TEAM INTERVENTION PROGRAM ON ROLE PERCEPTION AND TASK COHESION ON SWEDISH JUNIOR ICE-HOCKEY TEAM
Abstract
The purposes of this study was to examine what effects a specific team intervention program had on the ice-hockey players’ perceptions of their roles and the teams’ task cohesion. Further the purpose was to examine the benefits from having clear roles and strategies to develop role clarity. It was an intervention study with experimental design and a mixed method approach. Participants were two Swedish male junior ice hockey teams including one experimental team (n=14) and one control team (n=16). The intervention took place during competitive season and was based on communication training, mutual sharing and role development. The results showed that the role clarity decreased in both teams during the time of the intervention. The players in the intervention team felt significant more appreciated than the players in the control team. Overall did the intervention team have more positive trends than the control team. Perceived benefits from role clarity were good cooperation, communication, self-confidence and determination. Suggested strategies to develop role clarity were to communicate with team mates and coach, practice and adjust to the team. Positive effects from the intervention were improved communication, positive attitude, self-confidence, calmness, cohesion and openess.
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Introduction

Sport Psychology Consultants are getting more common and play an important role in the delivery of applied programs to high performance athletes. Consequently the need to evaluate applied sport psychology programs and the consultants performing them is essential (Anderson, Miles, Mahoney, & Robinson, 2002). Applied evaluation research can be used to generate information that helps clarify judgment about services, facilitates program improvement and produces knowledge (Chelimsky, 1997). One of the most common team interventions are different team building approach. Woodcock and Francis (1994) described team building as a process that involves a series of techniques, often used in combination with one another, which are designed to improve teams’ performance by providing opportunities for the team members to interact and grow as a team. One of the main targets when doing team interventions is to increase the team cohesion. Self-evaluation questionnaires’ is the most common way of measuring team cohesion (Weinberg & Gould, 2006) and most of the researches in the area of team cohesion has so far been quantitative, for example studies of relationship between cohesion, performance and role clarity (but there are still few qualitative studies done that explains the results more deeply). Even less intervention studies testing intervention programs to develop strategies to improve these factors have been done so far. It is an important aspect for the results from the researches to be applied into the real world, in the clubs and with the athletes (Granström & Olofsson 2006). There are many interesting results from studies that never become more than just results in a study. Though intervention program the results from previous studies can turn in to practical tools for coaches and athletes. Since it seems complicated to capture the themes around cohesion and role clarity this intervention study used both qualitative (semi-structured interviews) and quantitative questionnaires in pre- and post-measures.

Roles

The role describes what is expected of the person and how its’ relation is to the other members in the group (Levi, 2001). In a team, just like in any other type of group, there are two types of roles; formal- and informal roles (Weinberg & Gould, 2006). Formal roles are those with a direct function in the team, distributed by the team or the management of the team (Carron & Hausenblas, 1998). Positions in the team, such as captain or goaltender are examples of formal roles. These roles are so important for the team that the role holder most likely is either trained for this role or selected to the team because of his or her particular skills and qualities. The informal roles are created through interaction between the members
Role clarity, ambiguity and conflicts

There are several factors affecting how well a person performs in his or her role. Carron and Hausenblas (1998) created a model (see Figure 1), in order to explain these factors. The player needs; clarity about the set of demands on the role (clarity), accept the assigned role (role acceptance) and experience ability to live up to the demands of the role (performance). One of the biggest problems that can appear is ambiguity about the role. Role ambiguity has been defined as lack of clear, consistent information about expectations related to one’s position (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, & Rosenthal, 1964). More recently the understanding of the role episode and role ambiguity in particular has been advanced through a multidimensional conceptualization of the construct. This means that athletes can perceive that ambiguity can appear for different reasons, which can be explained in four dimensions within the context of offensive and defensive responsibilities in interactive sports such as soccer and hockey (Beauchamp, Bray, Eys, & Carron, 2002). These dimensions include the scope of responsibilities, the behaviors necessary to fulfill the role, how the role will be evaluated, and the consequences of a failure to achieve the role (Beauchamp et al., 2002). In particular, perceptions of role ambiguity have been shown to be negatively related to perceptions of task self-efficacy and task cohesion (Eys & Carron, 2001), role satisfaction (Beauchamp, Bray, Eys, & Carron, 2005), overall athlete satisfaction (Eys, Carron, Bray, & Beauchamp, 2003), and role performance (Bray & Brawley, 2002). Eys et.al (2003) found in their study that players with more experience perceived less ambiguity within their roles in the beginning of the season, compared to the less experienced players. They also found that the non-starters experienced more ambiguity than the starters. However, the players experienced less ambiguity about their role in the end of the season, compared to in the beginning of the season. Finally, in order to perform well the player has to accept the assigned role. Acceptance includes both that the player feels comfortable and feels competent performing the role.

Another area regarding roles is that the player experiences a conflict within his role. Kahn, et al., (1964) identified three forms of role conflicts; (1) person-role conflict, when the players believes or values and the defined role behavior doesn’t match, (2) inter-role conflict, when
the player has more than one role at the same time and (3) intra-role conflict, when there are different expectation on the player performing the role. This creates confusion for the player, who doesn’t know how to act in order to fulfill all the perceived expectations at the same time.

![Figure 1: Model over the relationship between individual roles and the teams' effectiveness](Carron & Hausenblas, 1998 s.162).

**Positive effects with role clarity**

Role clarity means that the player is clear about his role (Bray & Brawley, 2002). There are several positive affects with increased role clarity. Mellalieu and Juniper (2006) discovered that when the players were more clear about their roles it facilitated their individual game; the players felt more secure in their positions and didn’t hesitate about what was expected from them. Another positive effect was that the conflicts between the players and the coach and within the team decreased. They also experienced that the communication increased when the roles got clearer. With clear roles, it seemed easier to discuss them. The players in the study by Mellalieu and Junipers (2006) also reported that their increased role clarity brought the team members together and cohesion became stronger. On the other hand, the players experienced that when the task cohesion increased and the player perceived that his role performance was important to the team, both the clarity and acceptance of the role came more easily.

Several studies have shown a positive relationship between role clarity and cohesion. The players in the study by Mellalieu and Junipers (2006) reported that their increased role clarity brought the team members together and cohesion became stronger. On the other hand, the
players also experienced that when the task cohesion increased and the player perceived that his role performance was important to the team, both the clarity and acceptance of the role came more easily. One of the players in the study from Hjelmåker (2006) reported that one of the key factors regarding why the players approved the game plan of the team was because the players had learned to accept their roles.

**Strategies to develop role clarity**

In their study about role episodes Mellalieu and Juniper (2006) found several items of ways to develop role clarity. Three explicit themes were discovered; clear interaction between the player and the coach, direct feedback during practice and games from team mates with similar roles and feedback and instructions from significant others, such as family and friends. Mellalieu and Juniper (2006) also found three implicit ways to create role clarity: (1) learning by doing, (2) try different roles to create an understanding about the role from another perspective and (3) modeling by observing others performing in a similar role.

The coach in the study by Hjelmåker (2006) said that he always tried to talk directly with the players who perceived ambiguity and tried to tell them what they could improve. Sullivan and Feltz (2003) discovered that their communication intervention not only improved the communication, but also made the participants more aware about how other people see them and what role they have in the group. The role-sender is generally the head coach of the team. However, another major possible source of role information for athletes may be through the communication practices and interaction with teammates (Eys et al., 2005).

**Measure role clarity and role ambiguity**

Bales (1950 ref. in Pennington, 2002) stated that in order for a group to work two different types of issues has to be solved and that requires two types of behavior; *task-oriented behavior*, which helps the group to receive their goals and *socio-emotional behavior* which creates interaction and a positive climate so that the members can work together. From that Bales and Cohen (1979 ref. in Pennington, 2002) developed in 1979 an instrument which they called *System for the multiple level observations of groups “SYMLOG”*. SYMLOG is a combination of several methods to observe, recognize and categorize different behavior in the group.

The Role Ambiguity Scale (Beauchamp, et al., 2002) developed a questionnaire that would examine the perception of the players’ role ambiguity in an independent team sport context. The questionnaire includes eight dimensions of role ambiguity in the setting of offence and
defense. The dimensions are (1) scope of responsibilities, which refers to the players’ knowledge of his or her responsibilities, (2) required behaviors to fulfill these responsibilities; (3) evaluation of role performance, the players’ own evaluation of the role performance and (4) consequences of not fulfilling role responsibilities, what would be the consequences if he or she doesn’t perform (perceived consequences). All the dimensions are in both offence and defense. Even though there has been performed qualitative studies about roles and role clarity, such as Eys, Carron, Beauchamp and Bray (2005) and Mellalieu and Juniper (2006) optimally there should be more done in this area in order to complement the role episodes and how the players perceive them (Mellalieu & Juniper, 2006). It would also be easier to work with the roles if there were strategies developed and knowledge about how the players themselves perceive are the best ways to develop role clarity, similar to the study made by Mellalieu and Juniper (2006).

Cohesion
Researches about cohesion has been conducted during several years and there are several definitions. Seibold (1999) believes there has to be a better defined, collective, definition of cohesion so that the areas of cohesion can develop and that results from different researches can be compared. Cohesion is a dynamic process which reflects the tendency for the group to stick together and remain united (Carron & Hausenblas, 1998). The factors that contribute to cohesion in the beginning might be different in the end of the season (Lindwall, Johnson & Åström, 2002). According to Yukelson (1997) team cohesion is one of the cornerstones when building effective team performance. According to the multidimensional approach there are two different kinds of cohesion; task- and social oriented cohesion (Weinberg & Gould, 2006). The task oriented cohesion is about how well the members of the group cooperate and achieve the collective goals of the group. The social cohesion on the other hand is more focused on how much the members enjoy spending time together.

The term ”group” can be defined in several ways. According to Carron and Hausenblas (1998) a group is primarily categorized by the common destiny of the group members. They also state that the difference between a group and a crowd of people is that the members of a group share the same believes. The members of a group are somehow connected (Levi, 2001). A team is usually described in a similar way in the literature, but there are some differences. In a group there can be between two and two thousand members, but in a team there usually
are a limited amount of members. The members of a team does also, unlike a group, have a stronger sense of “us against them”, clearer roles, norms and a more structured ways of communicating (Weinberg & Gould, 2006).

**Task cohesion and performance**
Luthanen and Salminen (1998) presented a study consisting of 200 Finnish ice-hockey players. In their study they used the Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ) and compared that with the amount of won games during the season. They found a clear pattern that the teams with higher cohesion won more games. It showed that the cohesion contributed to the performance, although the performance was mostly connected to the task-oriented cohesion. Other studies have shown that the connection between cohesion and performance goes both ways. In the study from Salminen (1987) about the relation between cohesion and performance it appeared that the players that had experienced success in their games during a long time perceived a higher cohesion than those who had just won a few games. In Hjelmäkers study (2006) all the players agreed on that cohesion was important for the performance. They said that if a person doesn’t enjoy spending time with the team he wouldn’t perform well. In the study by Granström and Olofsson (2006) the players perceived that joy and the feeling of comfort in the team made the members take more initiative of their own and were not being afraid of critique if they failed.

**Develop cohesion within teams**
Team building is a dynamic process that changes over time and is influenced by personal, situational and team factors. In sport, a team is a collection of individuals that together organize task roles in order to achieve purpose or common goal (Yukelson, 1984). The literature offers different suggestions on how to develop cohesion. Wheelan (2008) examples on strategies to improve the cohesion is to increase the members’ influence on the decision making process, increase the group integration, rise the satisfaction of each member and develop better cooperation within the group. Wheelan also suggest that by increasing the enjoyment and humor at work the togetherness will be stronger and ultimately increase the cohesion. Other strategies are to let the players be proud of their team and a belief in themselves and each other, enhance the identity of the team, avoid small sub-groups and a big amount of turnovers and implement team meetings on regular bases (Weinberg & Gould, 2006).
Team building through mutual sharing and discussions

There are several theories about how a team should be organized to develop cohesion. One strategy when working with team building interventions is to facilitate peer helping and social support. This refers to teammates helping one another, being there for one another, picking each other up, particularly in time of need. By helping each other and providing sincere support, peers can be a great source of technical, informational, or emotional support for each other (Hardy & Crace, 1991). By using regular team meetings to discuss team issues and to share information leads to creativity to decision-making processes, and builds trust, support, mutual respect, and mutual understanding among the players (Yukelson, 1993).

Personal-disclosure and mutual-sharing team building interventions is a model used by Dunn and Holt (2004) with male ice hockey players and later with female soccer players (Holt & Dunn, 2006) prior to a national tournament. The players in both studies reported enhanced understanding, increased cohesion, and improved confidence. Intervention study made by Pain and Harwood (2009) took place during one season and the focus was more concentrated on team functioning. The results showed that open discussions of team functioning had positive effect on not only togetherness and inclusion, but also on communication, training quality and self-understanding. In this process the perceived key words to be open discussions and honesty. For teams that are not used to such activities or approaches it’s important for the consultant to set norms for the meetings and make sure that the environment is appropriate (Pain and Harwood, 2009).

Measure cohesion

Self-evaluation questionnaires’ is the most common way of measuring team cohesion (Weinberg & Gould 2006) and most of the researches in the area of team cohesion has, so far, been quantitative, as the relationship between cohesion, performance and role clarity, but there is still lacking studies in the area explaining why the results are like that and even less intervention studies, testing intervention programs to develop strategies. Salminen (1987) thought already in the year 1987 that there were enough studies examine the relation between the Sport Cohesiveness Questionnaire (SCQ), at that time most used self-evaluation questionnaire and performance. Since 1987 there have been many studies made and new instruments like the GEQ have been developed, but there are still deficiencies in the area.
Communication and feedback
There are several different ways to communicate and some appear to be more effective than others. Effective intra-team communication has been operationally defined to include both verbal and nonverbal communication concerning task and social factors (Sullivan & Feltz, 2003). Sullivan and Feltz suggests that in order for effective intra-team communication to work in team sport the communication between the members will contain a suitable amount of verbal and nonverbal exchange of acceptance, distinctiveness, negative conflicts and positive conflicts. Acceptance includes appreciation and consideration among the players. Distinctiveness has to do with the creation of identity through the communication within the team, which could be both verbal (nicknames, sayings etc.) and nonverbal (body language). Negative conflict is the communication that deals with differences within the team in an emotional way, in contrast to the constructive, non-emotional, positive conflict. Studies have shown that effective communication is based on trust, honesty, mutual sharing and mutual understanding (Yukelson, 1993). In order for a group or a team to function effectively, members must be able to communicate openly and honestly with each other about the efficiency of group functioning. Sullivan and Feltz (2003) describe effective communication as when team members listen to each other, communicate in order to help each other and try to understand each other. By using regular team meetings to discuss team issues and to share information leads to creativity to decision-making processes, and builds trust, support, mutual respect, and mutual understanding among the players (Yukelson, 1993). It’s important for the players to learn how to express their thoughts and feelings in a good way and to know how things that other people say effects them. Athletes can benefit from feedback related to performance in many ways; two of the main functions are to motivate and to instruct (Weinberg & Gould, 2006). From my experience working with athletes, and ice hockey players in particular, is that they in general experience lack of feedback from the coach. The feedback from the team mates is mostly general like “good job” or negative. Positive reinforcement should be the predominant way to change behavior (Weinberg & Gould, 2006).

Strategies to communicate
Weinberg and Gould (2006) have lined up some useful tips that can help to make the communication more constructive, such as describe your feelings, describe your thoughts about the action of event that concerns you, describe why it affects you and describe what you want to do about it. The idea is that these strategies would make it easier for the team
members to communicate in a more constructive way. Lätt (2009) provides a set of words to avoid when to communicate in a constructive way. The words are “but”, “why”, “have to/should”, “not”, “never”, “always” and the pronominal “one”. These are the words that work as conversation blockers, i.e., these words inhibit the communication. For example; why, not and never can sound very negative and can make the people very defensive and that makes it harder to create a good communication in the team.

There are several factors affecting how well a person performs his or her role. Role clarity (clarity), accept the assigned role (role acceptance) and experience ability to live up to the demands of the role (performance). As mentioned, according to Beauchamp et al. (2002) there are four dimensions of sources to role ambiguity; the scope of responsibilities, the behaviors necessary to fulfill the role, how the role will be evaluated, and the consequences of a failure to achieve the role. The perceptions of role ambiguity have been shown to be negatively related to perceptions of task self-efficacy and task cohesion (Eys & Carron, 2001), role satisfaction (Beauchamp, et.al. 2005), overall athlete satisfaction (Eys, et.al., 2003), and role performance (Bray & Brawley, 2002). Mellalieu and Juniper (2006) discovered several positive effects with increased role clarity; it facilitated their individual game; the players felt more secure in their positions and didn’t hesitate about what was expected from them. Another positive effect was that the conflicts between the players and the coach and within the team decreased. They also experienced that the communication increased when the roles became clearer. Mellalieu and Junipers (2006) also reported that their increased role clarity brought the team members together and cohesion became stronger. Studies have shown that interventions with open discussions of team functioning and communication training has positive effect on togetherness, inclusion, communication, training quality, self-understanding and role clarity (Pain & Harwood, 2009, Sullivan and Feltz, 2003 & Eys et al. 2003).

Objectives
The main objective of this study was to examine what effects a team intervention program had on Swedish male ice-hockey players’ perception of their roles, the task cohesion within the team and amount of feedback. The second objective was to examine the players’ perceived benefits from having a clear role (for themselves and for the team), the players’ strategies to develop role clarity and how they work to develop role clarity. The third objective was to evaluate the ice-hockey players’ perceptions of the intervention and the consultant.
Method

Participants
The participants in the study were two Swedish under-18 teams; one experimental team (n=14) and one control team (n=16). All the participants were male, junior, ice hockey players in the age of 16-17. The selection method used was purposeful sampling. Purposeful sampling is used when the study requires information-rich participants and the groups are comparable (Struwig & Struwig, 2001). In this case both teams played in the highest under 18 series in Sweden and both coaches were highly educated (all the steps of Swedish Ice Hockey Federations’ Coach Academy). The players in the teams were all in the target group of the purpose of the study. The teams were both in the top of the league the previous season and were considered comparable in terms of skill level and ranking. No coaches attended during the meetings.

Instruments
The study was conducted with both quantitative and qualitative instruments. The quantitative part of the study was composed by a questionary divided into three parts (see attachment 1). The first part consisted of 18 items about roles, the second part consisted of nine items from the Group Environment Questionnaire (Attraction to the group –task and Group integration-task), and the third part consisted of three items about feedback. All the answers of the questionnaire were on libert-scale 1-9. After the intervention the players in the experimental team also filled out an evaluation form about the intervention and the consultant who led the intervention.

Roles
The items in the role-part were constructed by the author and made from the model of Carron and Hausenblas (1998) ”Model of relations between individual roles and team effectiveness” and the theory of role conflicts by Kahn, et al., (1964). The items were about role clarity (cognitive) how clear the player experience his role and how well he understand the demands of the role (item 1 & 18), role acceptance (emotion) how satisfied the player is with his role; a) how well the role fits the players perceived skills (item 3 & 16), b) how appreciated the player feels in his role (item 5 & 13), c) how important the player feel that his role is for the team (item 7 & 10) d) how much empowerment the player experience that he has in his role (item 8 & 9), role performance (competence) how confident the player is that he can perform in the role (item 11 & 12). In the end there are three categories concerning role conflicts;
*intra-role conflict* about if the player experience different, contradictory demands on the role which makes the player confused (item 6 & 14), *inter-role conflict* which is when the player has different demands from different role senders (for example coach, team mates, parents) (item 4 & 15), and *person-role conflict* if the role and the players personality is not in balance (item 2 & 17).

**Group Environment Questionnaire (GEQ)**

GEQ is a self-evaluation instrument (see attachment 1) developed by Carron, Widmeyer and Brawley (1985). When they developed the instrument they started with five assumptions; (1) groups have characteristics, like roles and status structures, which can be observed, (2) the members experience the social atmosphere in the group and have clear perception of it, (3) these perceptions are the results of the information that the person him or herself has taken in and processed, (4) the members perception reflects the cohesion in the group, (5) it’s possible to measure those perceptions with a self-evaluation questionnaire. As a background they developed a model which illustrates the four group characteristics which they later used to create the four dimensions of the questionnaire (see Figure 2): Attraction to the group-task, which has to do with the player taking part in the teams’ task solving process, Attraction to the group-social, involves how much the players enjoy the team and how accepted they are in the group, Group integration-task, the task related cohesion and how well the team solved problems together and Group integration-social, how much time team spend together outside the sport context (Carron et.al.,1985).

The questionnaire consist of four dimensions: a) *Attraction to the group- task*, which has to do with the player taking part in the teams’ task solving process, b) *Attraction to the group social*, involves how much the players enjoy the team and how accepted they are in the group, c) *Group integration-task*, has to do with the task related cohesion and how well the team solved problems together and d) *Group integration-social*, has to do with how much time team spend together outside the sport context (Carron. et.al.,1985). Since some previous studies have shown that mostly the task cohesion has an influence in the performance only the task related dimensions were being measured in this study. In this case the questions 1, 2, 3 and 4 cover the attraction to the group dimension and questions 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 cover the group integration dimension.
Feedback

The purpose of the three questions about feedback in the third section of the questionnaire differs from the rest of the questionnaire, since it does not have a direct connection to the purpose of the study. The feedback was used as a strategy to improve the cohesion and role perception. Since the consultant was not present during the whole time the team was together, the purpose of these questions was to make sure that the feedback given during the meeting proceeded also between the meetings. So the feedback questions should rather be considered as a tool for the intervention than as a measure of the effect of the intervention. The questions targets how often the player give feedback to others, receive feedback from others or give feedback to himself.

Semi-structured interview guide

There were two different semi-structured interviews in this study. One was used as a pre-test, before the intervention, with five players from each team. The selection of players was both strategic and randomized. The strategy was to pick two forwards, two defensemen and one goaltender from each team. The purpose was to receive the perspective from all the positions in the teams. The players in each position were then randomly picked from a bowl, with one name on each paper. The second interview guide was used to target the perceived changes that may have appeared during the intervention, both changes that the player perceived within himself and changes within the team. The purpose of the interview was to be a complement to the evaluation form. Since only the intervention team participated in the intervention, only five players from the intervention team were interviewed at the time of the post-tests. The selection procedure was the same as with the first interview. Some players participated in both of the interviews and some only in one of them. The first interview had questions about how
the player perceives his role and how they work with the roles within the team (see attachment 2). The second interview guide had questions about how the players experienced the intervention and if they had perceived any changes with themselves or with the team during the season (sees attachment 3).

**Evaluation of the intervention**

The evaluation form (see attachment 4) was structured in two sections. The first section contained five statements about the players’ perception of the consultant which the players were asked to rank in the scale *I don’t agree* to *I completely agree* (1-10). Example: “The consultant has been giving clear instructions”. The second part contained seven open questions where the player could write using their own words. Example: “What have you learned so far from the meetings?”

**Design**

The design of the intervention was a long term intervention program with one team during a competitive season. The regular meetings (every third week, 11 meetings in total, á 1h) followed a program of several techniques (see below). Another comparable team was used as a control group during the same season. Present intervention study, was partly based on the guidelines from the intervention made by Pain and Harwood (2009), described earlier, but since the participants were young (16-17 years old) it was combined with the Youth Sport Consulting Model (YSCM) (Visek, Harris & Blom, 2009). Since youth athletes are in a different development stage than adult athletes it’s important to modify and adjust the exercises so that they are appropriate for the specific age group when delivering sport psychology programs to youth athletes (LeBlanc & Dickson, 1997). The YSCM is an educational framework made for guiding sport psychology consultants in the implementation and delivery of sport psychology services to young athletes. The YSCM model promotes that the consultant should make the sessions as active as possible and connect it to the athletes sport directly. Visek et al. (2009) suggests in her study that young athletes can be introduced to the same areas as an adult athlete, such as teambuilding, imagery, communication, leadership) but it has to be adjusted to the athletes developmental level.

**Meeting 1 - Introduction.** The first meeting started up with the consultant explaining the program for the season. Each player had to read and sign the letter of content before the meeting could start. After that, each player was asked to introduce himself to the group using
three statements, two true and one false. Then the rest of the players had to guess which statement was false. In that way the consultant got to know the players a little better and also got a hint of how well the players knew each other. In the second part of the meeting the questionnaires were filled out and the interviews conducted.

Meeting 2 – Norms and basic principles of effective communication. The meeting started with a discussion about what norms that the team should have during the meetings. There were norms concerning punctuality, how to get permission to speak, confidentiality within the team and active participation. When the players had agreed on some norms the subject of effective communication was introduced by the consultant. The framework was the strategies provided by Lätt (2009). After introducing the strategies, the players were asked to discuss an activity that they could do together in order to improve their cohesion. Some of the players were given “tips from the coach” with conversation blockers like “not”, “never”, “always” and “why” and then after a while they were asked to just continue without the blockers. After that, the differences between conversing with and without blockers were discussed.

Meeting 3 – Trust and body language. The first part of the meeting was dedicated to trust building exercises. One example was that the players were paired up two and two and asked to lead each other with blindfolds. Another exercise was that one player should fall backwards and be caught by a team mate. In the second part of the meeting the topic was “good body language”. The matters discussed were (1) what is a “good body language” on the bench and on the ice? (2) how are we effected by others body language? (3) how should we act in our team to benefit the team?

Meeting 4 – Feedback. During the first exercise of the fourth meeting each player was asked to tell the team something that felt he had done well the last practice or game. The players were asked to help each other to fill in if someone didn’t come up with anything. The aim of that exercise was to get the players aware about how much negative feedback they give to themselves and how hard it can be to find the good things when you are not used to it. (This exercise was used in all the following meetings). After that the team discussed feedback within the team; when to give feedback, how to give feedback in a constructive way, how to receive feedback and when not to give feedback. Matters discussed were timing, voice tone, sense the mood of the team mate and what to say when receiving feedback. The discussion resulted in team rules of how to work with feedback in the team.

Meeting 5 – Role theory. The theme of the meeting was roles within the team and started off with the consultant explaining the theory behind roles and what a player need in order to perform in his role. The theories based on Carron and Hausenblas (1998) and Beauchamp
et.al (2002). After that, each player was asked to explain his role to the team and then the rest of the team were asked to respond if they had the same perception of the role as the player in focus. Some players were very clear and some needed some help from their team mates to explain his role.

**Meeting 6 - Strategies to develop role clarity.** The first part of the meeting was dedicated to get back to the subject of meeting four. Each player was asked to look at the team mate on the right and say something positive using the sentence “I appreciate “X” because…” The player receiving the feedback was asked to just say “thank you”. The aim of the second half of the meeting was to develop some strategies within the team in order to make the roles more clear. The consultant introduced the strategies provided by Mellalieu and Juniper, (2006) and the strategies suggested in the interviews. One of the strategies the team decided to use was to help each other more by giving and asking for feedback from team mates. The “Secret-feedback-friend” was introduced (see explanation after meeting 11).

**Meeting 7 – Quiet communication: give and receive help.** The whole seventh meeting was dedicated to an exercise were the players had to work together in order to build letters and numbers using plastic blocks. Each player was given some blocks and they had to use all blocks in order to fulfill the exercise. The problem was that they were not allowed to communicate in any way and not to ask for help, but they were allowed to help each other and give blocks to each other. The aim of the exercise was to make the players aware of the others and not only focus on themselves.

**Meeting 8 – Problem solving.** In this meeting a problem solving method was introduced as a tool to work with the roles. The problem solving method is provided by De Haan (2005) and is a strategy in five steps; (1) introduction of the case (2) exploration of the case (3) discussing solutions (4) issue holder’s response (5) evaluation. One player brought up a problem and the rest of the team tried to solve it. The second part the meeting was focused on feedback. The players sat in a circle and provided one positive feedback and one constructive feedback to each of the team mates. The feedback was given eye to eye and with a post-it that the player could bring home.

**Meeting 9 – Problem solving part two.** The same method as in meeting eight was used, but this time another player brought up a new problem area.

**Meeting 10 – How to go on.** The meeting was used to sum up all the previous meetings and set norms and routines for the work with feedback, roles and other team issues. The discussion was open and each player was able to bring up whatever issue he wanted to discuss. The aim was to set a standard of how that team should work when the intervention
period was over.

Meeting 11 – Evaluation The last meeting started with a group discussion on what they had learned during the intervention and how they had perceived it. Then the post-tests and evaluation forms were filled out and the interviews were conducted.

Secret-feedback-friend. At meeting number six, the game “Secret-feedback-friend” was introduced to the players. With beginning at meeting number six and through the rest of the intervention period the players had to draw a piece of paper from a hat with the name of a team mate on it. Until the next meeting the player had to give extra feedback to that team mate. Each player then had to guess who their secret friend was that period. The player who had done a good job giving feedback received one point. Every meeting they had to pick a new name. At meeting number eleven the player with most points got a reward “Team-mate of the year”. The purpose of the game was to make the giving-feedback process less uncomfortable, since everybody then expected their team mates to give feedback.

Procedure
The coaches of each team were contacted by the author in the end of August. One coach (the coach of the experimental team) was told about the aim of the study and the content of the intervention program. The other coach (control team) was told that the aim of the study was to examine the change of team cohesion and role perception during one season. Both coaches were told to feel free to ask questions at any time during the process. The pre-tests and interviews we conducted in the middle of September with both of the teams and took place in the teams’ own meeting rooms. None of the coaches participated during the team meetings. The post-tests took place in February, a few weeks before the play-off.

Ethics
At the time of the pre-test all the players were informed about the purpose of the study, that they participate in the study on voluntary bases and that they could choose to abort their participation at any time. All players signed a letter of agreement (see attachment 5).

Data analysis
The outcome was measured by both quantitatively (GEQ and role clarity/ambiguity scale), qualitatively (semi-structured interviews) and with the evaluation form (both quantitatively and qualitatively). The quantitative data was analyzed with Statistical of Social Science (SPSS, 20) through MANOVA tests. The results from the pre- and post-tests from
experimental group were compared with the results from the control group. The qualitative data was audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim right after each interview and the raw-data were analyzed by constant comparative method. The method is developed by Glaser & Strauss and modified by Lincon and Guba (1985 ref. in Maycut & Morehouse, 1994) and is an inductive analyze method for qualitative data. The analysis was performed in several steps:

1. First the recorded interviews were transcribed.
2. Then read several times so the author would become familiar with the material.
3. During the analysis repeated words, subjects and phrases in the answers, which seemed to be connected to the aim of the study, were identified and marked as units.
4. The data units were compared with each other according to the procedure of the analysis method and the grouped in temporary themes and sub-themes. First the units that seemed similar were grouped into sub-themes and then major themes were constructed by grouping several sub-themes that seemed connected to each other.
5. As examples of the answers quotes has been collected from the transcriptions.
6. To be able to track the quotes each quote was assigned a code. Example: (IP1:2 1.1.) means interview person one, team one, question 1.1 or (IP5:1pi 3) means interview person five, team one, post intervention, question 3.

The interviews were conducted by the consultant (who is a master student in sports psychology with a background in junior elite sport). All the interviews were performed in Swedish language and later the quotes were translated by the consultant and corrected by a native English speaking person with sport background.

Results

The results will be presented in four major sections: (1) the quantitative results from the questionnaires (Roles, GEQ and Feedback) (2) the qualitative results from the interviews that were conducted before the intervention (3) the qualitative results from the evaluating interviews conducted after the intervention and (4) a summary of the results from the evaluating from, both quantitative and qualitative. The qualitative material is described in themes and sub-themes and as examples of the answers quotes has been collected from the transcriptions.
Quantitative results

Roles

Table 1. Descriptive of means – Roles (n=14, 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role Type</th>
<th>Team 1 (n=14)</th>
<th>Team 2 (n=16)</th>
<th>Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Post Mean (SD)</td>
<td>Effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role Clarity</td>
<td>16,7 (2,3)</td>
<td>15,2 (3,6)</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role acceptance qual.</td>
<td>13,5 (4,9)</td>
<td>13,1 (5,5)</td>
<td>-0,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role acceptance app.</td>
<td>14,1 (4,0)</td>
<td>14,6 (2,7)</td>
<td>+0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role acceptance imp.</td>
<td>14,4 (2,9)</td>
<td>15,0 (3,5)</td>
<td>+0,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role acceptance dev.</td>
<td>13,2 (4,5)</td>
<td>13,7 (4,6)</td>
<td>+0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-role conflict</td>
<td>13,1 (3,9)</td>
<td>13,4 (4,0)</td>
<td>+0,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-role conflict</td>
<td>13,6 (4,0)</td>
<td>14,1 (3,0)</td>
<td>+0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person-role Conflict</td>
<td>15,6 (2,4)</td>
<td>14,2 (3,6)</td>
<td>-1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role performance</td>
<td>14,4 (4,3)</td>
<td>15,8 (3,2)</td>
<td>+1,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The descriptive statistics (Table 1) show that the intervention team had overall slightly more positive trends, from the pre- to the post test, in more role perception variables than the control team. Descriptive data show that the biggest differences in change were in the variables Role Acceptance Appreciation, Role Acceptance Importance and Role performance. Both teams decreased in Role Clarity between the tests.

MANOVA revealed no significant overall group differences between the teams in the pre-test, except for the variable Intra-role Conflict (F=4,164, DF=1, (P=0,041). The players in the intervention team experienced less Intra-role conflict than the players in the control team.

The MANOVA post-test showed significant difference in the variables Role Acceptance Appreciation (F=12,454, DF=1) (P= 0,002) and the variable Intra Role Conflict (F=6,067, DF=1) (P=0,021). The players in the intervention team felt more appreciated than the players in the control team and experienced less intra-role conflicts than the players in the control team.
Cohesion

Table 2. Description of means – Cohesion (n=14, 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team 1 (n=14)</th>
<th>Team 2 (n=16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction Task</td>
<td>31.4 (4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration Task</td>
<td>31.6 (5.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The descriptive statistic (Table 2) show that the intervention team mean value decreased in Attraction to the task while the control team increased during the intervention period. Both teams improved the Integration in the group, but the intervention team improved more slightly. MANOVA showed a significant difference between the teams before the intervention in the variable Attraction to the task (F=4.825, DF=1) (P=0.036). The players in the intervention team were more attracted to the task than the players in the control team. The post-test MANOVA showed no significant difference between the teams after the intervention.

Feedback

Table 3. Descriptive of means – Feedback (n=14, 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team 1 (n=14)</th>
<th>Team 2 (n=16)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback to others</td>
<td>6.2 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback from others</td>
<td>6.4 (1.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback to myself</td>
<td>7.0 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The descriptive statistics (Table 3) show that both teams perceived marginally more feedback in all categories, except feedback from others in the control team, which didn’t change during the intervention period. The MANOVA test showed a significant difference between the teams in the variable Feedback from others (F=5.638, DF=1) (P=0.025) before the intervention. No significance in the other two variables. The intervention team perceived that they received more feedback from others than the control players did. The results from the post-test MANOVA showed significant difference between the teams in
the variable Feedback from others (F=5.013, DF=1) (P=0.033). That is the players in the intervention team experienced receiving more feedback from others than the control team.

Interview before intervention

Roles

Assigned according to skills and personal characteristics
Most of the players described that they had been given their roles because of the skills they have and their personal characteristics. They state that they have that certain role because they are good at what they are doing. “I guess I am… confident when handling the puck, have pretty good perception of the game and things like that.” (IP1:2 1.1). “I’m dynamic and move fast sideways, calm most of the time.” (IP2:2 1.1) “I’m a solid defenseman who doesn’t let anyone pass me. More defensive than offensive.” (IP4:1 1.1)

Benefits from own role clarity for the player and for the team: Confidence, determination and calmness
According to the players the most significant consequences from being clear about the role is confidence and courage to do what they are supposed to do without hesitation. “Well, I guess I dare to step up and be dominant in the game. I mean I know what I should do! I don’t just skate around and think about what I should do, it comes naturally.” (IP1:2 2.3) Two of the players state that the role clarity allows them to show determination on the ice. “I can show determination in everything I do and never need to hesitate.” (IP4:2 2.3) Some of the players mention that they experience a sense of calm when the role is clear. They didn’t have to worry so much what they had to do to keep their spot. “It creates a sense of calm inside me that I know; this is what I have to do in order to get to play and if I do what I am good at, the coach will let me play.” (IP2:2 2.3) According to some of the players the clarity about the own role does not only help the player himself, but also the team. One player state that he can transfer the feeling he get from his own role clarity to the other players. “First of all I try to act as calm as possible and play safe in order to spread the calmness in the whole defense. They (the other players) feel more secure when I play well and don’t mess around and drop easy shots” (IP2:1 1.1)

Benefits from clarity between the players: Cohesion and responsibility to the team
When the players experience that they are clear about each other’s roles they found it important to try to make it easier for each other, so that each player is able to perform their
best. The clarity between the players made this process easier. “We play for each other. I’m not sure how to explain it, but we play for the line, not for ourselves. Since we know each other’s roles we always try to make it easier for each other.” (IP3:1 4.2)

All the players agree on that they should perform in their role in order to help the team. The team comes first, then the player himself. “You see, I’m a very offensive defense-player… I like to help the team. It feels like I help the line a lot.” (IP3:2 1.1) They seem to put a lot of pride into helping the team and are very specific about what it means to help the team.

“My role is to help the team by giving hundred percent every game… It’s important to have a significant role in the team and score goals, but even more important to work hard, give good passes to the team mates and build opportunities for my team mates.” (IP3:1 1.1)

One player explains that he is not really satisfied with his role, but he accepts it since it’s for the benefit of the team. “Well… Of course I would rather be the one who gets to be in charge of the power play for example, but then… If they want me in front of the goal, that’s where I’ll be” (IP1:1 3.1)

It seems like the cooperation between the player benefit from role clarity between the players. “Now I play with (mentions a team mate) and it seems like he understands that I’m a more defensive player and that he has to be the offensive one. That works really well.” (IP4:1 4.1)

One player explains one kind of situation where role clarity between the players is needed. “Usually you know where your team mate is so if I get caught in a situation I know where he is… or at least most of the time (laughter) so I know where to send the puck without looking.” (IP4:2 4.2)

**Players’ strategies to develop role clarity: Communicate with team mates and the coach, show the team mates and adjust to the team**

One key to develop role clarity, mentioned by almost all of the players, was communication. “It’s all about communication. We talk a lot defensemen - goaltender. It’s better to talk about it than just do things.” (IP2:2 5.1) They state that it’s important to discuss the roles right away when things are not working well. Everybody is expected to participate in the discussion. “If something was wrong I would talk to them (the team mates). I would tell them how I think and expect them to tell me how they see it. So we all could agree on something together.” (IP5:2 5.1) One player explain how he uses communication to make his role clearer trough
asking for feedback from his team mates “I would explain how I perceive my role and then ask them (the team mates) how they see my role.” (IP1:1 5.1)

The coach was mentioned as both a source of information about the role but also a way to escape from the problem and try to play with someone else. One player explains what he would do if things weren’t working in the line: “Then I probably would talk to the coach and say that I don’t think that our way of playing match so well together and ask if I could try to play with someone else.” (IP4:1 5.1)

But one of the players was not so comfortable with talking to the other team mates about their roles. His alternative would be to show the other players on the ice how he wants it to be. “Well, it can be hard to say… I mean to talk to them about that. Maybe it’s better to show it on the ice how I want it to be.” (IP3:2 5.1)

To only submit and adjust to the other players seems to be another option, but not an option that the players prefer. “Well… then maybe you have to adjust to that way of playing… but… it would really feel wired, but I guess you would have to adjust in that case.” (IP4:2 5.1) This option was considered as a last alternative when all the other strategies already have been tried.

The teams’ strategies to develop role clarity: Practice and it will come naturally

The role clarity was also developed during the regular practice on the ice and the players explained that that was a big and important part of the practice. “We do many drills and such… We also have plenty of time for individual training, and then we have a chance to practice our own role.” (IP1:1 5.3) Some of the players said that they don’t think that much practice is needed, since it most of the time works out by itself when each player just do what he is good at. “We have some players who do the ”hard-work” and some who does the shooting. Each player is good at his thing. So you think: he is good at that thing and then you just try to facilitate so that he can keep on doing what he is good at. It comes naturally.” (IP1:2 5.3) The players’ statement was confirmed by yet another player. “We don’t work so much on that, but we have a clear picture of how we should play and everybody play according to that. They simply do what they are good at and then it works.” (IP2:2 5.3)

Some players thought that what they were doing in the team wasn’t enough and suggested some changes that could be made. One example was to improve the communication. “We don’t do it so much. We could sit down and discuss more about each other’s roles.” (IP3:1 5.3) Another player would like the coaches to take more responsibility of the role setting process and do a better background check before trying it in practice.
“We actually do not work much with that. I think we just practice and try different combinations. They (the coaches) could do a better work looking through the video analysis and see how we play and then put us together according to our roles and way of playing the game.” (IP4:1 5.3)

**Responsibility to clarify the roles**

All the players agreed on that it’s mostly the individual players own responsibility to collect information and make his own role clear.

“It’s completely up to me to figure out and make my role clear. The other players shouldn’t get into my business about how I play in my role. If they focus on their roles and I focus on mine it hopefully turns out well.” (IP2:2 5.2)

Some players explain that it’s also the coaches’ responsibility to help the player to become clear in his role. ”It’s each players’ own responsibility… and maybe the coach has a responsibility to say what he thinks”. (IP1:1 5.2)

**Perception of the intervention**

Only players from the intervention team participated in the second interview about their perception of the intervention. All the five interviewed players reported a positive experience of the intervention. All of them had experienced changes, both within themselves and in the team.

**Perceived effects on themselves: improved communication, more feedback and increased self-confidence**

The biggest change the players experienced was the way they communicate with each other. “I have been able to talk more easily with my team mates on the bench… say things in a better way.” (IP1:1pi 3.1) They also experience that they take time to think before they say something or give feedback to each other. “Now I don’t just yell it out right away. Instead I take a breath, calm down and say the feedback”. (IP1:1pi 6) One player mention that he as well has improved how he receives feedback, he has developed a more positive attitude to feedback. “Now I receive feedback in another way. Now I don’t think negatively directly when someone says something, instead I think if maybe that person is right and maybe I need to change something. So I have improved that a lot.” (IP4:1pi 6)
The players remark that they have developed a more positive attitude, not only when receiving feedback from others, but in the game in general.

“I think that I have become more positive. I mean… in the beginning I was irritated all the time, now I’m a lot more happy. I don’t get so much annoyed any more when bad things happen, I’m more positive. If something did happen before I always thought damn, not again now I think forget it and move on”. (IP5:1pi 3)

Two players state that they have improved their self-confidence during the intervention, which have had an effect on their game. “I think I have gained more self-confidence. It feels like I have the courage to do more difficult things on the ice.” (IP3:1pi 3.2)

**Perceived effects on the team: Improved communication and positive attitude**

The improvement of the communication and the positive attitude was already mentioned as something the players experienced in themselves, but they had also noticed a similar change with their team mates.

“Maybe you can say that it has become a more positive atmosphere on the bench. For example when someone does something wrong or make a mistake we tell it in another way. I actually think that everybody have improved in that and now do it in a better way.” (IP4:1pi 3.2)

**Cohesion, openness and self-confidence**

All the players mention that they have experienced an improvement in the cohesion within the team. They refer to that they now stand up for each other more, help each other and got to know each other better. A consequence from that was that they also got more open towards each other and found it easier to talk about things.

"I think that we have got to know each other better, got closer to each other and stick together more as a group: simply better cohesion. We are also more open with each other and give feedback more often; we now have the courage to do that. Since we have been practicing it a lot during the meetings it now comes naturally during the games. Every time I’m on the bench I hear my team mates talking.” (IP2:1pi 7)
One player state that since they have changed the way they give feedback to each other he experience that all his team mates have gained more self-esteem and self-confidence and he thinks it’s because of that they now try to root for each other rather than nag on each other when something is going wrong.

"For example when someone does a mistake you don’t push him down, you get him back on track by telling him forget about is, you’ll do it better next time and such. Everybody now have more self-confidence, they have better self-esteem. They have confidence and play really well.” (IP1:1pi 7)

**Evaluation of the intervention and the consultant**

The evaluation form (see attachment 5) was structured in two sections. The first section contained five statements about the players’ perception of the consultant which the players were asked to rank in the scale I don’t agree to I completely agree (1-10). The second part contained seven open questions there the player could write using their own words. The answers from each open question were summarized and quotes were used as examples of the answers.

Table 4. Mean of the players perception of the intervention and the consultant (1-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The consultant has been giving clear instructions</td>
<td>9,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The areas which we have been working on have been interesting</td>
<td>9,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The consultant has been available whenever I wanted to contact him/her</td>
<td>9,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My experience is that the consultant has been well prepared for each meeting</td>
<td>9,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m overall satisfied with the cooperation</td>
<td>9,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 4 the players thought that the consultant has been giving clear instructions during the intervention. The subjects that have been the themes for the meetings have been perceived as very interesting. The players felt that the consultant have been available whenever they have wanted to talk to her. The consultant seemed to have been well prepared for each meeting and the players were overall satisfied with the cooperation.
Skills learned during the intervention
The most frequent answer to what skills they had learned during the intervention was concerning communication and feedback. The players stated that they have improved their way to give and receive feedback. They mention that they have learned to give more positive feedback, have a better timing when to give feedback, be more constructive and think one more time and not just say whatever comes to their mind. “I have become better at giving feedback to myself and to others. Give and receive more constructive critique.” Another common answer was that many of the players perceived that they had learned to be more focused on the game and cooperate better with the team mates; “about how we should work together as a team”. The last skills mentioned by some of the players were to be more positive, both in thinking and towards other players and they also felt like they now have a better picture of what they should improve, since they had got a lot of constructive feedback. “Now I know more about what I need to be better at.”

Frequency of the meetings
All of the players agreed on that the amount of meetings were fine, but most of the players would have liked to have more frequent meetings. The most common reason for that was that they would have liked to learn more and get more time to go deeper in to the subjects. Some of the players thought the amount of meetings were enough; none of them wanted fewer meetings. “Could have been more, then we would have had more time to work, but we have still done a lot!”

Consultants’ knowledge about the specific sport situation and dedication to the work
Each one of the players thought that it was very important that the consultant had knowledge about the specific sport and their situation as high school players and they gave several reasons. The most important reason was that they felt like they could be understood right away without confusions or unnecessary explanations. “Yes! Because then the consultant understands what you mean and you don’t have to explain everything.” Another reason was the importance of knowing which specific psychological skills that is required in ice-hockey. “Yes, of course! If not, she doesn’t understand what skills that are required in our sport and what the demands are and so on…”
That the consultant showed interest to the team, were dedicated to her work and keep herself updated about the team also in-between the meetings was seen as very important to the players. The reasons stated were that she then could keep track on how the team was doing
and if any specific player were going through a hard time. “Yes, I think so. Maybe she observes that someone in the team has a problem which she can help him with that.” One player thought that was less important. “No, it doesn’t matter to me. Unless it’s a very long time in-between the meetings and you forget what we talked about last time.”

**Improvements of the intervention and interest in future mental skills training**

Most of the players stated that they were overall satisfied with the intervention. The only thing that two players asked for, which had made the program better was to add more meetings. “Some more meetings, so we could get to know each other better and so on.” All of the players, except one stated that they were sure that they would like to keep on the mental skills training in the future. Some of the players wanted to continue with only the team meetings, but some would also like to do individual training. One of the players was a little unsure about the future and stated: “It depends on how things develop.”

**Discussion**

The main objective of the study was to examine what effects a team intervention program had on the players’ perception of their roles and the task cohesion within the team. The second objective was to examine the players’ perceived benefits from having a clear role (for themselves and for the team), the players’ strategies to develop role clarity and how the team works to develop clarity within the team. The third objective was to evaluate the players’ perceptions of the intervention and the consultant. The descriptive statistics showed that the intervention team had overall slightly more positive trends, from the pre- to the post test, in more role perception variables than the control team. The MANOVA showed a significant difference between the teams in the variable Intra-role conflict in both the pre- and post-test and in the variable role acceptance in the post-test. The descriptive results showed that the mean value of attraction to the task for Team 1 decreased during the intervention, while the control team did not change during the same time. Further the MANOVA showed a significant difference in that variable in the pre-test, but not in the post-test. The main perceived effects of the intervention were that the players have become better in communicating, both to give feedback but also to receive feedback. The players perceived several positive consequences when their own role was clear. The two major advantages were that they felt confidence and could show determination on the ice. The most common strategy to develop role clarity was to communicate with the team mates. The consultants knowledge about the specific sport seemed to be important to the players, but even more important the
understanding of their specific situation. That the consultant showed interest to the team, were dedicated to her work and keep herself updated about the team also in-between the meetings was very appreciated by the players.

**Quantitative results**

**Role perception**

The descriptive statistics showed that the intervention team overall had higher mean values, from the pre-test to the post test in most of the role perception variables. The mean value in the variable role clarity decreased in both teams during the time of the intervention, even though it was marginally. This result is contradictory to the results from the study of Eys et.al (2003) where the players experienced less ambiguity about their role in the end of the season, compared to in the beginning of the season. The reason for that could be that the pre-test were conducted in October, when the season already had started and both teams had played several pre-season games. The results from the pre-test showed that both teams, especially the players in the intervention team, already had very clear perceptions of their roles. Within the dimensions of role acceptance the two teams differed from each other in three out of four dimensions. Regarding how the player perceives the role fits to his qualities (quality) the players in both of the teams were less satisfied at the time of the post-test. For the three dimensions how appreciated they felt in their role (appreciation), how important they perceive the role is for the team (importance) and the ability to develop within the role (development) the intervention team had a positive trend, thou the control team had a negative trend. The MANOVA showed a significant difference between the teams in the post test (p=0.002) regarding the variable role acceptance appreciation. The players in the intervention team felt significant more appreciated than the players in the control team. These results from the intervention team are in line with the aim of the intervention. The team building strategy with mutual sharing serves to build trust, support, mutual respect, and mutual understanding among the players (Yukelson, 1993) and that may have made the players feel more appreciated, important and that it’s okay to try new things. During the intervention a lot of time was dedicated to the players to talk about their perception of their own and each other’s roles. The role conflict dimensions didn’t change much in either of the teams, except the person-role conflict that became a bigger conflict for the players in both of the teams. One interesting thing was that the intervention team had significant less intra-role conflicts than the control team in the post test (p=0.021). Although this complicates the evaluation of the intervention
because the MANOVA pre-test showed that difference between the team in this variable was significant even before the intervention \((p=0.041)\). Because of this result it’s difficult to determine if the difference has to do with the intervention or not.

In the last dimension, role performance, the both teams were almost the same at the time of the pre-test, but in the results from the post-test the intervention team had improved their results whereas the players of the control team answered that they were less confident that they were able to perform in their role.

**Cohesion: Attraction to the task and task oriented group integration**

The results from the GEQ measure showed that the mean value in attraction to the task for the intervention team decreased during the intervention, which was the opposite of what the aim of the intervention was. That can be explained by Carron and Brawley’s (2000) who suggest that the focus on task cohesion may be more important in the early stages of team development when collective effort and work are the most important focus. Another potential reason to why the attraction to the task for intervention team decreased during the intervention could be that they over the whole season performed very well. Carron and Hausenblas (2005) stated that the attraction to the task could become lower if the player feels that his/her skills and not being fully used or that their role does not play an important part for the teams’ performance. Since the team was leading the series almost through the whole season it is speculated that the players didn’t feel they had to perform their best in order to win and the attraction decreased. The control team did not change much during the same time. However, the MANOVA test showed a significant difference before the intervention started \((P=0.036)\), but there were no significant difference in the post-test.

The descriptive results of the GEQ showed that both teams mean value in the variable task oriented group integration increased, even though it was not significant. The intervention team increased their integration a little more than the control team. But already before the intervention both teams has pretty high rates on the integration scale, which was also revealed in the answers from the interviews. Players from both of the teams talked a lot about how one of the main responsibilities they had in their role was to help the team and the team mates. Several players stated that they first of all play for the team and the own performance was always second priority.
**Communication and Feedback**

The descriptive statistics showed that the mean values increased marginally in all three of the variables. The mean value for the intervention team did though increase slightly more than the values for the control team. The difference was not significant, so it’s hard to determine whether it is an effect of the intervention or not. The MANOVA test showed that the players in the intervention team perceived receiving significant more feedback than the players in the control team in both the pre- and post-test. That makes it more difficult to compare the teams. One interesting tendency in the results of the intervention team was that the two variables that increased the most were feedback to others and feedback to myself. During the intervention many exercises focused on how to give feedback in a constructive way. It seems like the players perceived that they had improved the giving feedback skill, but the mean value for receiving feedback from others almost didn’t change at all. The qualitative results on the other hand did show that the players perceived that also their teammates had improved their communication and feedback skills.

**Qualitative results**

**Role clarity**

The players in the present study perceived that there were several positive consequences when the own role was clear. The two major advantages were that they felt confidence and could show determination on the ice. Mellalieu and Juniper (2006) discovered similar effects in their study; that when the players were clearer about their roles it facilitated their individual game; the players felt more secure in their positions and didn’t hesitate about what was expected from them. The players also perceived that they could stay calm, help each other and cooperate better in the team.

The major key to develop role clarity, mentioned by almost all the players, was to communicate with the team mates. This experience goes in line with the study from Sullivan and Feltz (2003) who discovered that their communication intervention not only made the communication better, but also made the participants more aware about how other people see them and what role they have in the group. The fact that they used their team mates as the major source is emphasized by Eys et al. (2005) who state that another major possible source of role information, apart from the coach, may be through the communication practices and interaction with teammates.

An expected way to receive information about the role, presented by the players, was to ask the coach. The coach is the one in charge of the team and the one who decides which role the
player should play. A more implicit way to develop role clarity suggested by the players was to practice. Mellalieu and Juniper (2006) found three ways to develop clarity during practice; (1) learning by doing, (2) try different roles to create an understanding about the role from another perspective and (3) modeling by observing others performing in a similar role. The players in the present study explained similar exercises from their own practice.

Cohesion
When the players experience that they are clear about each other’s roles they try to make it easier for each other, so that each player is able to perform their best. According to some of the players the clarity about the own role does not only help the player himself, but also the team. It seemed like the own clarity improved the task oriented group integration. This result is similar to the result from the study by Mellalieu and Junipers (2006) where the players also reported that their increased role clarity brought the team members together and cohesion became stronger. The players in the present study stated that it was their duty to play for the team and do everything they could in order to help their team mates, in that way they felt that they contributed to the team. This parallel with the previous study where the players experienced that when the task cohesion increased and the player perceived that his role performance was important to the team both the clarity and acceptance of the role came more easily (Mellalieu & Juniper, 2006).

Communication and feedback
Several of the players in the intervention group explained that during the intervention they have become better in communicating, both to give feedback but also to receive feedback. Some of the players also said that they now think more before they say anything and also evaluate the feedback they receive from their team mates. These behavioral changes may lead to reduced amount of conflict within the team. Similar results were found in the study from Mellalieu and Juniper (2006) where the conflicts between the players and the coach and within the team decreased when the roles were clearer and at the same time that the communication increased when the roles got clearer. With clear roles, it seemed easier to discuss them. By using open discussions and negotiations are common and often successful strategies to avoid and solve conflicts (Wheelan, 2008).
Perception and evaluation of the intervention and the consultant

Applied evaluation research can be used to generate information that helps purify judgment about services, facilitates program improvement and produces knowledge (Chelimsky, 1997). All of the players were overall satisfied with the intervention. The players stated that there were several specific skills that they had improved during the intervention. The most dominant skill was concerning communication and feedback. They mention that they have learned to give more positive feedback, have a better timing when to give feedback, be more constructive and think one more time and not just say whatever comes to their mind. This is in line with strategies provided by (Sullivan & Feltz, 2003) that in order for a group or a team to function effectively, members must be able to communicate openly and honestly with each other about the efficiency of group functioning. Sullivan and Feltz define effective communication as when team members listen to each other and try to make each other better. Also Yukelson (1993) states that it’s important for the players to learn how to express their thoughts and feelings in a good way and to know how things that other people say to them affects them.

The amount of meetings seems to be appropriate to the rest of the schedule for the players. The meetings every third week didn’t take too much time from all their other obligations. Some players would have liked the meetings to be more and more frequent, but one should be careful to interrupt too much with the daily routines. In the evaluation of the intervention made by Dunn and Holt (2003) some players thought the meetings were too time-consuming and interrupted with their routines. As an option, the intervention could start earlier in the pre-season and increase the frequencies to every second week. But that has to be adjusted from one team to another.

The consultants’ knowledge about the specific sport seemed to be important to the players, but even more important the understanding of their specific situation. The consultant herself has never played ice hockey; the knowledge about the sport comes from interest and asking questions, but she has her own experience of attending an elite sport high school and has a good picture of what kind of challenges there are. That the consultant showed interest in the team, were dedicated to her work and keep herself updated about the team also in-between the meetings was seen as very important to the players. The players from Dunn and Holts (2003) study stated the same findings.
**Method discussion**

One potential problem with the GEQ is that the validity has been rather low when used on young athletes (Sullivan, Short, & Cramer, 2002). Eys, Loughead, Bray and Carron (2009) developed a new version of the GEQ with the intention that it would suite better to young athletes. The questionnaire is called Youth Sport Environment Questionnaire (YSEQ). It may have changed the results if the YSEQ would have been used instead of the GEQ, but the YSEQ has still not been used in that many studies and as far as the author knows, not yet translated to Swedish. Another critical aspect is that in this study only the task oriented dimensions of the GEQ was used. The main reason was that earlier studies have shown that the social dimensions do not have any effects on the performance (Salminen, 1987), but on the other hand Bosseluta, McLarena, Eys and Heuzéc (2012) found that the social cohesion was the only dimension that were positively related to two dimensions on role ambiguity so it could have been interesting to include that part in a future study. Their theory was that it has to do with that the players in their study were youth athletes and that social cohesion is more important to young players than to adult players. That is in the present study mentioned the social cohesion frequently during the interviews. The interviews were tested on two players of the same age as the target group and the questions seemed to work well. Each question was based on previous studies, so they would be suitable for the study. After analyzing the interviews the author regretted that there weren’t more questions about the different dimensions of the roles could have given even more interesting findings. Most of the questions targeted role clarity, if there would have been more questions targeting role conflicts and role ambiguity maybe more interesting results could have been found.

Another thing that could have affected the results of the interviews is that the players who were interviewed filled out the questionnaires just prior to the interviews. That may have had an effect on how they answered the questions in the interviews. The players who participated in the interviews were not completely neutral and can possibly have tried to figure out the aim of the study and therefore not answered authentically, but instead tried to “help” the consultant by answering in the way they thought would be useful for the study. If it would have been the other way around maybe the questions in the interview would have affected the results of the questionnaire. Still another issue is time to start an intervention which is always crucial. In this study the pre-tests and the intervention started in October. At that time the series games had just started and both teams had already played several pre-season games. Both teams did the pre-tests during a two weeks period, so they were both the same, but the effect of the intervention may have been stronger if the intervention had started earlier in the
pre-season. One of the reasons why the intervention didn’t start earlier was because process of finding a suitable control team took longer than expected. At the time of the pre-tests all the scores were already pretty high. For example, Eys et.al (2003) discovered that the players roles were clearer in the end of the season than in the beginning, but then the pre-tests in present study were made the players were already very clear about their roles. A strength in the study is that all the questionnaires and interviews within the same team were conducted at about the same time. To eliminate the risk of external events to effect the results, for example if half of the players made the tests before a game and the rest after the game, the game itself could affect the way the player answer the questions. The inductive analyses of the interviews were chosen because the author didn’t find that any of the previous studies provided mentioned any theory suitable enough to do a deductive analysis. Another aspect that was taken into account was there might appear some new strategies that the author maybe would have missed by using deductive analysis method. If the results only are compared with previous research and only items that fit into already constructed categories are selected, some valuable results might be overlooked.

**Strengths and limitations**

There are several strengths of this study. First of all the intervention was based on previous research. The second strength was that a control group was used as a baseline measure so the results could be compared to a regular team that didn’t participate in the intervention. A third strength was that the intervention was evaluated, not only with questionnaires that measure the development of the skills, but also the players’ perception of the intervention. This gives valuable information to the consultants’ future work and to the research field. One limitation of the study was that the role and feedback questions were not validated. Because of that it’s not sure that the questions measure what they are meant to measure. At least one should be careful to draw conclusions from those results, even though some indications were found which could be investigated further in future studies.

**Implications**

It is an important aspect of the results from the researches to be applied into the real world, in the clubs and with the athletes (Granström & Olofsson, 2006). The first practical advices to coaches who work with teams and players who play in interactive teams, is to try to create an open atmosphere where each player feel comfortable to speak their mind. Discuss norms about how to deliver and receive feedback and practice that in organized settings so that it
after a while comes naturally. Set time for team meetings, where team issues and roles can be discussed. Last but not least; apply research based team intervention programs. If the team building activity isn’t tested in earlier studies the event may just be a fun event for the team. That’s not a bad thing in itself, but it might not serve the purpose it was meant to do.

**Future research**

More studies are needed in order to capture the development of cohesion and the different dimensions of the roles in interactive teams, such as ice-hockey. Bosseluta et al. (2012) requests more longitudinal studies regarding relationships examined over a competitive season as to examine cohesion and role ambiguity-cohesion relationships with performance. In this study only the task variables of the GEQ instrument was used. Bosseluta et al. (2012) found that the social cohesion was the only dimension that was positively related to two dimensions on role ambiguity so it could have been interesting to include that part in a future study. In the interviews players from all the different positions were included, but the results were analyzed on a group level. It would be interesting in future research to study if the perceptions of the role differ from one position to another. During the intervention it sometimes was difficult to include the goaltenders in the discussions about the roles. Maybe they have a different perception of the roles than the field players. Another aspect that would be interesting to study is if the role ambiguity and role clarity have any correlation with type of personality and if the players with different personality use different strategies to develop clarity. There have been several studies in this area, but obviously more research needs to be done.
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Attachments

Attachment 1: Questionnaires Roles, GEQ and Feedback
Attachment 2: Semi-structured interview before intervention
Attachment 3: Semi-structured interview after intervention
Attachment 4: Evaluation form
Attachment 5: Letter of agreement
Del. 1 Roller

1. Jag är helt klar över vad min roll på isen innebär och vilka krav som ställs på mig.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

2. Jag känner mig trygg och kompetent i den roll jag har nu.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

3. Min roll känns som gjord för mig, jag får verkligen visa vad jag är bra på.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

4. Tränaren och mina medspelare har samma uppfattning om min roll som jag har.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

5. Jag får ofta beröm och uppskattning för min prestation.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

6. Tränaren ger mig ofta motsägelsefulla instruktioner om vad jag ska göra på isen.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

7. Det är viktigt för lagets prestation att jag gör ett bra jobb i min roll.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

8. Min roll ger inget utrymme för egen kreativitet.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

9. I min roll har jag möjlighet att ta egna initiativ och utveckla rollen.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

11. Jag känner att jag har tillräckligt med kunskap och erfarenhet för att klara av min roll.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

14. Jag har har fått tydliga instruktioner om vad min roll innebär och tvekar sällan.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

15. Ofta upplever jag att mina medspelare inte har samma bild av min roll som jag har.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

17. Jag känner ofta att jag inte klarar av de krav som ställs på mig i min roll.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

18. Jag blir ofta osäker på vad min roll går ut på och vad jag ska göra på isen.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

**Del 2. Group Environment Questionary (GEQ) -uppgift**

Läs följande påståenden och ringa in den siffra som bäst stämmer överens med din uppfattning. Svara anonymt.

1. Jag är missnöjd med den speltid jag får.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

2. Jag tycker inte att lagets vilja att vinna är tillräckligt stark.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt

3. Detta laget ger mig inte tillräckligt med möjligheter att förbättra min prestationsförmåga.
   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
   Instämmer ej  Instämmer helt
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej 1 Instämmer helt

5. Vårt lag strävar gemensamt efter att nå de uppsatta målen.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej Instämmer helt

6. Om laget förlorar eller gör en dålig insats känner alla i laget sig ansvariga.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej Instämmer helt

7. Lagets medlemmar har motstridiga ambitioner beträffande lagets prestation.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej Instämmer helt

8. Om några av lagkamraterna har svårt att hänga med på träningen är alla andra angelägna om att hjälpa dem för att inte splittra laget.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej Instämmer helt

9. Lagets medlemmar diskuterar inte fritt varje spelares ansvar under matcher eller på träning.
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
   Instämmer ej Instämmer helt

Del 3. Feedback
10. Jag GER konstruktiv feedback till mina lagkamrater.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Sällan Väldigt ofta

11. Jag FÅR konstruktiv feedback av mina lagkamrater.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Sällan Väldigt ofta

12. Jag GER konstruktiv feedback till mig själv.
    1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
    Sällan Väldigt ofta
Semi-structured interview before intervention

**Intervjuguide:**

**Rollklarhet**

1.1 Vilken är din roll i kedjan/vad är din uppgift?

1.2 Skulle du kunna beskriva den?

2.1 Hur klar över din roll är du?

2.2 Vad beror det på tror du?

2.3 På vilket sätt märker du/märks det? eller Vad innebär det?

2.4 Om du skulle känna dig osäker på din roll, hur går du tillväga för att skapa klarhet?

3.1 Trivs du med din roll?

3.2 Vad beror det på?

4.1 Upplever du att dina lagkamrater har samma uppfattning av din roll som du har?

4.2 Vad beror det på tror du?

4.3 På vilket sätt märker du/märks det? Vad innebär det?

5.1 Om du skulle uppleva att dina medspelare inte har samma uppfattning, hur går du tillväga för att skapa klarhet?
Semi-structured interview after intervention

Team 1 intervju efter intervention

1. Hur har du upplevt de träningar som vi har haft med laget?
2. Vilken träning tycker du gav mest?
3. Har träningen påverkat dig på något sätt?
3.2. Har du noterat några förändringar hos dig själv?
4. Vilken var den minst givande träningen?
6. Har ditt sätt att tänka påverkat dig på något sätt?
7. Har du upplevt några skillnader i laget?
8. Har det påverkat ditt sätt att spela på något sätt?
Utvärdering av den idrottspsykologiska rådgivaren

Sätt kryss för det som passar dig bäst

1. **Rådgivaren har varit tydlig i sina instruktioner**
   - Håller inte med 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9,4 10 Håller helt med

2. **De områden som vi har arbetat med har varit intressanta och givande**
   - Håller inte med 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9,2 10 Håller helt med

3. **Rådgivaren har varit tillgänglig när jag velat nå honom/henne**
   - Håller inte med 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9,8 10 Håller helt med

4. **Jag upplever att rådgivaren har förberett sig väl inför varje träff**
   - Håller inte med 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9,8 10 Håller helt med

5. **Jag är nöjd med samarbetet i helhet**
   - Håller inte med 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9,5 10 Håller helt med

6. **Vad har du lärt dig hittills under tiden med rådgivaren?**
   - Kommunicera bra med medspelare
   - På vilket sätt man ska ge varandra feedback och vad jag behöver bli bättre på.
   - Feedback, hur man gör det!
   - Hur man samarbetar och feedback
   - Ge feedback till mig själv och andra. Ge och ta emot konstruktiv kritik.
   - Om hur vi ska samarbeta som lag
   - Om något dåligt skulle hända, skita i det och vara positiv.
   - Ge mer positiv feedback
   - Ge feedback i bättre lägen. Koncentera sig och samarbeta bättre.

7. **Har det varit lagom många träffar eller hade du velat ha fler/färre träffar?**
   - Några fler kanske
   - Det har varit bra som det var nu, men det kanske hade varit bättre med fler
   - Lagom
   - Jag tycker att det kunde varit fler träffar
   - Hade faktiskt vilja haft lite fler
   - Kunde varit fler, men vi har ändå hunnit med mycket.
8. Anser du att det är viktigt att rådgivaren har kunskap om din idrott? Om ja, varför?
- Ja, eftersom rådgivaren ska kunna sätta sig i vår situation
- Ja, Emelie kollar ofta på matcherna och verkar ha väldigt bra koll.
- Ja, så man vet vad man sysslar med.
- Ja, då får rådgivaren mer förståelse.
- Ja, utbildning är alltid bra.
- Ja, de klart! Annars vet hon ju inte hur det är i den sporten, vad som krävs o.s.v.
- Viktigt att hon har en inblick hur det fungerar hos oss.
- Ja! För då förstår rådgivaren vad man menar.

9. Vad skulle ha kunnat göras för att förbättra ditt/lagets och rådgivarens samarbete?
- Inget
- Det har funkat bra
- Lite fler träffar, lära känna varandra bättre o.s.v

10. Anser du att det är viktigt att rådgivaren är engagerad/håller sig uppdaterad om laget även mellan träffarna?
- Japp
- Ja, och det gör Emelie också. Hon kollar som sagt ofta på matcherna.
- Ja, det tycker jag
- Ja, annars vet hon ju inte hur det går.
- Ja, det är viktigt!
- Ja det tycker jag. För hon kanske märker att någon i laget har ett problem som hon kan hjälpa till med.
- Ja helt klart. Tycker min rådgivare har lyckats med denna punkten mycket.

11. Är det något annat du vill framföra angående samarbetet?
- Hoppas du stannar nästa år

12. Skulle du vilja fortsätta med idrottspsykologisk träning/rådgivning i framtiden?
Med laget/individuellt?
- Ja
- Ja, både och! Den mentala delen är enormt viktig!
- Ja, med laget! Kanske också individuellt.
- Ja, med laget.
- Det beror på hur det går
- Ja, eftersom det funkat bra
- Ja det vill jag, tycker att der har varit skoj.
- Både laget och själv.
Studie av Juniorspelarens utveckling av rollklarhet och uppgiftsinriktad lagsammanhållning under en säsong

Jag heter Emelie Lindström och studerar Idrottsvetenskap med inriktning psykologi. Under de tre senaste åren har jag arbetat med ett flertal juniorlag i ishockey och speciellt intresserat mig för hur rollklarheten och den uppgiftsinriktade lagsammanhållningen utvecklas under säsongen och vad det är som påverkar utvecklingen.

Syftet med studien är att undersöka hur stor utvecklingsgrad spelarna har under en säsong och vad som påverkar utvecklingen. Detta kommer att mätas med en enkät, delad i två delar. Detta kommer även att kompletteras med några intervjuer.


Du har rätt att dra dig ut studien när som helst och du har även möjligheter att ställa frågor under perioden.
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