

'The Catherine Wheel': A case study of delivering a motivational climate intervention in a  
youth performance academy

Chris Hartley<sup>a\*</sup> & Peter Clarke<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences and Sport, University of Stirling, FK9 4LA, Scotland,  
United Kingdom.

Date of acceptance for publication in *Sport and Exercise Psychology Review*:

19 October 2018

\*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Chris Hartley, Office  
E9, Pathfoot Building, Faculty of Health Sciences and Sport, University of Stirling, FK9 4LA.

Email: christopher.hartley@stir.ac.uk

Conflicts of interest: none.

### **Abstract**

This case study describes the consultancy experiences of targeting motivational climate within a youth performance hockey academy. Written from the perspective of a trainee sport and exercise psychologist, the theoretical and philosophical frameworks which guided the consultancy are described and justified, whilst discussing the unexpected challenges associated with consultancy implementation. The consultancy is evaluated with reference to lessons learnt, whilst also highlighting key reflexive and developmental considerations for the supervision and development of trainees and experienced practitioners alike.

*Keywords:* Motivational climate, trainee, Stage 2, team sport, hockey, supervision.

Following an autoethnographic approach (Lindsay et al., 2007), this case study concerns the experiences of the first author (a trainee sport and exercise psychologist) during the delivery of a motivational climate intervention within a youth performance hockey academy. The autoethnographic approach not only intends to compliment empirical research and encourage its application to practice (Lindsay et al., 2007), but it is hoped that the personalised accounts of the first author supports the development of other trainees and practitioners by highlighting the challenges trainees may face and the implications this may have for supervision.

### **Consultancy Context**

The majority of my trainee experiences during my first year on the Qualification for Sport and Exercise Psychology (Stage 2) took place within a multisport youth performance academy. I had been contracted to provide psychological support to athletes aged 12-18 years old within the badminton and swimming programmes, with the aim of enhancing performance, supporting wellbeing, and facilitating successful transitions in and out of elite youth sport. The head coach from the hockey programme (herein called HeadCoach) had repeatedly shown an interest in my consultancy and often made remarks about an unsatisfactory motivational climate within the hockey programme. Having built good rapport with HeadCoach during my first year at the performance academy, I agreed to an 'intake' meeting with him and the performance director.

### **Ethics and Contracting**

An intake meeting with the hockey programme allowed me to revisit the consultancy agreement I had with the performance academy from outset of my Stage 2 journey.

Extending my consultancy to the hockey programme meant re-administering an updated agreement to all high-performance hockey coaches (HeadCoach, CoachB, and CoachC) and parents associated with the hockey programme. An updated ethics checklist was also re-administered, outlining the BPS and HCPC standards of conduct, performance and ethics minimum requirements with regards to disclosure, limitations to confidentiality, avoidance of harm, record keeping, right to withdrawal, areas of competency, and trainee status (BPS, 2018; Keegan, 2015; Kerr et al., 2018). Prior to any consultancy, all associated parties were offered the opportunity to ask questions and provide informed consent (young athletes were given the opportunity to provide assent; Harris et al., 2018). The consultancy ran from October 2017 to April 2018.

### **Consulting Philosophy Adopted**

HeadCoach wished to foster a mastery climate within the hockey programme yet stressed that this would necessitate working with the hockey programme as a whole. I reflected on this intake with my supervisor (second author), who supported my decision that my current skillset and professional philosophy (Friesen & Orlick, 2010; Poczwardowski et al., 2004) best aligned with a cognitive-behavioural paradigm aimed at helping coaches to create a mastery-involving motivational climate (e.g. as opposed to other paradigms I had been exposed to during my training, such as humanistic or Acceptance Commitment Therapy models; Kelly, 1955; Rogers, 1961; Hayes et al., 1999; Smith et al., 2007). The cognitive-behavioural approach assumes interactional relationships between situational triggers, cognitions, emotions and behaviours (McArdle & Moore, 2012), where clients use their 'self-knowledge' in a collaborative working relationship with the psychologist's expertise to create problem-focused solutions (Westbrook et al., 2011). I felt this approach

resonated with my attitudes towards behaviour change (i.e. stoic assumptions around empowering others to choose their responses to stimuli), and that conceptualising the factors contributing to motivational climate in this manner would be more tangible when collaborating with the clients.

Although my supervisor did not provide explicit guidance around how best to plan and deliver this consultancy, he supported me in using self-guided discovery in conjunction with consulting the literature. I eventually agreed with HeadCoach that consultancy would be delivered using an integrative supervisory-consulting model of practice (Harwood & Steptoe, 2018) with an educational approach (Poczwadowski et al., 2004). Although service delivery was 'team focused' (e.g. McArdle & Barker, 2016), this meant primarily educating the coaches about motivational climate (e.g. situational triggers and the contributing role of cognitions, emotions and behaviours) and supporting them in applying this knowledge into the day-to-day training environment (Henrikksen et al., 2018).

### **Needs Analysis**

The hockey programme's needs and goals for service delivery were operationalised by triangulating the following sources of information:

**Motivational climate scales.** I distributed an online survey at the start of consultancy to gather a baseline measure of motivational climate indicator scales (follow-up was administered 1-month following intervention cessation; see Table 1), which also served as indicators of the general cognitions, emotions and behaviours within the hockey programme. Based on previous research into motivational climate outcomes and interventions (e.g. Braithwaite et al., 2011; Smith et al., 2007; Smoll et al., 1993), athletes

completed motivational climate-indicator scales including the Motivational Climate Scale for Youth Sports (MCSYS; scored out of 30 for both task-initiating and ego-initiating climate; Smith et al., 2008), the self-confidence subscale from the Children's Competitive State Anxiety Inventory (CSAI-2C; scored out of 4; Stadulis et al., 2002), and the Washington Self-Description Questionnaire (scored out of 56; Smoll et al., 1993).

**[Insert Table 1 about here]**

**Observation.** I 'hung out' during training sessions (Andersen, 2000) several weeks preceding the start of the intervention, while taking note of coach-athlete behaviours and interactions (Gee, 2011). Although observation is congruent with the cognitive-behavioural philosophy I had adopted (Hemmings & Holder, 2009), I admittedly struggled to decide what exactly I was supposed to extract from observation (my supervisor did not provide explicit guidance around this, instead opting to engage in active listening and self-guided discovery techniques during and following observation sessions). Although this afforded me the opportunity to not read too much nor too little into individual events whilst observing and noting down the athletes' and coaches' responses to performance situations, interactions, and interpersonal relationships (Taylor, 1995); I also felt rather conscious and awkward of the fact that my observation might be affecting their behaviours (Holder & Winter, 2016). However, my supervisor provided reassurance by pointing out the other benefits associated with observation, namely facilitating engagement with clients (Holder & Winter, 2016) and developing a greater understanding and awareness of the organisational setup of the hockey programme (in hindsight, I feel this contributed to greater contextual understanding of the practice setting; Brown et al., 2005; Wagstaff et al., 2012).

**Interviews.** I held several informal interviews with coaches and athletes during observation to gather their views on the hockey programmes' needs and to determine their current level of understanding around motivational climate concepts (e.g. asking them what they thought the impact of goal communication and praise had upon outcomes such as attitude, enjoyment, confidence, self-esteem, and perceptions of effort; Braithwaite et al., 2011). Whilst this allowed me to gain an understanding of individualised accounts, each interview was somewhat unique, which challenged my subsequent case formulation to capture and reflect how each individual's patterns of cognitions, emotions, and behaviours contributed to the overall motivational climate.

#### **Case Formulation (modified 5-Areas Model; Williams & Garland, 2002)**

HeadCoach and CoachB displayed a good understanding of motivational climate concepts, yet felt the current climate was pitting athletes against each other, with some athletes adopting socially comparative notions of success (Smith et al., 2007). Although motivational climate scales indicated high scores for self-confidence, self-esteem and mastery climate (with low scores for ego climate), given the performance academy-pathway context there were concerns over the athlete's displaying social desirability (i.e. due to concerns over selection eligibility). Considering these contextual triggers in conjunction with observations and informal interviews, it became clear this climate was being maintained through behaviours whereby athletes would avoid recognising effort or reinforcement of self-referenced improvement (i.e. water breaks in between training pieces were often done in silence, and only the most gifted players provided critical feedback to their peers), whilst coaches would allow athletes' focus on outcome achievement and outperforming others to go-on unchecked. During informal interviews, some individuals also displayed altered and

negative thinking styles around effort and achievement within the programme (e.g. that motivational climate is not controllable nor relevant to high performance; jumping to conclusions without reviewing evidence; and dichotomous thinking around athletes' potential). In general, it seemed the goal priorities of the environment were contributing to altered outcomes whereby athletes were failing to maximise the development opportunities afforded to them (e.g. performance progression was poor; Cecchini et al., 2014).

Although motivational climate is a multifaceted and complex construct, coaches play an influential role in how athletes develop achievement goal orientations (Conroy et al., 2002; Smith et al., 2008), and can significantly influence quality of the sport experience (Knight et al., 2018; Smith et al., 2007). Furthermore, social norms around social support and group-valued behaviours have the potential to impact on motivational climate perceptions (Keegan et al., 2009). It was therefore agreed with HeadCoach that the intervention would broadly be targeted towards promoting a mastery-involving climate by addressing the following areas. Firstly, promoting mastery coaching practices through (Smith et al., 2007; Vazou et al., 2006):

- educating coaches to challenge beliefs around effort over outcome through communication of goal priorities;
- optimising the use of evaluative feedback;
- managing response-contingent approval and disapproval;
- fostering a supportive team environment; and
- reducing social comparison pressures and anxiety.

Secondly, fostering socially normative behaviours around (Keegan et al., 2009)

- peer social-support behaviour;
- valuing others; and
- valuing effort over outcome.

### **Implementation Plan**

Practical cognitive-behavioural guidelines to achieving these aims are provided by the 'Mastery Approach to Coaching' (MAC; Smith et al., 2007). MAC attempts to foster mastery-oriented climates through challenging coaches and athletes to think about their behaviour in relation to communication of goal priorities, to focus towards mastery outcomes, and to change the norms around social support and comparison behaviours (Duda & Ntoumanis, 2005; Smith et al., 2007).

A combination of strategies was used in the delivery of MAC (Braithwaite et al., 2011). Firstly, two traditional Coach Effectiveness Training (CET; Smoll et al., 1978) workshops were delivered to the coaches in order to (a) improve positive reinforcement, mistake-contingent-encouragement, and positive corrective instruction; and (b) encourage maximum effort, enjoyment, development over outcome, and providing individualised guidance to athletes (I did not include 'sound technical instruction' to prevent coach alienation; Smith et al., 2007; Smoll & Smith, 2006; Vazou et al., 2006). To allow coaches the opportunity to discuss and challenge their own cognitive-behavioural tendencies in relation to the material, both CET sessions were followed by role-playing (Smith et al., 2007), cognitive restructuring, and behavioural experiment exercises (McArdle & Moore, 2012). Secondly, the educational portion of MAC targeted both coaches and athletes, and was integrated into the sport environment through having the coaches deliver modified training

sessions using the TARGET framework (Epstein, 1989). Despite being developed for educational settings, TARGET has been successfully applied to sport settings by highlighting the organisational components of learning environments that influence motivational climate (Cecchini et al., 2014).

Several planning meetings were held with HeadCoach and CoachB to agree on a delivery structure and manage expectations (with the implicit aim of building rapport; McArdle & Barker, 2016; Speed et al., 2005). However, several days were also spent out with the agreed delivery dates attending training sessions and tournaments to become integrated into the coaching team, for athletes to become accustomed to my presence (Weinberg & Williams, 2010), and to act as a visual prompt for the concepts introduced (Andersen, 2000; Keegan, 2015).

## **Intervention**

**CET Workshops.** Mastery climate concepts were introduced to the coaches in the first workshop (Smith et al., 2007), and described the consultancy implementation plan. This afforded me opportunity to highlight expected roles, responsibilities, and consultancy boundaries (Sharp et al., 2015), while also allowing coaches to ask questions (Gilbourne & Richardson, 2005; Pain & Harwood, 2004). However, during both sessions I faced an unexpected barrier in the form of CoachC: he seemed disengaged, and when invited to partake in discussion simply shook his head and said, "I've got nothing to say". CoachC also verbally interrupted me several times during the session, highlighting his distaste towards the material, questioning its validity, and arguing with HeadCoach that this was a waste of time. Following completion of the CET workshop, subsequent observation and feedback

sessions with HeadCoach and CoachB suggested the CET training had increased their awareness of their own coaching practices, but CoachC's practices seemed largely unchanged. At this point I was becoming increasingly concerned that CoachC's distaste towards the consultancy would be a considerable barrier moving forward (Andersen et al., 2001).

**TARGET.** I felt the biggest challenge as this stage would be to prove my worth and build rapport with CoachC if I was to achieve 'buy-in' (Green et al., 2012). In order to seem more competent and as though I 'belonged' in the environment (Gardner, 2001), I made a point of getting to know the game of Hockey from CoachC's perspective (e.g. his experiences of effective hockey coaching and beliefs about nurturing talent; Brown et al., 2005). In order to show CoachC that I was not attempting to acquire control over his sessions or to undermine his competence, I resorted to an 'indirect interventions paradigm' (Moran, 2012) by engaging in reflective questioning and discussion with CoachC during training sessions (e.g. "Why do you believe talented athletes need to be nurtured in that particular way? Is that effective?"). This provided informal opportunities to prompt CoachC to reflect on his coaching behaviours and beliefs, and to engage in role-playing (Smith et al., 2007) and coaching (i.e. behavioural) experiment exercises (McArdle & Moore, 2012).

For the TARGET sessions, I explained the session tasks in advance, and before the start of the session asked the coaches to explain how they had modified it in line with the task. During and after TARGET sessions, I would spend time observing and occasionally having reflective discussions with the coaches (McArdle & Barker, 2016). The sessions were modified as follows.

- **Task:** Drills were created that would prevent performance comparisons being made between athletes, and would instead emphasise effort, and prompt individualisation of tasks.
- **Authority:** Athletes were actively involved in decision making processes through coaches' use of guided discovery, problem solving behaviours, and the promotion of shared leadership behaviours (Jones & Wallace, 2006).
- **Recognition:** Sessions were structured so that private reward and individualised feedback were possible, and to allow for peer-to-peer support opportunities to emerge in response to good effort.
- **Grouping:** Training groups were organised in a way as to prevent normative comparisons; specifically, not grouping by ability where skill deficits would be apparent (Duda & Treasure, 2010).
- **Evaluation:** Athletes were consulted at the start of sessions as to what they wished to accomplish during sessions and how they would measure self-referenced improvement and effort on individual goals (Ames, 1992).
- **Time:** Athletes were consulted at the start of sessions about the temporal nature of drills, and drills had to be temporally structured in ways that prevented differences in ability from being apparent.

### **'The Catherine Wheel': Revised Case Formulation and Implementation Plan**

Following the last TARGET session, I had a meeting with HeadCoach to monitor consultancy progress. HeadCoach informed me that an emotion-laden argument had occurred between the coaches (I sought clarification that all coaches were happy sharing this information with me). CoachC was expressing his continued distaste towards the sport

psychology support; saying that it was not instigating any real change, while the other two coaches were disappointed about his attitude. However, this argument facilitated a 'Eureka' moment when CoachC said: 'This is not helping us develop good athletes', to which CoachB replied: 'Well, what is good?'. Apparently, this allowed the coaches to realise their dispute was partly due to a lack of alignment and ambiguity over what the desired outcomes should be within the hockey programme. In this instance, HeadCoach likened the sport psychology support to a 'Catherine Wheel', where the (sometimes fiery!) sparks emanating from it allowed the 'real change' to happen.

Following this, I held a planning meeting with all three coaches, where we revised the implementation plan towards creating clearer alignment over the desired outcomes amongst coaches and athletes within the hockey programme (Henrikksen et al., 2018). Surprisingly, CoachC was the one to suggest engaging in a 'Core Values' exercise. Considering CoachC's buy-in was vital at this stage, I agreed to facilitate an identity-building exercise (although I retained CoachC's ascribed label of Core Values) with the hockey programme (Thomas et al., 2017), as this could provide greater alignment amongst the coaches and athletes, whilst also embedding identity motives around coaching practises and socially normative behaviours for promoting a mastery-involving climate.

**Core Values.** Over two sessions, I invited athletes and coaches to discuss and write down the hockey programme's defining characteristics ('why are we here?'), values ('what is considered good?'), and desired outcomes ('what should we expect from each other?'). Prior to the second session, I produced a 'WordCloud' based on the frequency of responses (see Figure 1), which was used by the team as a basis for generating programme-specific

Core Values (see Table 2). To implement the Core Values and encourage their enactment, I attended several more training sessions to prompt frank discussion and act as a visual prompt for integrating the Core Values into daily practice (Andersen, 2000; Harwood & Steptoe, 2018).

**[Insert Table 2 about here]**

### **Evaluation**

Through ongoing discussions with coaches, athletes, and my supervisor, the consultancy was evaluated by triangulating the following sources of information (Keegan, 2015);

**Motivational climate scores.** Although there were higher scores for self-confidence, self-esteem and mastery climate (with lower scores for ego climate), these changes were non-significant from baseline scores.

**Social validation questions.** Whilst effectiveness of the intervention could not be inferred from measurable indicators of motivational climate (Braithwaite et al., 2011), I asked three recommended social validation questions to HeadCoach about the consultancy (Barker et al., 2011): (1) What do you think about the goals of the intervention?; (2) What do you think about the procedures that were applied?; and (3) What do you think about the results produced by those procedures? HeadCoach felt the goals of consultancy could have been made clearer to the athletes and other coaches from outset, and in conjunction with the complicated logistical demands of measuring motivational climate and implementing the intervention (e.g. co-ordinating number of sessions), felt this contributed to early resistance from both athletes and coaches. However, HeadCoach felt the results of the

consultancy were both “fantastic and somewhat unexpected”. For example, athletes were reportedly choosing to enact and evaluate their Core Values, with younger athletes adopting a ‘warning card’ system to encourage adherence to the values, and group leaders spontaneously emerging who routinely questioned the training practices of the group. HeadCoach felt the programme had gained greater clarity and alignment, whilst moving successfully moved towards a mastery-involving climate, ‘although not by the originally planned route’ (highlighting the importance of practitioners being willing to change their strategy and manner of implementation in order to achieve the aims of consultancy and incorporate new ones).

**Sport Psychology Consultant Evaluation Form (SPCEF; Partington & Orlick, 1987).**

Administration of the SPCEF further suggested the consultancy to be a positive experience, with HeadCoach only rating one section as 7/10 (‘Tried to help me draw upon my strengths’; all other sections were 8/10 or above). Regarding areas for improvement, HeadCoach recommended spending more time explicitly highlighting my experience and ability to lead the consultancy from outset (this instead had to be inferred as the consultancy progressed) and a simpler phased-start to consultancy may have secured earlier buy-in, and subsequently made the start of consultancy more effective.

**[Insert Figure 1 about here]**

**Moving Forward**

HeadCoach was generally pleased with the progress made during this consultancy, but acknowledged that due to the annual turnover of academy athletes, some progress is lost as new athletes transition in and out of the programme. Moving forward during the coming year, we agreed to revisit and focus on embedding the Core Values, with a larger

focus on the culture of the performance academy as a whole (Henrikksen et al., 2018).

Furthermore, ongoing monitoring and observation suggested parents' communication of goal priorities at home was influencing the normative behaviours of athletes during training (Smith et al., 2007). Considering parents are key agents in the construction of motivational climates (Braithwaite et al., 2011; Cecchini et al., 2014), they should have been considered during case formulation (i.e. as contextual triggers and/or maintaining factors; Williams & Garland, 2002) and it may have been prudent to include them in the implementation plan, perhaps by disseminating a booklet or holding a parents drop-in session explaining the benefits of encouraging a mastery-involving climate (Knight & Newport, 2018; Smith et al., 2007).

### **Reflections on consultancy**

Reflecting on the consultancy now (guided by Gibbs' model; 1988), there are several lessons worth highlighting. Firstly, I felt that immersing myself in the hockey environment greatly helped triangulate ongoing monitoring and evaluation (Friesen & Orlick, 2010; Mathers & Brodie, 2011), while also enhancing my understanding of the consultancy context (e.g. learning the internal coaching politics and staff dynamics; Fifer et al., 2008). This level of immersion allowed me to structure consultancy in accordance with those who mattered most (the coaches), however, being welcomed and supported by a key stakeholder (HeadCoach) clearly proved vital in this regard. Secondly, I feel there was an element of luck involved with the positive outcome and timing of the 'Catherine Wheel' moment; indeed, my supervisor warned me of the challenges of using a supervisory-consulting model of practice (e.g. whereby crises interventions may need to be anticipated and managed when the practitioner is absent; Perna et al., 1995). Thirdly, the 'Catherine

Wheel' moment further shows that consultancy impact might not always be apparent during sessions, but rather emerge gradually over the course of several weeks in the practitioner's absence. Finally, and most importantly, my repeated run-ins with CoachC are good examples of where a lack of reflexivity in the early phases of consultancy meant I took CoachC's buy-in for granted. Indeed, ongoing observation did prove to enhance my contextual understanding with regard to CoachC's early resistance (Brown et al., 2005; Wagstaff et al., 2012), and revisiting the start of consultancy through the lens of reflexivity now highlights several mistakes: (a) not involving CoachC in the needs analyses and planning phases; (b) not fully understanding nor appreciating CoachC's positionality within the context of consultancy from outset (e.g. CoachC being requested to 'hand-over' his athletes); (c) not spending enough time convincing CoachC of the need and efficacy of sport psychology support prior to intervention, and; (d) introducing 'too much change, too quickly' in terms of workshops and modified training sessions. In the end, it seemed as though increasing reflexivity informed my use of interpersonal skills to achieve buy-in (Green et al., 2012) and to build the working alliance (Lubker et al., 2005; Sharp et al., 2015), as CoachC displayed increasing warmth and even gifted me with some of his own Academy kit. Although it is questionable if CoachC's coaching practices changed, his enthusiasm for the Core Values exercise and feedback from HeadCoach suggested that his attitude towards consultancy might be changing regarding future work together.

It is worth discussing the experience of developing reflexivity in trainees, as it may be that the importance of developing this characteristic as a practitioner is discovered 'accidentally' (i.e. as opposed to the importance of the reflective process which is emphasised frequently; e.g. BPS, 2015). Reflexivity has the potential to enhance one's

awareness for (ethical and applied) dilemmas that may arise during practice and provide guidance for how to respond appropriately to them (McGannon & Johnson, 2009; Sparkes, 2002), and ultimately aid development towards being a more knowledgeable and ethical practitioner (Anderson et al., 2004; Cropley et al., 2010). My advice is for trainees to explicitly introduce reflexivity into their reflective processes from the earliest stages possible by introspecting on how their own backgrounds, biases and interests may be situated within a given consultancy and how it may potentially influence service delivery, reception, and impact. In other words, how might they be impacting on the consultancy process? Equally, questioning how receptive they are towards clients' perspectives around consultancy topics and experiences, as they are likely to approach the consultancy from multiple different positions given differing contexts (Saukko, 2002). As evidenced in the present case study, although trainees might display a certain degree of self-awareness for how these processes are influencing their practice, they may still fail to critically moderate their practice accordingly (thereby complacently transferring their own biases and perspectives onto the consultancy and onto their clients; Holmes 2010). Moving forward, I will personally be adopting a simple process goal from the outset of consultancy sessions, reminding myself to occasionally 'check in' with how my own values, biases, social positioning, and self-identity might be impacting upon my perspective, thinking, and behaviour during consultancy (Schinke et al., 2012). This can be facilitated by asking myself simple introspective questions such as the following (Holmes, 2010; Schinke et al., 2012): how might my client be experiencing the consultancy or event in question?; how might my own (or my client's) background, biases, and interests be influencing the work we are doing together?; is this in the client's best interests, and; does this align with my model of practice?

**Supervisor comment.** Whilst the revised formulation and implementation strategy in this case study proved to result in mostly favourable outcomes, the consultancy goals were perhaps overly ambitious, with little measurable room for improvement and too little time for instigating organisational-level change in Academy culture. Furthermore, given the disparity between numerical data and social validation data, it is worth reiterating that trainees and practitioners avoid solely relying on quantitative measures for evaluating the impact of consultancy. In multimodal interventions such as this one, it is hard to determine the relative contribution of each component to overall improvement, whereas social validation data may highlight which areas were perceived as effective (Hanton & Jones, 1999). Although the case study shows that having supervisory support can prove beneficial in the face of trigger events (e.g. so that trainees may react appropriately and are able to reflect and learn from them; McArdle & Barker, 2016), it also highlights the benefits and challenges associated with certain styles of supervision. For example, using a humanistic model of supervision means I may not necessarily provide high levels of structure or direction, but instead prioritise creating an environment that encourages trainees to direct their own learning through humanistic processes such as empathy, congruence, and unconditional positive regard (evidenced in the present case study, where the trainee perceived there to be a lack of explicit guidance around how best to plan the consultancy or what to look for during observation sessions; Kelly, 1955; Rogers, 1961). Indeed, these experiences might have been less confusing for the first author had he been more explicitly familiar with my chosen model of supervision (Van Raalte & Andersen, 2000). Analogous to how trainees are exposed to the importance of developing a philosophy for practice and exploring the use of different theoretical models (e.g. Keegan, 2015; Poczwardowski et al.,

2004), explicitly introducing them to the model of supervision used is an important tool for developing their reflexivity. Such knowledge allows trainees to position their supervisor's behaviours and guidance as situated within a particular supervisory model, thereby affording them the opportunity to develop a greater awareness and decision making around the guidance being offered (e.g. potentially reducing the tendency for trainees to unconsciously mirror their supervisor's model and style of practice).

As alluded to above, reflexivity is a tool that must be continually developed if practitioners are to be sufficiently self-aware of their own limitations, self-interests, frustrations, and prejudices during consultancy (Anderson et al., 2004; Cropley et al., 2010), as this will ultimately allow them to display more sensitivity towards how a client is experiencing the consultancy process. Depending on the supervisor's own philosophy of practice and how this impacts on the style of supervision, there is value in explicitly guiding trainees towards the importance of developing reflexivity from the outset of supervisory relationships (for example, by providing them with a set of simple prompts during early consultancy experiences as outlined above).

## **Conclusion**

It is hoped this case study helps to raise confidence and provide remote peer support for other trainees, as it is seldom the case that even qualified practitioners complete applied work without occasionally making wrong decisions for certain athletes, teams, or contexts (Andersen, 2000; Tod, 2007). Therefore, the intention of this case study is to show one of several ways that trainees and supervisors can respond to unexpected

events and learn from them in the interests of developing greater reflexivity, and to stress that an initial hurdle doesn't mean that consultancy is unworkable.

### References

- Ames, C. (1992). Achievement goals, motivational climate, and motivational processes. In G.C. Roberts (Ed.), *Motivation in sport and exercise* (pp.161–176). Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- Andersen, M.B. (2000). *Doing sport psychology*. Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- Andersen, M.B., Van Raalte, J.L. & Brewer, B.W. (2001). Sport psychology service delivery: Staying ethical while keeping loose. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 32(1), 12–18.
- Anderson, A., Knowles, Z. & Gilbourne, D. (2004). Reflective practice for sport psychologists: Concepts, models, practical implications, and thoughts on dissemination. *The Sport Psychologist*, 18, 188–203.
- Barker, J., McCarthy, P, Jones, M. & Moran, A. (2011). *Single-Case Research Methods in Sport and Exercise Psychology*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Braithwaite, R., Spray, C.M. & Warburton, V.E. (2011). Motivational climate interventions in physical education: A meta-analysis. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 12, 628–638.
- British Psychological Society (2015). *Qualification in Sport and Exercise Psychology (Stage 2): Candidate handbook*. Leicester: The British Psychological Society.
- British Psychological Society (2018). *Code of Ethics and Conduct*. Leicester: The British Psychological Society.
- Brown, C.H., Gould, D. & Foster, S. (2005). A framework for developing contextual intelligence (CI). *The Sport Psychologist*, 19, 51–62.

- Cecchini, J., Fernandez-Rio, J., Mendez-Gimenez, A. et al. (2014). Epstein's TARGET framework and motivational climate in sport: Effects of a field-based, long-term intervention program. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 9(6), 1325–1340.
- Conroy, D.E., Willow, J.P. & Metzler, J.N. (2002). Multidimensional fear of failure measurement: The performance failure appraisal inventory. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 14, 76–90.
- Cropley, B., Hanton, S. & Miles, A. (2010). Exploring the relationship between effective and reflective practice in applied sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist*, 24, 521–541.
- Duda, J.L. & Ntoumanis, N. (2005). After-school sport for children: Implications of a task-involving motivational climate. In J.L. Mahoney, R.W. Larson & J.S. Eccles (Eds.), *Organized activities as contexts of development: Extracurricular activities, after school, and community programs* (pp.311–330). Mahwah: Erlbaum.
- Duda, J.L. & Treasure, D.C. (2010). Motivational processes and the facilitation of quality engagement in sport. In J.M. Williams (Ed.), *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Epstein, J. (1989). Family structures and student motivation: A developmental perspective. In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education* (pp.259–295). New York: Academic Press.
- Eubank, M. (2013). Professional training experiences on the Qualification in Sport and Exercise Psychology: A supervisor and candidate perspective. *Sport & Exercise Psychology Review*, 9(1), 45–60.
- Fifer, A., Henschen, K., Gould, D. & Ravizza, K. (2008). What works when working with athletes. *The Sport Psychologist*, 22(3), 356–377.
- Friesen, A. & Orlick, T. (2010). A qualitative analysis of holistic sport psychology consultants' professional philosophies. *The Sport Psychologist*, 24, 227–244.

- Gardner, F.L. (2001). Applied sport psychology in professional sports: The team psychologist. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 32(1), 34–39.
- Gee, C.J. (2011). Aggression in competitive sports: Using direct observation to evaluate incidence and prevention focused intervention. In J.K. Luiselli & D.D. Reed (Eds.), *Behavioral sport psychology: Evidence-based approaches to performance enhancement* (pp.199–210). New York: Springer.
- Gibbs, G. (1988). *Learning by doing: A guide to teaching and learning methods*. Oxford: Oxford Brookes University.
- Gilbourne, D. & Richardson, D. (2005). A practitioner-focused approach to the provision of psychological support in soccer: Adopting action research themes and processes. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 23(6), 651–658.
- Green, M., Morgan, G. & Manley, A. (2012). Elite rugby league players' attitudes towards sport psychology consulting. *Sport & Exercise Psychology Review*, 8(1), 32–44.
- Hanton, S. & Jones, G. (1999). The effects of a multimodal intervention program on performers: II. Training the butterflies to fly in formation. *The Sport Psychologist*, 13, 22–41.
- Harris, B.M., Blom, L.C. & Visek, A.J. (2018). Key considerations for applied services with young athletes. In C.J. Knight, C.G. Harwood & D. Gould (Eds.), *Sport psychology for young athletes* (pp.231–242). Oxon: Routledge.
- Harwood, C.G. & Steptoe, K. (2018). Excellence together: Integrated sport psychology for coaches and young athletes. In C.J. Knight, C.G. Harwood & D. Gould (Eds.), *Sport psychology for young athletes* (pp.288–302). Oxon: Routledge.
- Hayes, S.C., Strosahl, K.D. & Wilson, K.G. (1999). *Acceptance and commitment therapy: An experiential approach to behavior change*. Guilford Press.

- Hazler, R.J. (2001). Core conditions of the cognitive-behavioural environment. In R.J. Hazler & N. Barwick (Eds.), *The therapeutic environment*. Buckinghamshire: OU Press.
- Hemmings, B. & Holder, T. (2009). *Applied sport psychology: A case-based approach*. Cornwall: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Henrikksen, K., Storm, L.K. & Larsen, C.H. (2018). Organisational culture and influence on developing athletes. In C.J. Knight, C.G. Harwood & D. Gould (Eds.), *Sport psychology for young athletes* (pp.216–227). Oxon: Routledge.
- Holder, T. & Winter, S. (2016). Experienced practitioners use of observation in applied sport psychology. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, 6(1), 6–19.
- Holmes, M. (2010). The emotionalization of reflexivity. *Sociology*, 44(1), 139–154.
- Jones, R.L. & Wallace, M. (2006). The coach as orchestrator. In R.L. Jones (Ed.), *The sports coach as educator: Reconceptualising sports coaching* (pp.51–65). London: Routledge.
- Keegan, R. (2015). *Being a sport psychologist*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Keegan, R., Harwood, C.G., Spray, C.M. & Lavalley, D.E. (2009). A qualitative investigation exploring the motivational climate in early career sports participants: Coach, parent and peer influences on sport motivation. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 10, 361–372.
- Kelly, G.A. (1955). *The psychology of personal constructs: Theory of personality*. New York: Norton & Company.
- Kerr, G., Stirling, A. & MacPherson, E. (2018). The role of sport psychology consultants in protecting young athletes from harm: shifting from safeguarding to an ethic of care. In C.J. Knight, C.G. Harwood & D. Gould (Eds.), *Sport psychology for young athletes* (pp.243–254). Oxon: Routledge.

- Knight, C.J. & Newport, R.A. (2018). Understanding and working with parents of young athletes. In C.J. Knight, C.G. Harwood & D. Gould (Eds.), *Sport psychology for young athletes* (pp.303–314). Oxon: Routledge.
- Knight, C.J., Harwood, C.G. & Gould., D. (2018). *Sport psychology for young athletes*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Lindsay, P., Breckon, J.D., Thomas, O. & Maynard, I.W. (2007). In pursuit of congruence: A personal reflection on methods and philosophy in applied practice. *The Sport Psychologist, 21*, 235–252.
- Lubker, J.R., Watson, J.C., Visek, A.J. & Geer, J.R. (2005). Physical appearance and the perceived effectiveness of performance enhancement consultants. *Sport Psychologist, 19*(4), 446–458.
- Martindale, A. & Collins, D. (2012). A professional judgment and decision making case study: Reflection-in-action research. *The Sport Psychologist, 26*, 500–518.
- Mathers, J.F. & Brodie, K. (2011). Elite refereeing in professional soccer: A case study of mental skills support. *Journal of Sport Psychology in Action, 2*, 171–182.
- McArdle, G. & Barker, J. (2016). Case Study 1: The challenges of consultancy with an amateur league soccer team. *Sport & Exercise Psychology Review, 12*(2), 9–17.
- McArdle, S. & Moore, P. (2012). Applying evidence-based principles from CBT to sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist, 26*, 299–310.
- McGannon, K.R. & Johnson, C.R. (2009). Strategies for reflective cultural sport psychology research. In R.J. Schinke & S.J. Hanrahan (Eds.), *Cultural sport psychology* (pp.57–75). Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- McGannon, K.R. & Metz, J.L. (2010). Through the funhouse mirror: Understanding access and (un)expected selves through confessional tales. In R.J. Schinke (Ed.), *Contemporary sport psychology* (pp.153–170). Hauppauge: Nova Science Publishers.

- Moran, A.P. (2012). *Sport and exercise psychology: A critical introduction*. London: Routledge.
- Pain, M.A. & Harwood, C.G. (2004). Knowledge and perceptions of sport psychology within English soccer. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 22*(9), 813–826.
- Partington, J. & Orlick, T. (1987). The sport psychology consultant evaluation form. *The Sport Psychologist, 1*(4) 309–317.
- Perna, F., Neyer, M., Murphy, S.M. et al. (1995). Consultations with sport organizations: A cognitive-behavioral model. In S.M. Murphy (Ed.), *Sport psychology interventions* (pp.235–252). Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- Poczwardowski, A., Sherman, C.P. & Ravizza, K. (2004). Professional philosophy in the sport psychology service delivery: Building on theory and practice. *The Sport Psychologist, 18*, 445–463.
- Rogers, C.R. (1961). *On becoming a person*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Saukko, P. (2002). *Qualitative research in cultural studies*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Schinke, R.J., McGannon, K.R., Parham, W.D. & Lane, A.M. (2012). Toward cultural praxis and cultural sensitivity: Strategies for self-reflexive sport psychology practice. *Quest, 64*(1), 34–46.
- Sharp, L.A., Hodge, K. & Danish, S. (2015). Ultimately it comes down to the relationship: Experienced consultants' views of effective sport psychology consulting. *The Sport Psychologist, 29*(4), 358–370.
- 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*, 116–136.
- Smith, R.E., Smoll, F.L. & Cumming, S.P. (2007). Effects of a motivational climate intervention for coaches on young athletes' sport performance anxiety. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 29*(1), 39–59.

- Smoll, F.L. & Smith, R.E. (2006). Conducting sport psychology training programs for coaches: Cognitive-behavioral principles and techniques. In J.M. Williams (Ed.), *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (pp.458–480). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Smoll, F.L., Smith, R.E., Barnett, N.P. & Everett, J.J. (1993). Enhancement of children's self-esteem through social support training for youth sport coaches. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 78, 602–610.
- Smoll, F.L., Smith, R.E., Curtis, B. & Hunt, E. (1978). Toward a mediational model of coach-player relationships. *Research Quarterly*, 49, 528–541.
- Sparkes, A.C. (2002). *Telling tales in sport and physical activity: A qualitative journey*. Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- Speed, H.D., Andersen, M.B. & Simons, J. (2005). The selling or telling of sport psychology: Presenting services to coaches. In M.B. Andersen (Ed.), *Sport psychology in practice* (pp.3–16), Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- Stadulis, R.E., MacCracken, M.J., Eidson, T.A. & Severance, C. (2002). A Children's form of the Competitive State Anxiety Inventory: The CSAI-2C. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science*, 6(3), 147–165.
- Taylor, J. (1995). A conceptual model for integrating athletes' needs and sport demands in the development of competitive mental preparation strategies. *The Sport Psychologist*, 9, 339–357.
- Thomas, W.E., Brown, R., Easterbrook, M.J. et al. (2017). Social identification in sports teams: The role of personal, social and collective identity motives. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(4), 508–523.
- Tod, D. (2007). The long and winding road: Professional development in sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist*, 21, 94–108.

- Van Raalte, J.L. & Andersen, M.B. (2000). Supervision I: From models to doing. In M.B. Andersen (Ed.), *Doing sport psychology* (pp.156). Champaign: Human Kinetics.
- Vazou, S., Ntoumanis, N. & Duda, J.L. (2006). Predicting young athletes' motivational indices as a function of their perceptions of the Coach and peer-created climate. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 7, 215–233.
- Wagstaff, C., Fletcher, D. & Hanton, S. (2012). Positive organizational psychology in sport: An ethnography of organizational functioning in a national sport organization. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 24, 26–47.
- Weinberg, R.S. & Williams, J.M. (2010). Integrating and implementing a psychological skills training program. In J.M. Williams (Ed.), *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (pp.361–391). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Westbrook, D., Kennerley, H. & Kirk, J. (2011). *An introduction to Cognitive Behaviour Therapy: Skills and Applications*. London: Sage.
- Williams, C. & Garland, A. (2002). A cognitive-behavioural therapy assessment model for use in everyday clinical practice. *Advances in Psychiatric Treatment*, 8, 172–179.

Table 1

*Baseline to post-intervention motivational climate indicator scores.*

Variable	Baseline		Post-Intervention	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Mastery Climate	25.91	2.33	27.93	3.20
Ego Climate	10.96	2.67	8.50	2.04
Self-Confidence	3.20	0.53	3.80	0.68
Self-Esteem	46.30	6.09	49.60	4.76

*Note. N = 23.*

Table 2

*Core Values and associated processes for integrating into daily practice*

<b>Core Value</b>	<b>Process</b>
<b>1. Always give 100%</b> (adherence to be evaluated before sessions)	<p>'The journey matters more' team mantra (reinforcing improvement as most important as opposed to outcome)</p> <p>'Only as strong as our biggest weakness' team mantra (targeting development towards areas for improvement)</p>
<b>2. Willingness to learn and to learn from others</b> (adherence to be evaluated during sessions)	<p>Ask all team-mates for their input</p> <p>Dedicate time to work on an area for improvement during warm-up and cool-down</p> <p>Break-out into 'feedback pairs' during water breaks</p>
<b>3. Have fun and enjoy</b> (adherence to be evaluated during sessions)	<p>Be verbal about it! (encouraging use of positive verbal reinforcement)</p> <p>Support and reinforce others for good effort</p> <p>Refocus on process: 'Next three seconds' (self-talk phrase)</p>
<b>4. Feedback from both athletes and coaches</b> (adherence to be evaluated before and after sessions)	<p>Take five minutes at the beginning and end of sessions</p> <p>Ask each other: 'Are we following our values?'</p>

### Figure Captions

Figure 1. *Frequency WordCloud generated from discussions during Core Values sessions, used as basis for creating Core Values and associated processes for integrating into daily practice.*

