom trener og utøver

8. **Påstander: Tillit mellom trener-utøver.** Du skal svare ja og nei, og du skal bare si det som faller deg inn med minst mulig betenkningstid. Ok?

Er du klar? Bra.

a. Oppriktig godvilje fra treneren:

- i. Du tar hensyn til dine egne utøvers interesser, ønsker og behov.

JA/NEI

- ii. Utøverne dine er mer til å stole på nå enn da du begynte å trene dem.

JA/NEI

- iii. Utøverne dine kunne tenke seg å ha deg som trener i mange år fremover. **JA/NEI**

- iv. Du ser frem til å treffe dine utøvere på trening **JA/NEI**

- v. Du er interessert i livene til dine utøvere. **JA/NEI**

- vi. Du kunne tenke deg å ha dine nåværende utøvere i mange år fremover.

JA/NEI

- vii. Utøverne dine ser frem til å treffe deg på trening. **JA/NEI**

b. Satte disse påstandene i gang noen tankeprosesser hos deg?

- i. Hva tenker du etter disse påstandene?

Del 4 - Maktforholdet mellom trener og utøver

9. Kan du beskrive hvordan du forstår ordet "makt" i henhold til trener-utøver relasjonen?

- a. Kan du gi eksempler på makt fra dine egne trener-utøver relasjoner?

X: Kan du gi et positivt eksempel på makt?

X: Kan du gi et negativt eksempel på makt?

- b. Hva er dine tanker rundt det du sa og gjorde i de nevnte eksemplene?
- c. Basert på dine tidligere ord og handlinger, tenker du at utøverne dine stoler på deg/har tillit til deg i treningshverdagen? Kom gjerne med eksempler.

Del 5 - Treningsprosessen

- 10. Kan du beskrive hvordan dere (trener-utøver) har jobbet sammen i treningsprosessen siden sist gang vi møttes?
 - a. Hvordan har du sørget for at samspillet mellom deg og utøverne dine har vært best mulig?
- 11. Hva er grunnen til at du har planlagt og gjennomført de ulike treningsøktene på den måten som du har gjort siden sist gang vi møttes?
- 12. Hvordan har kommunikasjonen mellom deg og dine utøvere vært på treningsfeltet [salen, banen og bassenget] siden sist gang vi møttes?

Intervjuguide SRT – T2 (utøver perspektivet)

Del 1 - Psykologisk velvære

1. Hvordan har du hatt det siden sist gang vi møttes?
 - a. Hvis nei ...
 - Hva er det som ikke er bra?
 - Vil du si noe om det som ikke er bra?
 - b. Hvis ja ...
 - Hva er det som er bra?
 - Vil du si noe om det som er bra?
2. Er du fornøyd med hverdagen slik den er nå (som utøver, skoleelev og ung voksen)?
 - a. Hvis ja, hva er du særlig fornøyd med?
 - b. Hvis nei, hva skulle du ønske var annerledes?
3. Har du tro på at du kan håndtere de utfordringene som venter deg de neste 2-3 ukene (både på og utenfor idrettsbanen)?
 - a. Hvis nei, kan du nevne noen årsaker som hindrer deg i dette?
 - b. Hvis ja, hvilke kloke grep vil du bruke (benytte deg av)?
4. Har du noen, som bryr seg om hvordan du har det og som du kan snakke med når du opplever utfordringer som er vanskelig å håndtere - enten disse er på eller utenfor idrettsbanen? Har dette endret seg siden sist gang vi møttes?

Del 2 - Generell interpersonell tillit

5. Hvordan ser et trygt trenings- og konkurransemiljø ut for deg som utøver?
 - a. Hvilke konsekvenser har et trygt trenings- og konkurransemiljø for deg som utøver?
6. Hva legger du i begrepet "å stole på andre personer"?

- a. Hva legger du i begrepet “å ha tillit til andre personer”?
- b. Kan du gi eksempler på “stole på/tillit” i ditt eget liv?
 - i. Er dette noe du tenker har endret seg i løpet av de siste årene?
- c. **Oppsummering:** Kan du gi meg en kort oppsummering av det du har sagt til nå?
 - i. Har jeg forstått deg riktig hvis ...?

7. Nå vil det bli presentert en rekke påstander for deg. Du skal svare ja og nei, og du skal bare si det som faller deg inn med minst mulig betenkningstid. Er du klar? Bra.

- a. Folk er alltid til å stole på. **JA/NEI**
- b. Du er alltid til å stole på. **JA/NEI**
- c. Du er mer til å stole på nå enn da du var yngre. **JA/NEI**
- d. Du har lettere for å stole på andre personer nå enn da du var yngre. **JA/NEI**
- e. De valgene som du har tatt den siste måneden viser at du er til å stole på.
JA/NEI
- f. Du er alltid til å stole på i dine nærmeste relasjoner. **JA/NEI**
- g. Du stoler mer på noen personer enn på andre. **JA/NEI**
- h. Det varierer hvor mye forskjellige personer stoler på deg. **JA/NEI**
- i. **Avhengig av svar på ALLTID-spørsmålene:** Hva legger du i disse svarene?
 - i. Satte disse spørsmålene i gang noen tankeprosesser hos deg? Hva tenker du etter disse spørsmålene?
- j. **Påstanden: Du stoler mer på noen personer enn på andre.** Kan du utdype dine synspunkter rundt denne påstanden?

Del 3 - Interpersonell tillit mellom trener og utøver

8. **Påstander: Tillit mellom trener-utøver.** Du skal svare ja og nei, og du skal bare si det som faller deg inn med minst mulig betenkningstid. Ok?

Er du klar? Bra.

a. Oppriktig godvilje fra treneren:

- i. Treneren din tar hensyn til dine interesser, ønsker og behov. **JA/NEI**
- ii. Treneren din er mer til å stole på nå enn da han/hun begynte å trene deg. **JA/NEI**
- iii. Treneren din kunne tenke seg å ha deg som utøver i mange år fremover. **JA/NEI**
- iv. Du ser frem til å treffe treneren din på trening. **JA/NEI**
- v. Treneren din er interessert i livet ditt. **JA/NEI**
- vi. Du kunne tenke deg å ha din nåværende trener i mange år fremover. **JA/NEI**
- vii. Treneren din ser frem til å treffe deg på trening. **JA/NEI**

b. Satte disse påstandene i gang noen tankeprosesser hos deg?

- i. Hva tenker du etter disse påstandene?

Del 4 - Maktforholdet mellom trener og utøver

9. Kan du beskrive hvordan du forstår ordet "makt" i henhold til trener-utøver relasjonen?

- a. Kan du gi eksempler på makt fra din egen trener-utøver relasjon?

X: Kan du gi et positivt eksempel på makt?

X: Kan du gi et negativt eksempel på makt?

- b. Hva er dine tanker rundt det din trener sa og gjorde i de nevnte eksemplene?
- c. Basert på din treners tidligere ord og handlinger, tenker du at treneren din stoler på deg/har tillit til deg i treningshverdagen? Kom gjerne med eksempler.

Del 5 - Treningsprosessen

- 10. Kan du beskrive hvordan dere (trener-utøver) har jobbet sammen i treningsprosessen siden sist gang vi møttes?
 - a. Hvordan har du sørget for at samspillet mellom deg og treneren din har vært best mulig?
- 11. Har du hatt påvirkning på planlegging og gjennomføring av de ulike treningsøktene siden sist gang vi møttes? Hvilken type påvirkning?
- 12. Hvordan har kommunikasjonen mellom deg og din trener vært på treningsfeltet [salen, banen og bassenget] siden sist gang vi møttes?

Appendix 7 – Interview Guide at T3

1

Intervjuguide SRT – T3 (utøverperspektivet)

Del 1 - Psykologisk velvære

1) Hvordan har du hatt det siden sist gang vi møttes?

a. Hvis nei ...

Hva er det som ikke er bra?

Vil du si noe om det som ikke er bra?

b. Hvis ja ...

Hva er det som er bra?

Vil du si noe om det som er bra?

2) Er du fornøyd med hverdagen slik den er nå (som utøver, skoleelev og ung voksen)?

a. Hvis ja, hva er du særlig fornøyd med?

b. Hvis nei, hva skulle du ønske var annerledes?

3) Har du tro på at du kan håndtere de utfordringene som venter deg de neste 2-3 ukene (både på og utenfor idrettsbanen)?

a. Hvis nei, kan du nevne noen årsaker som hindrer deg i dette?

b. Hvis ja, hvilke kloke grep vil du bruke (benytte deg av)?

4) Har du noen, som bryr seg om hvordan du har det, og som du kan snakke med når du opplever utfordringer som er vanskelig å håndtere - enten disse er på eller utenfor idrettsbanen?

a. Har dette endret seg siden sist gang vi møttes?

Del 2: Utøverens fortid og inner states

5) Hvilke episoder opplever du har vært med på å forme deg mest som person?

- a. Hvilke personer opplever du spiller hovedrollen i de nevnte episodene?
- b. Hvilke erfaringer sitter du igjen med?
- c. Hva tenker og føler du om disse episodene?

5.1) Har du hatt episoder der du har erfart å ikke strekke til i relasjonen til de nevnte personene?

- a. Hva tenker du er grunnen til at de nevnte personene gjorde som de gjorde i de nevnte episodene?

6) Hvilke episoder opplever du har vært med på å forme deg mest som utøver?

- a. Hvilke personer opplever du spiller hovedrollen i de nevnte episodene?
- b. Hva tenker du er det viktigste disse personene har lært deg?
- c. Hva tenker du er det viktigste disse personene har lært deg som utøver?

6.1) Har du hatt episoder der du har erfart å ikke strekke til i relasjonen til de nevnte personene?

- a. Hva tenker du er grunnen til at de nevnte personene gjorde som de gjorde i de nevnte episodene?

7) Kan du fortelle meg om tidligere trenere du har hatt som har gjort inntrykk på deg?

- a. Hva var det han/hun gjorde som gjorde inntrykk på deg?
X: (Se etter a1/b1 og/eller strain tests)
- b. Hva slags erfaringer har du gjort deg etter denne treneren?

X: Stille dette spørsmålet etter hver trener

- c. Etter disse erfaringene med tidligere trenere, hvordan ser en trener ut med tanke på dine forventninger/perspektiver/ståsteder/erfaringer/tanker/holdninger?
- d. Har disse erfaringene påvirket dine forventninger til nye trenere? På hvilken måte?

8) Har du hatt episoder du har erfart å ikke strekke til i relasjonen til de nevnte trenere?

- a. Hva tenker du er grunnen til at de nevnte trenerne gjorde som de gjorde i de nevnte episodene?

Del 3: Promotion og prevention

9) Hvilke episoder opplever du har vært med på å forme dine tanker om det å

lykkes/mislykkes i idrett [ballett/fotball/svømming]?

- a. Hvilke personer opplever du har spilt de viktigste rollene i de nevnte episodene?
- b. Hva var det de nevnte personene gjorde/ikke gjorde som formet tankene dine?

10) Se på arket: (Glad, lykkelig, lettet, avslappet, trist, skuffet, nervøs, stresset)

- a. Gi eksempler på når du opplever disse følelsene i konteksten av trenings – og forestilling/formidling/konkurransesituasjoner?
- b. Gi eksempler på alle følelsene

10.1) Hvilke følelser har vært mest fremtredende for deg som utøver/student siden første intervjurunde (april/mai)?

- a. Kan du rangere følelsene etter hvor ofte du har erfart dem siden den første intervjurunden (april/mai)? Vennligst ranger hver følelse fra 1-8.

- b. Hvor ofte føler du de respektive følelsene i løpet av en måned: Aldri, sjeldent, noen ganger, ofte, alltid
- c. Hva er dine tanker rundt dine egne rangeringer?

Del 4: Unit og sentiment

- Nå skal vi forsøke å knytte disse følelsene opp mot trener-utøver relasjonen

11) Hvordan opplever og/eller erfarer du å vise disse følelsene overfor treneren/læreren din i konteksten av trenings – og forestilling/formidling/konkurransesituasjonen?

- a. Er det forskjell på de positive følelsene og de negative følelsene?
- b. Hvilken rolle har læreren/treneren i erfaringen og/eller opplevelsen av disse følelsene?
- c. Har treneren hatt noe å si med tanke på hvilke følelser som har oppstått siden den første intervjuunden (april/mai)?

11.1) Hvordan erfarer du at treneren/læreren imøtekommer og responderer på de ulike følelsene du har opplevd og uttrykt i konteksten av trenings – og forestilling/formidling/konkurransesituasjonen?

11.2) Når treneren kommer på treningsfeltet/inn i studio/inn i svømmehallen, hvilke av de nevnte følelsene blir mest dominerende for deg?

12) Hvis du skulle ha blitt trener i fremtiden, ville din nåværende trener vært et forbilde for deg?

- a. Hvis nei, hva ville du gjort annerledes?
- b. Hvis ja, hva er det med han/hun som er grunnen til det? Verdier, holdninger?

Del 5: Treningsprosessen**13) Hvordan har samhandlingen vært mellom deg og din trener/lærer siden sist gang vi møttes?**

X: Hvordan har du erfart samhandlingen med din nye trener/lærer sammenlignet med din gamle trener/lærer?

Del 6: Sosial ønskverdighet

- Jeg har aldri mislikt noen intenst
- Jeg blir noen ganger irritert når jeg ikke får viljen min
- Jeg er alltid en god lytter, uansett hvem jeg snakker med
- Det har vært situasjoner hvor jeg har utnyttet andre
- Jeg er alltid villig til å innrømme det når jeg har gjort noe feil
- Av og til prøver jeg å ta igjen, istedenfor å tilgi og glemme
- Jeg har opplevd situasjoner hvor jeg har hatt lyst til å knuse noe i tusen biter
- Jeg har til tider vært ganske misunnelig og sjalu på andres hell og lykke
- Jeg har aldri følt at jeg har blitt straffet uten grunn
- Jeg har aldri med vilje sagt noe som har såret andres følelser

Magefølelse: Sant eller usant

Intervjuguide SRT – T3 (trenerperspektivet)**Del 1 - Psykologisk velvære****1) Hvordan har du hatt det siden sist gang vi møttes?**

a. Hvis nei ...

Hva er det som ikke er bra?

Vil du si noe om det som ikke er bra?

b. Hvis ja ...

Hva er det som er bra?

Vil du si noe om det som er bra?

2) Er du fornøyd med hverdagen slik den er nå?

a. Hvis ja, hva er du særlig fornøyd med?

b. Hvis nei, hva skulle du ønske var annerledes?

3) Har du tro på at du kan håndtere de utfordringene som venter deg de neste 2-3 ukene (både på og utenfor idrettsbanen)?

a. Hvis nei, kan du nevne noen årsaker som hindrer deg i dette?

b. Hvis ja, hvilke kloke grep vil du bruke (benytte deg av)?

4) Har du noen, som bryr seg om hvordan du har det, og som du kan snakke med når du opplever utfordringer som er vanskelig å håndtere - enten disse er på eller utenfor idrettsbanen?

a. Har dette endret seg siden sist gang vi møttes?

NOTE (!!!): klargjøre at det er i forhold til de gitte utøverne treneren skal snakke i kontekst av!

Del 2: Trenerens fortid og inner states

5) Hvilke episoder opplever du har vært med på å forme deg mest som person?

- a. Hvilke personer opplever du spiller hovedrollen i de nevnte episodene?
- b. Hvilke erfaringer sitter du igjen med?
- c. Hva tenker og føler du om disse episodene?

5.1) Har du hatt episoder der du har erfart å ikke strekke til i relasjonen til de nevnte personene?

- a. Hva tenker du er grunnen til at de nevnte personene gjorde som de gjorde i de nevnte episodene?

6) Hvilke episoder opplever du har vært med på å forme deg mest som trener?

- a. Hvilke personer opplever du spiller hovedrollen i de nevnte episodene?
- b. Hva tenker du er det viktigste disse personene har lært deg?
- c. Hva tenker du er det viktigste disse personene har lært deg som trener?

6.1) Har du hatt episoder der du har erfart å ikke strekke til i relasjonen til de nevnte personene?

- a. Hva tenker du er grunnen til at de nevnte personene gjorde som de gjorde i de nevnte episodene?

7) Kan du fortelle meg om tidligere trenere du har hatt som har gjort inntrykk på deg?

- a. Hva var det han/hun gjorde som gjorde inntrykk på deg?
X: (Se etter a1/b1 og/eller strain tests)
- b. Hva slags erfaringer har du gjort deg etter disse trenerne?

X: Stille dette spørsmålet etter hver trener

c. Basert på summen av dine egne erfaringer med tidligere trenere, hvordan har dette farget dine forventninger til trenerrollen?

d. Hvordan har disse erfaringene påvirket dine tanker om hvem du vil være som trener?

X: Forventninger og ønsker

8) Har du hatt episoder du har erfart å ikke strekke til i relasjonen til de nevnte trenere?

a. Hva tenker du er grunnen til at de nevnte trenerne gjorde som de gjorde i de nevnte episodene?

Del 3: Promotion og prevention

9) Hvilke episoder opplever du har vært med på å forme dine tanker om det å lykkes/mislykkes i idrett [ballett/fotball/svømming]?

a. Hvilke personer opplever du har spilt de viktigste rollene i de nevnte episodene?

b. Hva var det de nevnte personene gjorde/ikke gjorde som formet tankene dine?

10) Se på arket: (Glad, lykkelig, lettet, avslappet, trist, skuffet, nervøs, stresset)

a. Gi eksempler på når du opplever disse følelsene, som trener, i de ulike kontekstene av trenings – og forestilling/formidling/konkurransesituasjoner?

x. Gi eksempler på alle følelsene

b. Gi eksempler på når du opplever disse følelsene i de ulike relasjonene til hver enkelt utøver?

x. Gi eksempler på alle følelsene

10.1) Hvilke følelser har vært mest fremtredende for deg som trener siden første intervjurunde (april/mai)?

a. Kan du rangere følelsene etter hvor ofte du har erfart dem siden den første intervjurunden (april/mai)? Vennligst ranger hver følelse fra 8-1

x. 8 er høyest og 1 er lavest

b. Hvor ofte har du følt de respektive følelsene siden den første intervjurunden?
:Aldri, sjeldent, noen ganger, ofte, alltid

c. Hva er dine tanker rundt dine egne rangeringer?

Del 4: Unit og sentiment

- Nå skal vi forsøke å knytte disse følelsene opp mot trener-utøver relasjonen

11) Hvordan opplever og/eller erfarer du å vise disse følelsene overfor hver enkelt utøver i konteksten av trenings – og forestilling/formidling/konkurransesituasjonen?

- a. Er det forskjell på de positive følelsene og de negative følelsene?
- b. Hvilken rolle har hver enkelt utøver i erfaringen og/eller opplevelsen av disse følelsene?
- c. Har hver enkelt utøver hatt noe å si med tanke på hvilke følelser som har oppstått siden den første intervjurunden (april/mai)?

11.1) Hvordan erfarer du at utøverne imøtekommer og responderer på de ulike følelsene du har opplevd og uttrykt i konteksten av trenings – og forestilling/formidling/konkurransesituasjonen?

11.2) Når utøverne kommer på treningsfeltet/inn i studio/inn i svømmehallen, hvilke av de nevnte følelsene blir mest dominerende for deg som trener?

12) Hvis du velger å fortsette som trener i fremtiden, hva har dine nåværende utøvere lært deg som person og trener?

Del 5: Treningsprosessen

13) Hvordan har samhandlingen vært mellom deg og hver enkelt utøver siden sist gang vi møttes?

- x. (danielle: har du hatt noe kontakt med dine tidligere utøvere siden siste intervjurunde?)

Del 6: Sosial ønskverdighet

- Jeg har aldri mislikt noen intenst
- Jeg blir noen ganger irritert når jeg ikke får viljen min
- Jeg er alltid en god lytter, uansett hvem jeg snakker med
- Det har vært situasjoner hvor jeg har utnyttet andre
- Jeg er alltid villig til å innrømme det når jeg har gjort noe feil
- Av og til prøver jeg å ta igjen, istedenfor å tilgi og glemme
- Jeg har opplevd situasjoner hvor jeg har hatt lyst til å knuse noe i tusen biter
- Jeg har til tider vært ganske misunnelig og sjalu på andres hell og lykke
- Jeg har aldri følt at jeg har blitt straffet uten grunn
- Jeg har aldri med vilje sagt noe som har såret andres følelser

Magefølelse: Sant eller usant