

# **FEAR OF FAILING IN A COMPETITIVE ACHIEVEMENT SETTING**

**The relations between fear of failure, achievement goals and achievement  
behaviours among adolescent male football players in Finland**

Tamás Gruborovics

Tuomas Kolehmainen

Master's thesis

Department of Psychology

University of Jyväskylä

April 2017



## JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Psykologian laitos

GRUBOROVICS, TAMÁS & KOLEHMAINEN, TUOMAS: Epäonnistumisen pelko kilpaympäristössä: Pitkäjänteisyyden, panostamisen, viihtymisen sekä tavoiteorientaatioiden ja epäonnistumisen pelon yhteydet teini-ikäisillä pojilla jalkapalloharrastuksessaan Suomessa.

Pro gradu- tutkielma, 37 s., liitteet

Ohjaajat: Timo Suutama, Niilo Konttinen

Psykologia

Huhtikuu 2017

---

Tutkimme, miten epäonnistumisen pelko on yhteydessä tavoiteorientaatioihin, pitkäjänteisyyteen, panostamiseen ja viihtymiseen teini-ikäisten poikien jalkapalloharrastuksessa. Olimme lisäksi kiinnostuneita siitä, miten yhteneväisiä pelaajien itsearvioinnit ja heidän valmentajiensa arviot olivat pelaajien pitkäjänteisyyteen, panostamiseen ja viihtymiseen liittyen ja vaikuttiko valmennusaika mahdollisiin näkemuseroihin. Epäonnistumisen pelko on tyypillinen haittailmiö kilpailullisessa toiminnassa, se edeltää usein epäedullisten tavoiteorientaatioiden syntymistä ja on yhteydessä viihtymisen vähenemiseen ja harrastuksen lopettamiseen. Tavoiteorientaatiot kertovat tarkempaa tietoa motivaation laadusta, kuten siitä, onko toiminnan tavoitteena omien taitojen kehittäminen vai pärjääminen suhteessa muihin, ja kuvaako toimintaa välttämisen- vai lähestymiskäyttäytyminen. Pitkäjänteisyys, panostaminen ja viihtyminen ovat keskeisiä tekijöitä nuorten tavoitteellisessa toiminnassa, ne ilmentävät harrastuksen taustalla olevaa motivaatiota ja ovat siten olennainen osa harrastuksessa kehittämisessä, kuin myös yhtenä syynä harrastuksen lopettamiseen. 104 kolmelta paikkakunnalta valittua 14–20-vuotiasta kilpailullisen suomalaisjalkapallojoukkueen pelaajaa kuudesta eri joukkueesta täytti strukturoidun kyselylomakkeen, joka sisälsi validoidut osiot epäonnistumisen pelosta, tavoiteorientaatioista, pitkäjänteisyydestä, panostamisesta sekä viihtymisestä otteluissa ja harjoituksissa. Heidän valmentajansa täyttivät jokaiseen pelaajaan liittyen lyhyen kyselyn, jossa tiedusteltiin heidän mielipidettään pelaajien pitkäjänteisyydestä, panostamisesta ja viihtymisestä harjoituksissa ja otteluissa. Analyysit tehtiin hierarkkisella regressioanalyysillä ja yleistetyllä lineaarisella mallilla. Epäonnistumisen pelko oli neljän tavoiteorientaation joukosta vahvimmin yhteydessä hallintavälttämiseen (esimerkiksi pyrkimys välttää suoriutumasta huonommin aikaisempaan verrattuna), joka oli puolestaan vahvasti yhteydessä alentuneeseen pitkäjänteisyyteen, panostamiseen ja viihtymiseen. Tässä tutkimuksessa yleisimmin esiintyvä pelko mahdollisen epäonnistumisen seurauksista oli häpeän ja nolostumisesta tunne, joka oli samalla vahvasti yhteydessä hallintavälttämiseen. Valmentajien arviot pelaajien pitkäjänteisyydestä ja panostamisesta olivat lievästi yhteydessä pelaajien itsearvioon, viihtymisen suhteen yhteyttä ei ollut. Havaittavia näkemuseroja pelaajan ja valmentajan välillä oli noin joka kolmannessa arviossa pitkäjänteisyyden, panostamisen ja viihtymisen suhteen. Valmennusajan kestolla ei ollut vaikutusta näkemuseroihin.

Avainsanat: epäonnistumisen pelko, tavoiteorientaatiot, pitkäjänteisyys, panostaminen, viihtyminen, valmentaja-pelaaja suhde, nuoret jalkapalloilijat

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

Department of Psychology

GRUBOROVICS, TAMÁS & KOLEHMAINEN, TUOMAS: Fear of failing in a competitive achievement setting: The relations between fear of failure, achievement goals and achievement behaviours among adolescent male football players in Finland.

Master's Thesis, 37 pp., appendices

Supervisors: Timo Suutama, Niilo Konttinen

Psychology

April 2017

---

The purpose of this study was to analyse how fear of failure was related to the achievement goals, persistence, effort and enjoyment of adolescent male football players, as well as how well the coaches of these players were able to correctly infer the persistence, effort and enjoyment of their players. Fear of failure often precedes the acquirement of detrimental achievement goals and achievement behaviour, and is also related to the lack of enjoyment, that often leads to dropout. The achievement goals represent the individual's attitude towards developing his or her competence: the person either wants to achieve task mastery or being better than the rest, and this is achieved by either approaching competence or avoiding showing incompetence. Persistence, effort and enjoyment are central concepts in achievement behaviour, as they characterise the individual's motivation towards the hobby, and they are also an integral part of development, as well as one of the main reasons for dropout. 104 players (14–20 years old) from six different teams around Finland filled in a structured questionnaire, which consisted of validated sections of persistence, effort, and enjoyment in trainings and in games, fear of failure and the achievement goals. Their coaches also evaluated their players' persistence, effort and enjoyment in trainings and in games by filling in a short questionnaire regarding each of their players. The results were achieved by using the hierarchical regression analysis and the general linear model. It was the mastery-avoidance goals (focus in avoiding performing worse than before) that proved to be the most detrimental among the four achievement goals in relation to fear of failure, that was connected to decreased persistence, effort and enjoyment. The most often featured aversive consequence of failure was the fear of shame and embarrassment that was also strongly related to the mastery-avoidance goals. There was a small convergence between the coaches' evaluations and their players' self-evaluations over the players' persistence and effort, but there was no convergence between the evaluations over the players' enjoyment. There were recognizable differences between the evaluations in about every third instance, but none of these differences were extreme. The length of the coach-player relationship was not related to the differences between the views.

Key words: fear of failure, achievement goals, persistence, effort, enjoyment, adolescent football players, coach-player relationship.

# CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
ACHIEVEMENT GOALS .....	2
FEAR OF FAILURE .....	2
RESEARCH ON THE EFFECTS OF FEAR OF FAILURE ON ACHIEVEMENT GOALS.....	4
RESEARCH ON THE EFFECTS OF FEAR OF FAILURE ON ACHIEVEMENT BEHAVIOURS .....	5
COACH-ATHLETE RELATIONSHIP .....	5
RESEARCH ON COACH EVALUATING THE ATHLETE'S ACHIEVEMENT BEHAVIOURS.....	7
AIMS OF THE STUDY .....	8
<b>METHODS.....</b>	<b>8</b>
PROCEDURE.....	9
QUESTIONNAIRE AND ASSESSMENT METHODS .....	10
<i>Achievement goals</i> .....	10
<i>Persistence/Effort</i> .....	11
<i>Enjoyment</i> .....	11
<i>Fear of failure</i> .....	11
<i>Coach evaluating the players</i> .....	12
DATA ANALYSIS.....	13
<b>RESULTS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
FEAR OF FAILURE, ACHIEVEMENT GOALS AND ACHIEVEMENT BEHAVIOURS .....	14
COMPARISON OF THE VIEWS BETWEEN COACHES AND THEIR PLAYERS.....	21
<b>DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>APPENDICES.....</b>	<b>38</b>
APPENDIX 1 .....	38
APPENDIX 2 .....	43

## **INTRODUCTION**

Achievement behaviours, such as persistence, effort, and enjoyment, represent the visible side of motivation and have often been used to assess achievement motivation (Roberts, 2001). In the achievement literature, effort is equated as all the energy that the person uses in order to accomplish the task at hand, whereas persistence refers to the continuing investment of effort (Guan, Xiang, McBride, & Bruene, 2006; Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997), and they have both been proven to be quite strong predictors of achievement in the classroom (Elliot, McGregor & Gable, 1999; Wentzel, 1996; Dweck, 1986), as well as in physical education (Guan, Xiang, McBride & Keating, 2013). Enjoyment, on the other hand, described as “to have fun”, “to like” and “to enjoy” (Liukkonen, 1998), is the driving force that orients the individual to start the hobby in the first place, whereas the lack of it increases the possibility of dropping out (Deci & Ryan, 1985; Roberts 1984, 2001; Scanlan & Simons, 1992). Dropping out of the hobby becomes more actual during adolescence, since at this time, the competition gets more serious and the outcome of performance becomes more important than the process itself, shifting the initial intrinsic joy towards extrinsic rewards gained when performed well (Deci, 1971; Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000; Roberts, 2001). If winning starts to mean success that leads to gains, losing easily becomes associated with failure that is followed by the withdrawal of these same gains, which might eventually lead into perceiving failure as a threat and fearing it (Rothblum, 1990; Sagar, Lavalley, & Spray, 2007). Then, fear of failure might in the longer run diminish an individual’s enjoyment and eventually raise the question of whether to keep on exerting effort and persisting in the hobby. Therefore, it is important to find ways, in which this early dropping out could be prevented, or the likelihood of it decreased in the highly competitive achievement context, where success and failure have often become the polarised determinants of accomplishment.

The present study is the second study completed from the same material, which was originally collected to fulfill the needs of two studies. In our bachelor thesis, we focused on getting information about Finnish adolescent male football players’ involvement in their hobbies, in other words, their underlying achievement motivations, and how these were reflected in their achievement behaviours.

## **Achievement goals**

Achievement motivation has throughout the past decades been assessed by using the achievement goal perspective (Elliot & McGregor, 2001), which is originally based on the researches of Carol Dweck (Diener & Dweck, 1978, 1980; Dweck & Leggett, 1988) and John Nicholls (Nicholls, 1984; Nicholls & Miller, 1984). Their primary emphasis was on two goals: mastery (or task) goals, which focused on one's development of competence through task mastery, and performance (or ego) goals, concentrated on demonstrating competence in relation to others (Ames, 1992; Ames & Archer, 1988; Dweck, 1986; Dweck & Leggett, 1988; Nicholls, 1984; Nicholls & Miller, 1984).

In his studies, Andrew Elliot and his colleagues (Elliot, 1999; Elliot & Church, 1997; Elliot & Harackiewicz, 1996; Elliot & McGregor, 2001) revised Dweck and Nicholls's original dichotomous achievement goal framework and brought competence into the core of the achievement goal construct. In this 2x2 achievement goal framework, competence was differentiated in two ways: the way it was defined and the way it was valenced. As the original mastery-performance dichotomy represented the definitional side of competence, the newly introduced approach-avoidance distinction stood for the valence of competence, where the individual either wanted to demonstrate and thus approach competence, or to avoid incompetence (Elliot, 1999; Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Elliot & Thrash, 2001). Hence, four achievement goals could be formed: mastery-approach goals are based on attaining task mastery and improvement, mastery-avoidance goals are centred around not losing one's already reached capacities or performing worse than before, performance-approach goals concentrate on doing better than the others, whereas the focus of performance-avoidance goals is on not doing worse than the others (Elliot & Thrash, 2001).

## **Fear of failure**

Failure might contribute to losing motivation and dropping out (Sagar et al., 2007). Achievement environments in which success is rewarded with added affection, acceptance, or money, often treat failure by withdrawing these gains (Conroy, 2001a; Rothblum, 1990; Sagar, Lavalley, & Spray, 2007). Hence, as many athletes equate success and failure with winning and losing, they are also likely to view themselves as failures in the face of losses, and might eventually start fearing failure (Sagar et al., 2007, 2010; Scanlan, 1984). It is worth noting though that athletes and performers do not always equate winning with success and losing with failure, nor that an athlete's goals would stay stable over time (Conroy, 2008; Conroy, Poczwardowski, & Henschen, 2001). Feelings of

success and failure can also be determined by whether the individuals meet their achievement goals or not, thus representing more psychological states than actual levels of performance (Maehr & Nicholls, 1980; Sagar et al., 2007).

Fear of failure (FF) has been described as a factor that motivates the individuals to perform at a higher level or prevents them from reaching their true potential (Conroy, Willow, & Metzler, 2002; Sagar et al., 2010). The former has to do with avoiding failure by succeeding (Martin & Marsh, 2003), whereas the latter is more about protecting the individual's self-worth by avoiding to perform worse than the others or worse than one has done in the past (Chen, Wu, Kee, Lin, & Shui, 2009; Elliot & Church, 1997). Besides losing motivation and dropout, there have been numerous detrimental consequences associated with FF, such as problems in achievement, moral development, mental health, and physical health, as well as athletic stress, worry, anxiety, and impaired interpersonal behavior and sporting performance (Conroy, 2001a; Conroy et al., 2002; Sagar et al., 2010).

Studies have shown, that it is not the actual failing people appear to fear, but the perceived aversive consequences of failure, and the stronger one's beliefs are about the likelihood of these unwanted consequences, the more one is going to fear failure (Birney, Burdick, & Teevan, 1969; Conroy, 2004, 2008; Conroy et al., 2001, 2002; Sagar et al., 2007). Conroy and his colleagues developed a multidimensional, hierarchical model of FF (Conroy, 2001b; Conroy et al., 2002), in which five aversive consequences of FF were identified: the fear of experiencing shame and embarrassment (FSE), fear of devaluing one's self-estimate (FDSE), fear of having an uncertain future (FUF), fear of important others losing interest (FIOLI), and fear of upsetting important others (FUIO). These consequences of FF exhibited similar associative patterns as the measures of achievement goals, perceived sport competence, trait anxiety, and optimism, somatic anxiety, worry and fear of success (Conroy, 2001; Conroy et al., 2002; Conroy & Elliot, 2004). However, Conroy (2004) showed in his study dealing with recreational level athletes and competitive female members of a track and field team of an American college, that these five lower-order FFs also had unique properties upon self-talk, achievement goals, and contextual motivation. He also noticed that when performing, individuals tended to treat themselves in a manner that resembled their feared consequence of failing, such as losing interest and giving up on themselves when fearing that important others would lose interest in them.

## **Research on the effects of fear of failure on achievement goals**

FF has been viewed, together with need for achievement and perceived competence, as one of the key antecedents in achievement goal adoption, having an indirect effect on achievement behaviour through achievement goals (Conroy & Elliot, 2004; Elliot 1999; Elliot & Church, 1997). As high perceived competence guides the individual towards approach goals and low perceived competence towards avoidance goals, need for achievement and FF orient the individual towards success and failure respectively (Birney et al., 1969; Elliot, 1999).

Many studies in the sports environment have concluded, that FF leads to an increase in performance-approach (PAP) goals, whereas it has no connection to the mastery-approach (MAP) goals (Chen et al., 2009; Conroy, Elliot, & Hofer, 2003). Since PAP goals are focused around demonstrating normative competence, it is understandable that adopting PAP goals has been one way of reacting to FF, thus avoiding failure by succeeding (Chen et al., 2009). However, research on this area is not unanimous. After assessing college students' physical education classes during a 3-week interval Conroy and Elliot (2004) found out, that PAP goals were unrelated to FF, and that there was a negative connection between MAP goals and FF, both of these findings being contradictory to other sport studies. In Conroy and Elliot's (2004) study, the MAP goals might have produced a slight protective effect against FF, whereas the PAP goals could have been more situational than the other achievement goals. High perceived competence may have also buffered the negative effect of FF on PAP goals (Morris & Kavussanu, 2009). Past studies in the academic world (Elliot & Church, 1997; Elliot & McGregor, 2001) have shown, that FF is also linked to avoidance achievement goals, and later studies (Chen et al., 2009; Conroy & Elliot, 2004; Conroy, Elliot, & Hofer, 2003) have extended this finding to also include the sports domain. Adolescent elite athletes high on FF have also been reported to mainly use avoidance-focused coping strategies (Sagar et al., 2010).

Out of the five lower-order FFs, shame and embarrassment have been mostly responsible for the connection between FF and avoidance goals (Conroy, 2004), although all the other FF appraisals have also been associated with avoidance goals (Conroy & Elliot, 2004). McGregor and Elliot (2005) concluded after studying 172 undergraduates in psychology, that shame is the core emotion of FF. The origins of shame often lie in criticism (Conroy, 2008), and the feelings of shame and embarrassment typically lead to fearing failure (McGregor & Elliot, 2005; Sagar et al., 2007). Individuals high in FF also experience greater levels of shame when failing, tend to generalise the failure experience to the global self in the form of self-devaluation (McGregor & Elliot, 2005), and are therefore more likely to orient towards avoiding failure and making mistakes

in the future (Sagar et al., 2007). Previous studies have also linked shame and embarrassment to PAp goals (Conroy & Elliot, 2004), increased self-blame and reduced self-affirmation (Conroy, 2004), and to less optimism towards future performances (Conroy et al., 2002).

### **Research on the effects of fear of failure on achievement behaviours**

There are not a lot of studies completed about the direct relationship between FF and achievement behaviours. Most of the studies have focused on the indirect effects of FF on achievement behaviours through achievement goal adoption. Since MAp and challenge seeking PAp individuals have mostly been motivated by learning and need for achievement instead of FF, they have been low in FF and have as a result exerted an increased amount of effort, persistence (Bing, 2002; Elliot & Church, 1997; Michou, Vansteenkiste, Mouratidis, & Lens, 2014; Vansteenkiste, Mouratidis, & Lens, 2010) and enjoyment (Ntoumanis, Taylor, & Standage, 2010). Also, when a person scores high on FF but has had no chance to bail out from the pressurising situation, the result might have been an increase in effort and persistence, hence reacting to FF by succeeding (Bing, 2002; Martin & Marsh, 2003). On the contrary, when the odds to fail have been high but there has been no pressure to continue pursuing the task, effort and persistence might have been reduced, working as an excuse for failing (Bing, 2002; Martin & Marsh, 2003) and at the same time, enjoyment has also been lowered (Ntoumanis et al., 2010). Thus, when high on FF, especially the performance orientation has had a tendency to result in either an increase or a reduction of effort, persistence and enjoyment, depending on the situation and other underlying reasons. Out of the two avoidance goals, both of them have mediated the relationship between FF and making excuses, but only PAV has mediated the relationship between FF and reducing effort (Chen et al., 2009). All in all, more research is needed on the direct relationship between FF and achievement behaviours, since most studies are focused on the indirect effects of FF.

### **Coach-athlete relationship**

Coaches have a strong influence on their athletes in their hobbies all through the adolescence to the late teenage years (Chan, Lonsdale, & Fung 2012). Coaches are often perceived as role models and experts by the youngsters (Coatsworth & Conroy, 2006; Vella, Oades, & Crowe, 2013), as well as a negative force that can disturb the enjoyment of the hobby. The dislike of the coach has been ranked as one of the biggest reasons for dropout from sport, alongside having other things to do,

lack of fun and perception of failure (Molinero, Salguero, Tuero, Alvarez, & Márquez, 2006; Salguero, Gonzalez-Boto, Tuero, & Marquez, 2003), whereas some athletes have reported coach becoming angry or unhappy as an aversive consequence of failure (Sagar et al., 2007). In addition to that, Rottensteiner and his colleagues (Rottensteiner, Laakso, Pihlaja, & Konttinen, 2013) studied 15–16-year-old dropout athletes, out of which 397 were football players, and found out that the coach had been the most influential significant other in the decision to withdraw from sport, ahead of teammates and family members.

The past literature has shown, that an autonomy-supporting coaching style has a positive influence on the athletes' motivation and performance (Gillet, Vallerand, Amoura, & Baldes, 2010; Keegan, Spray, Harwood, & Lavalley, 2010; Mageau & Vallerand, 2003). Autonomy-supporting coaching style, as opposed to controlling coaching style, means acknowledging the athletes' feelings and perspectives, allowing them to be involved in the decision-making processes and explaining reasons behind rules and limits. Leptokaridou and her colleagues (Leptokaridou, Vlachopoulos, & Papaioannou, 2016) compared the change in the effects of autonomy-supportive teaching and non-autonomy-supportive teaching in Greek physical education classes through the school trimester. The levels of effort and enjoyment among the autonomy-supported pupils remained relatively high, and FF stayed low during the whole trimester, whereas there was a gradual decline of enjoyment and effort and an increase of FF among the non-autonomy-supported pupils, thus further stressing the importance of autonomy-supporting coaching in keeping the motivation high through longer periods of time.

The competitive nature of sport is a challenge to coaches' autonomy-supportive behaviour, since the pressure to perform orients the focus of coaching more towards the outcome of performance and controlling styles of coaching, especially if the coaches' jobs are directly dependent on the results (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003). The pressure to perform may make the coaches to change their perceptions of their athletes' behaviours (Huddleston, Ahrabi-Fard, & Garvin, 1995), which in turn might influence their coaching behaviour (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003). Since coaches react to the athletes' perceived and actual motivation, they do not behave the same way with all their athletes. That is problematic, because the coaches' motivational abilities partly rely on how well they are able to estimate their athletes' competitive behaviours (Huddleston et al., 1995), and the coaches' and athletes' metaperceptions of their relationship (how they think their partners view the relationship) are essential to motivation, since they create a feeling of mutual understanding (Lorimer & Jowett, 2009b). In addition to that, coaches in team sports generally communicate more to the team as a whole compared to individual sports athletes and their coaches (Jowett & Clark-Carter, 2006; Lorimer & Jowett, 2009a), and their expectations

and satisfaction on performance are often more focused on the team instead of understanding any one individual (Lorimer & Jowett, 2009b). To summarise, the limited time to spend with an individual and the pressure on the outcome of the performance make it challenging for the coaches to correctly infer the motivational state and behaviour of their athletes, and thus to be autonomy-supportive.

### **Research on coaches evaluating the athletes' achievement behaviours**

Research has shown, that coaches may not accurately judge their athletes' behaviours, feelings or thoughts (Huddleston et al., 1995), and this may be even more obvious in team sport than in individual sport, partly due to less time available for one-to-one communication and the pressure on the coaches (Lorimer & Jowett, 2009a, b). In Lorimer and Jowett's (2009a) study about the empathic accuracy of coach-athlete dyads, coaches and athletes demonstrated a less than 40% accuracy at inferring each other's thoughts and feelings, although according to Jowett and Clark-Carter (2006), both the players and coaches seemed to assume that these interpretations were more accurate than they actually were. In another study (Huddleston et al., 1995), coaches were able to accurately estimate their athletes' goals and win orientations, but they were not good at identifying behaviours that directly affected the athletes' performances, such as precompetition traits and state anxiety. In addition to that, Chan et al. (2012) concluded that when coaches stress the importance of hard work in the team, they are more likely to perceive their athletes putting in more effort, thus reinforcing and more easily noticing behaviours they themselves appreciate. As coaches mostly rely on their own perceptions about the athletes' feelings, thoughts and behaviours, there is likely going to be errors and biases in these interpretations (Jowett & Clark-Carter, 2006).

There has been not so much research on how the length of the coach-athlete relationship affects the accuracy of the coaches' evaluations of their athletes' achievement behaviours. Jowett and Clark-Carter (2006) studied 121 coach-athlete dyads, out of which most of the relationships had been one and a half to two years long with none of them less than six months long. They found out that the shorter relationship time (6 months to 2 years) resulted in more empathic understanding than the longer (over 2 years), possibly because in the beginning of the relationship, the coaches and their athletes were more motivated to observe each other's behaviours. However, these results were stronger in the case of athletes, whereas the coaches were not so accurate in their perceptions. Interestingly, Lorimer and Jowett (2009a) argued that it is not so much the years but the actual time

spent together that matters, and they demonstrated, that having longer training sessions resulted in higher empathic accuracy.

### **Aims of the study**

As our previous study focused on the relations between the achievement goals and the achievement behaviours (persistence, effort and enjoyment), our current study from the same material had three points of interest to further extend our understanding of the motivation among competitive adolescent football players. Firstly, we were interested in the relationship between FF and the achievement goals. Secondly, we wanted to assess the relationship between FF and the achievement behaviours. Thirdly, we wanted to explore how much the coaches' evaluations about their players' achievement behaviours differed from the players' own estimates of their own achievement behaviours, and whether these differences had anything to do with the length of the coach-athlete relationship.

We hypothesised, based on previous studies, that FF would be positively related to avoidance goals and unrelated or slightly negatively related to MAp goals, whereas the PAp goals would either have a positive connection with FF, thus avoiding failure by succeeding, or no connection at all. What comes to the relationship between FF and achievement behaviours, FF was expected to be connected with lowered enjoyment. However, FF has had a tendency to result in either increased or lowered persistence and effort, so it was of particular interest for us to observe the nature of this connection in our study. What comes to the third point of interest, the divergence between the coaches' evaluations and their players' estimates about the players' persistence, effort, and enjoyment, it was difficult to hypothesise the nature and the direction of the divergence. We were also interested if this possible difference was related to the length of the coach-athlete relationship.

### **METHODS**

One hundred and four 14–20 years old male adolescent football players took part in our study involving three different clubs in Finland. All of these players represented their respective clubs' competitive teams of the two eldest age groups, namely the A-juniors, generally meant for 18–19-year-old players, and the B-juniors, meant for 16–17-year-old players. Thus, our sample consisted of six teams together, two from each of the three clubs. In addition to this, every head coach of these teams evaluated those of their players who took part in the study.

At the time of the survey, the mean age of all the players was 16.9 years ( $SD = 1.3$ ), out of which the A-juniors' mean age was 17.9 years ( $SD = .7$ ) and the B-juniors' mean age 15.8 years ( $SD = .7$ ). There was only one 14-year-old and one 20-year-old in our sample. It is also noteworthy, that we completed the surveys in the end of February, so many of the players had not had their birthdays for that year yet. The participation rate was 67% (104/156), and the respective rates for the A-junior teams were 23%, 64% and 92%, and for the B-junior teams 57%, 73% and 95%. There were also some players from the A-juniors who were absent at the time of the survey due to the obligatory national service. It was essential for us to find clubs, whose youth teams had regularly performed well on the national level and whose adult teams play, or have recently played on the highest level of Finnish football.

## **Procedure**

After getting permission to complete the study from the people responsible for the youth organisation in each club, we telephoned each team's head coach, who all agreed to participate. Later, we were granted with an approval for conducting the study from the Ethical Committee of the University of Jyväskylä, after which we sent informational consent letters to the coaches, who distributed them to their players to sign, in addition to signing their own copies. Under 18-year-olds were asked for a written parental consent. The consent letters stressed the facts that participation is voluntary and that anonymity is going to be fully granted.

Only those players, who agreed to participate, attended the survey where the questionnaires were filled. At least one of the researchers was on the premises of the survey, where they emphasized that the responses were to remain confidential, and that the coaches would not see the answers the players gave and therefore, it could not affect the selection of the squad. Those players, who did not attend the survey but had earlier agreed to participate, or had not returned the letter of consent but filled in the questionnaire, were given an envelope ready to be posted directly to the researchers, thereby securing that no outsider would see the answers given. The coaches were also handed an envelope containing copies of the coach's evaluation of the players, which were to be filled in later and posted to the researchers.

## Questionnaire and assessment methods

The player's questionnaire (see Appendix 1) was accompanied with a short instruction, stressing the anonymity of the player and that the questionnaire was to be filled with full concentration to ensure, that the questions were correctly understood and answered in line with the players' thoughts about the matter. The questionnaire started with basic questions, such as name, age and the club of the player. These questions were followed by parts assessing the achievement goals, fear of failure, persistence/effort, and enjoyment. The questions in all the methods were translated to Finnish.

The coach's questionnaire also included a short instruction, where it was address that the coach did not need to worry if he felt he had known a player for a too little time for proper evaluation, because we were only interested in the impression the coach had about the player at that particular time during their relationship. The questionnaire had only questions concerning the length of the coaching relationship and the coach's evaluation of his players' persistence, effort, and enjoyment in trainings and in games.

The variables assessing the achievement goals, achievement behaviours, and FF variables were formed by summing the values of the items assessing the respective variable and counting the mean value to represent the score of each wanted variable.

### *Achievement goals*

The Achievement Goal Questionnaire for Sport, AGQ-S, (Conroy, Elliot, & Hofer, 2003), was used to assess the achievement goals. Being a refinement of Elliot and McGregor's (2001) original Achievement Goal Questionnaire (AGQ), it is proved to fit well the sport environment. The questionnaire consists of 12 items, with three items representing each of the four achievement goals, namely the mastery-approach, mastery-avoidance, performance-approach and performance-avoidance goals. We used a gradually rising Likert-type scale, from 1 = is not at all true to 7 = is very true. In addition to that, we assessed the scale number 4 to represent "is reasonably true", because we felt the need to clarify the meaning of the middle number of the scale. Reliability estimates were good, since the Cronbach's alphas of the achievement goals were .83 (PAp), .72 (MAp), .78 (PAv) and .81 (MAv).

### *Persistence/Effort*

The persistence/effort scale (Guan et al., 2013) consists of eight items, with four items assessing each factor. The response scale was identical to that used in the case of AGQ-S, that is a gradually rising scale from 1 to 7, with the response number 4 pointed out as “is reasonably true”. Guan et al. (2013) had concluded that the eight items represented a single persistence/effort factor, and we reached the same conclusion by using the explorative factor analysis with VARIMAX rotation (eigenvalue = 5.29; extraction sums of variance = 61.5%; factor loadings .60–.86). The Cronbach’s alpha was .93, thus confirming the reliability of this new combined factor. We concluded, that although persistence and effort are theoretically two separate factors, they are similar enough to be treated as one factor in the first phase of the analysis. However, we kept the two factors separate in the latter part of the analysis where the coaches evaluated their players (see later in coaches evaluating their players).

### *Enjoyment*

The original four-item enjoyment scale comes from the study of Scanlan et al. (1993). Liukkonen (1998) adapted the same scale for the game and training events separately, making it an eight-item questionnaire, with the first four items considering enjoyment in trainings and the next four dealing with enjoyment in games, and we decided to do the same with our data. The response scale ranged from 1 to 5 (1 = totally disagree, 2 = disagree to some extent, 3 = not agree nor disagree, 4 = agree to some extent and 5 = totally agree). The Cronbach’s alpha was .91 for the enjoyment in trainings-variable and .95 for the enjoyment in games-variable.

### *Fear of failure*

FF was assessed with the Performance Failure Appraisal Inventory, PFAI, (Conroy, 2001b; Conroy et al., 2002), which is a 25-item measure including scores for the five lower-order beliefs (FSE 7 items, FDSE 4 items, FUF 4 items, FIOLI 5 items, FUIO 5 items) about the aversive consequences of failure and a higher-order score for general FF. According to Conroy (2001b), general FF is created by taking one item from each lower-order FF. The response scale was from 1 to 5, identical to that in the case of enjoyment. Differing from the original Conroy’s study (2001b), in our study

FUF and FDSE consisted of only 3 items instead of the original 4, since about every fifth player (19/104) had understood the reversely formed question in FUF (“When I am failing, I am not worried about it affecting my future plans.”) wrong, meaning that the answer was inconsistent compared to the other FUF items. With respect to the FDSE, there was one item (“When I am failing, I hate the fact that I am not in control of the outcome.”) that correlated weakly (between .15–.30) with the other FDSE items and after removing this item, the Cronbach’s alfa of the FDSE rose from .68 to .76. The explorative factor analysis (principal axis factoring with VARIMAX rotation; eigenvalue: 2.18; extraction sum of variance: 42.3%) also supported our decision, since the communality of the item (.10) stayed below the .30 extraction level. Reliability estimates were good for the other fear-of-failure variables too, since the Cronbach’s alphas were .75 (general FF), .82 (FSE), .88 (FIOLI), .83 (FUF) and .84 (FUIO).

### *Coaches evaluating their players*

The coaches had one question to evaluate each of their players’ achievement behaviour, that is persistence, effort, enjoyment in trainings and enjoyment in games. The descriptions of the achievement behaviours in the coach’s questionnaire were formed by collecting the descriptions of all the individual items assessing the wanted behaviour from the player’s questionnaire, and combining them to form a unified description of that behaviour. For example, the combined description of effort was the following: “He puts a lot of effort and works very hard to prepare for the games. He works hard to do well even when he does not like what we are doing and always pays attention to the coach.” The scale to evaluate was identical to what the players had had in their respective assessments, so persistence and effort had a Likert-7-type scale, whereas both enjoyment variables had a Likert-5-type scale. As this assessing method was our own creation and thus not validated in previous studies, we kept persistence and effort separate during this phase and not as a combined factor, as we did in the first part of the analysis when measuring the relations between FF and the achievement goals and achievement behaviours (see persistence/effort).

In addition to that, the evaluation of the length of the coaching time was assessed by giving four different time periods for the coaches to choose from with respect to each player, and those were 0–6 months, 6–12 months, 1–2 years or more than 2 years.

## Data analysis

The statistical analysis was done in two phases according to the study questions. First, we examined the interconnections between the players' FF and the achievement goals, persistence/effort, enjoyment in trainings and enjoyment in games. Second, we focused on the congruence of the coaches' and their players' views regarding persistence, effort and enjoyment in trainings and games.

As there was a possibility that the homogeneity of the locations and age groups could have influenced the players' results in the first phase, the possible group differences of the three locations and age groups were analysed with respect to the dependent variables (achievement goals, persistence/effort, enjoyment in trainings and enjoyment in games) with the help of the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) or its nonparametric version, the Kruskal-Wallis. Since there were only six participants in the older age group from Location 1, that team was left out of the analysis. Some group sizes were relatively small for the use of ANOVA (the range of group sizes was 12–44), but they were still big enough to justify the analysis. As a result, we got some indicative evidence of the group differences that we took into account while performing the following analyses.

We used the hierarchical regression analysis to test if the lower-order FFs were related to the achievement goals, persistence/effort, enjoyment in trainings, and enjoyment in games. The possible group differences were controlled by setting the differing variables as dummy variables onto the first step and adding all the lower-order FFs to the next step. After running the analysis with all the necessary variables included in the analysis, we extracted the variable that most exceeded the statistical significance value of .05, since that variable was the one that least explained the model. This procedure was repeated as long as there finally was a model where each independent variable was below the statistical significance value ( $p \leq .05$ ) and thus had a significant effect on the dependent variable. Our aim was to find the simplest model with the highest possible coefficient of determination.

We used general linear model (GLM) as a way to assess the relations between the players' self-evaluations and the coaches' evaluations of their players, since GLM enables the controlling of the categorical background variables (length of the coach-player relationship, location and age group) when examining the relations between the views. In the analysis, the background variables were set as fixed factors, the players' self-evaluations as a covariate and the coaches' evaluations of their players as a dependent variable. We created standardised variables from the players' self-evaluations and the coaches' evaluations of the players in order to get a standardised beta value of

the final model's beta value. The complete model included three- and two-item-interactions of the background variables and the covariate, as well as the main effects of the independent variables and the covariate. The analysis started from the three variable interactions in the same manner as it did with the hierarchical regression analysis in the first phase, by extracting one by one the interactions if they were statistically insignificant. The same continued through the two variable interactions all the way to the main effects of the variables where we distracted one by one the interaction or variable which was the least significant until we had the final model with statistically significant interactions or main effects. If there remained statistically significant interactions in the final model that included the players' self-evaluation covariate, we would categorise the differences between the views in the frequency tables according to the background variable(s) that accompanied the players' self-evaluations in this interaction.

In addition to acquiring information with GLM, we examined the congruence between the players' self-evaluations and the coaches' evaluations of their players also with the help of the means, standard deviations and the frequencies of the differences between the views. We created differential variables to be able to assess the frequencies of the differences regarding persistence, effort and the enjoyment variables by subtracting the coach's evaluational value from the player's self-evaluational value. Hence, the value zero meant that there were no differences between the opinions, whereas the negative value resulted when the coaches evaluated the players' abilities higher than the players did themselves and vice versa. The results were categorised in the way that all the values between .49 and -.49 were coded as number 0, and all the values between .5 and 1.49 were coded as number one and so on. These differential variables were then used to demonstrate the frequency of the differences between the views in the frequency statistics.

## **RESULTS**

### **Fear of failure, achievement goals and achievement behaviours**

The descriptive statistics of the variables used in this study are found in Table 1 and the correlations of these variables are in Table 2. The n of the variables in the Table 1 is constantly changing due to the absence of the corresponding answers. If the respondent had left over one third of the items measuring a particular variable unanswered, that variable was left without a value.

General fear of failure (GenFF) had statistically significant positive correlations with both avoidance goals, negative correlations with persistence/effort and enjoyment in trainings, whereas it

did not have a relationship with the two approach goals nor with enjoyment in games (see Table 2). All the lower-order FFs correlated strongly and positively with the MAV goals, and all of them besides the FDSE also had negative correlations with the two enjoyment variables (Table 2). In addition to that, FSE correlated positively with the PAp goals, whereas FUF, FDSE and FUIO had positive correlations with the PAv goals. FUF and FUIO also correlated negatively with persistence/effort (Table 2).

Table 1. The descriptive data of players' achievement goals, persistence/effort, enjoyment in trainings, enjoyment in games, fear of failures and coaches' evaluations on the players' persistence, effort and enjoyments.

Variable	n	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Performance-approach	103	5.11	1.23	2.00	7.00
Mastery-approach	103	6.13	.74	4.00	7.00
Performance-avoidance	104	3.71	1.43	1.00	7.00
Mastery-avoidance	104	3.92	1.33	1.00	7.00
Persistence/Effort	104	5.24	.98	2.25	7.00
Persistence	104	5.12	1.05	2.00	7.00
Effort	104	5.36	.99	2.50	7.00
Enjoyment in trainings	104	4.10	.72	2.00	5.00
Enjoyment in games	104	4.31	.73	2.00	5.00
General fear of failure	101	2.10	.72	1.00	4.20
FSE	104	2.70	.74	1.14	4.71
FIOLI	104	2.24	.80	1.00	4.20
FDSE	103	1.86	.77	1.00	4.33
FUF	104	2.30	.89	1.00	4.33
FUIO	104	1.76	.77	1.00	4.20
Coach's evaluation on player's persistence	95	5.22	1.35	2.00	7.00
Coach's evaluation on player's effort	95	5.35	1.47	2.00	7.00
Coach's evaluation on player's enjoyment in trainings	95	3.99	.95	1.00	5.00
Coach's evaluation on player's enjoyment in games	95	3.95	.89	1.00	5.00

Note. Players' achievement goals, persistence/effort, and coaches' evaluations on the players' persistence and effort measured using scale 1 to 7. Players' enjoyments and fear of failures and coaches' evaluations on the players' enjoyments measured using scale 1 to 5. FSE = Fear of experiencing shame and embarrassment, FIOI = Fear of important others losing interest, FDSE = Fear of devaluing one's self-estimate, FUF = Fear of having an uncertain future, FUIO = Fear of upsetting important others.

Table 2. Correlational coefficients between achievement goals, persistence/effort, enjoyment in trainings, enjoyment in games and fears of failure.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Performance-approach	1												
2. Mastery-approach	.481***	1											
3. Performance-avoidance	.473***	.060	1										
4. Mastery-avoidance	.292**	-.075	.478***	1									
5. Persistence/Effort	.270**	.698***	-.074	-.271**	1								
6. Enjoyment in trainings	.084	.331***	-.026	-.265**	.533***	1							
7. Enjoyment in games	.121	.308**	-.049	-.259**	.459***	.712***	1						
8. General fear of failure	.128	-.130	.263**	.557***	-.255*	-.260**	-.177	1					
9. FSE	.271**	.001	.186	.554***	-.162	-.260**	-.242*	.715***	1				
10. FIOLI	.060	-.019	.150	.351***	-.117	-.264**	.257**	.753***	.631***	1			
11. FDSE	.166	.003	.281**	.513***	-.096	-.128	-.062	.644***	.442***	.392***	1		
12. FUF	.083	-.104	.293**	.450***	-.253**	-.285**	.298**	.712***	.450***	.533***	.472***	1	
13. FUIO	.192	-.046	.300**	.479***	-.204*	-.256**	-.220*	.712***	.451***	.536***	.423***	.485***	1

Note. \*\*\*  $p < .001$  (2-tailed), \*\*  $p < .01$  (2-tailed), \*  $p < .05$  (2-tailed). FSE = Fear of experiencing shame and embarrassment, FIOLI = Fear of important others losing interest, FDSE = Fear of devaluing one's self-estimate, FUF = Fear of having an uncertain future, FUIO = Fear of upsetting important others.

The analysis of the possible group differences of the locations and age groups showed, that Location 1 got more positive scores on persistence/effort and enjoyment in trainings than the other two locations (see Table 3), as well as significantly higher levels of MAp than Location 3. In addition to that, enjoyment in the game events was significantly lower in Location 3 than among the other locations (see Table 3). As a result, we controlled the location variable in all of the hierarchical regression analyses.

Table 3. Mean differences in variables between locations.

Variable	Location 1		Location 2		Location 3		F (df1,df2)	H (df)*	p	$\eta_p^2$	Pairwise comparisons
	n = 12,		n = 42,		n = 44,						
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD					
Persistence/ Effort	6.13	.79	5.32	.81	4.86	1.02	9.61 (2,95)		<.001	.17	1 > 2, 3
Enjoyment in trainings	4.69	.37	4.14	.73	3.88	.71	6.76 (2,95)		.002	.13	1 > 2, 3
Enjoyment in games*	4.88	.20	4.48	.64	3.95	.76		21.91 (2)	<.001	-	3 < 1, 2
Mastery- approach**	6.58	.47	6.22	.65	5.88	.83	5.36 (2,94)		.006	.10	1 > 3

Note. Pairwise comparisons column shows which group differences are statistically significant at  $p < .05$  (with Bonferroni correction). Persistence/effort and mastery-approach measured using scale 1 to 7. Enjoyments measured using scale 1 to 5.  $\eta_p^2$  = partial eta squared. \* Mean differences tested with nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis test, \*\* In Location 3 n = 43.

The hierarchical regression analysis revealed, that the lower-order FFs did not have statistically significant connections with the MAp goals. The PAp goals, on the other hand, had a statistically significant positive relationship with FSE (see Table 4), whereas the PAv goals had a positive connection with FUIO (Table 5). The MAV goals were positively related to FSE, FDSE and FUIO (Table 6). The standardised regression coefficients and the coefficients of determinations of the final models are presented in the following tables.

Table 4. Hierarchical regression analysis (the final model): Fear of failure's effects on performance-approach (n = 103).

Variables	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	$R^2$	Adj. $R^2$
Step 1: Dummy variables		.05*	.05*	.04*
1. Location 1	.21*			
Step 2: Independent variables		.08**	.13**	.11**
2. Location 1	.24*			
3. FSE	.29**			

Note.  $\beta$  = the standardised regression coefficient from the last step of the model (when all the variables of the model are included),  $\Delta R^2$  = the change of the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), when all the variables from the step are included. \*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ . FSE = Fear of experiencing shame and embarrassment.

Table 5. Hierarchical regression analysis (the final model): Fear of failure's effects on performance-avoidance (n = 104).

Variables	$\beta$	$R^2$	Adj. $R^2$
Independent variable		.09**	.08**
1. FUIO	.30**		

Note.  $\beta$  = the standardised regression coefficient from the last step of the model (when all the variables of the model are included),  $\Delta R^2$  = the change of the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), when all the variables from the step are included. \*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ . FUIO = Fear of upsetting important others.

Table 6. Hierarchical regression analysis (the final model): Fear of failure's effects on mastery-avoidance (n = 103).

Variables	$\beta$	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>
Independent variables		.43 <sup>***</sup>	.41 <sup>***</sup>
1. FSE	.34 <sup>***</sup>		
2. FDSE	.28 <sup>**</sup>		
3. FUIO	.21 <sup>*</sup>		

Note.  $\beta$  = the standardised regression coefficient from the last step of the model (when all the variables of the model are included),  $\Delta R^2$  = the change of the coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>), when all the variables from the step are included. \*\*\* p < .001, \*\* p < .01, \* p < .05. FSE = Fear of experiencing shame and embarrassment, FDSE = Fear of devaluing one's self-estimate, FUIO = Fear of upsetting important others.

FUF had a negative relationship with persistence/effort (Table 7), and FSE was negatively connected with both the enjoyment variables (Tables 8 & 9), when all the lower-order FFs had been taken into account and the background variables controlled in the hierarchical regression analysis. The standardised regression coefficients and the coefficients of determinations of the final models are presented in the tables below.

Table 7. Hierarchical regression analysis (the final model): Fear of failure's effects on persistence/effort (n = 104).

Variables	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	R <sup>2</sup>	Adj. R <sup>2</sup>
Step 1: Dummy variables		.11 <sup>***</sup>	.11 <sup>***</sup>	.11 <sup>***</sup>
1. Location 1	.34 <sup>***</sup>			
Step 2: Independent variables		.06 <sup>**</sup>	.17 <sup>***</sup>	.16 <sup>***</sup>
2. Location 1	.33 <sup>***</sup>			
3. FUF	-.24 <sup>**</sup>			

Note.  $\beta$  = the standardised regression coefficient from the last step of the model (when all the variables of the model are included),  $\Delta R^2$  = the change of the coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>), when all the variables from the step are included. \*\*\* p < .001, \*\* p < .01, \* p < .05. FUF = Fear of having an uncertain future.

Table 8. Hierarchical regression analysis (the final model): Fear of failure's effects on enjoyment in trainings (n = 104).

Variables	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	$R^2$	Adj. $R^2$
Step 1: Dummy variables		.07***	.07***	.06***
1. Location 3	-.27**			
Step 2: Independent variables		.08**	.15***	.14***
2. Location 3	-.29**			
3. FSE	-.29**			

Note.  $\beta$  = the standardised regression coefficient from the last step of the model (when all the variables of the model are included),  $\Delta R^2$  = the change of the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), when all the variables from the step are included. \*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ . FSE = Fear of experiencing shame and embarrassment.

Table 9. Hierarchical regression analysis (the final model): Fear of failure's effects on enjoyment in games (n = 104).

Variables	$\beta$	$\Delta R^2$	$R^2$	Adj. $R^2$
Step 1: Dummy variables		.18***	.18***	.17***
1. Location 3	-.42***			
Step 2: Independent variables		.08**	.26***	.24***
2. Location 3	-.45***			
3. FSE	-.28**			

Note.  $\beta$  = the standardised regression coefficient from the last step of the model (when all the variables of the model are included),  $\Delta R^2$  = the change of the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ), when all the variables from the step are included. \*\*\*  $p < .001$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ . FSE = Fear of experiencing shame and embarrassment.

## Comparison of the views between coaches and their players

The congruence between the coaches' and the players' answers regarding persistence and effort when the background variables have been controlled are presented in Tables 10 and 11. There were only two teams included from the A-juniors, since one of the coaches did not return his own questionnaire. The answers of the players and coaches were positively related with respect to persistence and effort, whereas there were no statistically significant connections between the opinions regarding the enjoyment variables, when the background variables were taken into account.

Table 10. Analysis of variance (ANOVA), (n = 95) coaches' perceptions of their players' persistence as dependent variable.

Variables	$\beta$	F (df1,df2)	$\eta_p^2$
Main effects			
1. Persistence	.22*	5.53 (1,88)*	.06
2. Location		7.36 (2,88)**	.14
3. The length of coach-player relationship		12.31 (3,88)***	.30

Note.  $\beta$  = the standardised regression coefficient from the last step of the model (when all the variables of the model are included),  $\eta_p^2$  = partial eta squared. \*\*\* p < .001, \*\* p < .01, \* p < .05.

Table 11. Analysis of variance (ANOVA), (n = 95) coaches' perceptions of their players' effort as dependent variable.

Variables	$\beta$	F (df1,df2)	$\eta_p^2$
Interaction term			
1. Location*Age group		6.80 (1,86)**	.07
Main effects			
2. Effort	.21*	4.31 (1,86)*	.05
3. The length of coach-player relationship		2.81 (3,86)**	.09
4. Age group		.05 (1,86)	< .01
5. Location		2.68 (2,86)	.06

Note.  $\beta$  = the standardised regression coefficient from the last step of the model (when all the variables of the model are included),  $\eta_p^2$  = partial eta squared. \*\*\* p < .001, \*\* p < .01, \* p < .05.

The majority of the lengths of coach-athlete relationships were either less than 6 months (34%) or over two years long (35%), whereas 12% of the lengths were between six months and one year, and 20% of answers between one and two years. We were interested if the length of the coach-player relationship had something to do with the divergence of the views between the players and their coaches.

The GLM revealed, that there were no statistically significant (p < .05) interactions in which the players' self-evaluations were included, meaning that the background variables, including the length of the coach-player relationship, did not have a statistically significant impact on the relationships between the views of the players and their coaches.

We also assessed the differences between the views regarding persistence, effort and enjoyment with the help of frequency tables. The differences between persistence and effort were considered significant if the difference in the respective answers was two or more points. In the case of the enjoyment variables, the difference of one point was considered to be more noteworthy than was with persistence and effort, since the scale type used with the enjoyments was Likert-5, instead of the Likert-7-type scale used in the case of persistence and effort. The one-point difference was not considered to be significant all by itself, but in borderline cases, a bigger amount of particular one-point differences were regarded as supporting the direction of the difference. In the frequency table (Table 12), the 'no difference in opinions' area is highlighted for clarification.

The frequencies of the differences between the views demonstrated (see Table 12), that the coaches had evaluated their players at least two points higher than the players themselves in 22% of the instances in the case of persistence, whereas the respective value for the players evaluating themselves two points higher was a bit below 11%, meaning that all in all, in about one third of the cases, the difference was over two points. In terms of effort, the respective two-points-or-more differences happened in 17% of the cases towards both ways, thus over one third of the answers differed quite significantly. The two enjoyment variables produced similar results in relation to each other, only that in the case of enjoyment in games, the players seemed to evaluate their enjoyment overall a bit higher than their coaches, whereas in the case of enjoyment in trainings, the differences were more equally distributed. In the case of both enjoyment variables, about every seventh player had evaluated his enjoyment at least two points higher than the coaches. The players had evaluated themselves one point higher than the coaches in 25% of the instances regarding enjoyment in trainings and 37% regarding enjoyment in games. In all, every second player had rated his enjoyment in games to some extent higher than the coaches. The coaches, on the other hand, had evaluated the players' enjoyment in trainings at least two points higher than the players in about every tenth time and in about every thirteenth time regarding enjoyment in games, and there were less coach+1 values regarding enjoyment in games than there was in the case of enjoyment in trainings. Due to the smaller Likert-scale used in the case of the enjoyment variables, the one-point difference was considered more meaningful than in the case of persistence and effort.

Table 12. Frequencies and percentages of the differences of the point of views in persistence, effort, enjoyment in trainings, and enjoyment in games.

Difference of the point of view	Persistence		Effort		Enjoyment in trainings		Enjoyment in games	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Coach +4	1	1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-
Coach +3	6	6.3	6	6.3	2	2.1	1	1.1
Coach +2	14	14.7	10	10.5	8	8.4	6	6.3
Coach +1	17	17.9	25	26.3	24	25.3	15	15.8
Equal	21	22.1	22	23.2	24	25.3	25	26.3
Player +1	26	27.4	16	16.8	24	25.3	35	36.8
Player +2	4	4.2	9	9.5	10	10.5	11	11.6
Player +3	5	5.3	4	4.2	3	3.2	1	1.1
Player +4	1	1.1	2	2.1	-	-	1	1.1
Player +5	-	-	1	1.1	-	-	-	-
Total	95	100	95	100	95	100	95	100

Note.

Grey area = no difference between opinions

Coach + means the difference where the coaches had evaluated the players' features higher than a player themselves.

Player + means the difference where the players had self-evaluated their own features higher than their coaches evaluated the players.

Persistence and effort measured using scale 1 to 7. Enjoyments measured using scale 1 to 5.

## DISCUSSION

The current study focused on persistence, effort and enjoyment in a competitive sports environment, since these achievement behaviours have proved to play an important part in the development as well as in dropout from the hobby during adolescence (Guan et al., 2013; Roberts 1984, 2001). First, we were interested in the relationship between fear of failure (FF) and the achievement goals. Second, we assessed the connections between FF and persistence, effort, and enjoyment. Third, we wanted to evaluate, how well the coaches of the players were able to estimate the persistence, effort, and enjoyment their players were themselves feeling in relation to their hobby. The main findings were, that out of the achievement goals, the mastery-avoidance (MAv) goals were the most detrimental on FF and that high FF lead to a decreased amount of persistence, effort and enjoyment. Fear of shame and embarrassment (FSE) was the most often featured lower-order FF. The views of the players and the coaches upon the players' achievement behaviours diverged to some extent, although there were no major differences between the views. Enjoyment seemed to be the most

difficult of the achievement behaviours for the coaches to estimate correctly. The length of the coach-player relationship did not have an influence on the differences between the views.

The results were mostly in line with previous studies (Chen et al., 2009; Conroy, Elliot, & Hofer, 2003), suggesting that general fear of failure (GenFF) does not have a connection with the mastery-approach (MAp) goals, whereas GenFF is related to an increase in performance-approach (PAp) goals. In this study, the players adopting MAp goals most likely took their motivation from learning and need for achievement instead of FF, whereas the PAp oriented players high on FF reacted to the possible prospect of failure by trying to succeed instead. The avoidance goals, as hypothesised based on previous studies (Chen et al., 2009; Conroy & Elliot, 2004; Conroy, Elliot, & Hofer, 2003), were positively related to FF, showing that the more one was fearing failure, the more one adopted avoidance goals. It was also noteworthy, that the MAV goals had more detrimental consequences than the rest of the achievement goals, as they were strongly related to FF and through FF also to lower persistence, effort and enjoyment. These negative connections were partly in contradiction with previous sport studies, which have resulted in positive (Guan et al., 2006), null (Gao, Podlog, & Harrison, 2012; Guan et al., 2013; Puente-Díaz, 2012) as well as negative (Morris & Kavussanu, 2009) consequences in relation to the MAV goals. GenFF was also related to a lower degree of the three achievement behaviour variables, namely persistence/effort, enjoyment in trainings and enjoyment in games, giving support for the results of previous studies (Bing, 2002; Martin & Marsh, 2003; Ntoumanis et al., 2010) and thus adding further proof to the detrimental effects of FF. However, there were no signs of the increase in effort and persistence following high FF, which according to some researchers (Bing, 2002; Martin & Marsh, 2003) would have pointed towards the tendency of avoiding failing by increasing persistence and effort in order to succeed.

The most notable connection in the current study, including by far the highest coefficient of determination among all the final models, was the one linking an increase in MAV goals with higher amount of FSE, fear of devaluing one's self-estimate (FDSE) and fear of upsetting important others (FUIO). In fact, the MAV goals were connected to all of the lower-order fears of failing, as they also correlated with fear of uncertain future (FUF) and fear of important others losing interest (FIOLI). These latter correlations were, however, partly overlapping with the rest of the lower-order fears of failure, and were not strong enough as standalones. One cannot avoid failing in a competitive achievement environment. Failure is often followed by criticism of some form, such as self-criticism, leading to feelings of shame and embarrassment, global self-devaluation, and the increase in failure avoidance (Conroy, 2008; McGregor & Elliot, 2005; Sagar et al., 2007) and in the current study, MAV goals. FSE and FDSE have also had a tendency to result in less optimistic orientation

towards the future with players being less hopeful in their upcoming performances (Conroy et al., 2002). The presence of FUIO hinted that important others did play an integral role in how one was interpreting the possible prospect of failure. It is interesting that both avoidance goals were related to FUIO. Especially the link between FUIO and the MAV goals might question the motivational background of the MAV goals, since the mastery orientation should be, theoretically at least, based on the will to improve the skills in relation to oneself, not the others. The relations between performance-avoidance (PAV) goals and FUIO were weaker than the relations between FUIO and the MAV goals, thus supporting the deleterious effects of the MAV in the current study. In all, criticism, shame, self-devaluation, fear of upsetting important others and the MAV goals may have formed a vicious cycle, where each of these factors affected one another and complicated the enjoyment of the hobby, and possibly the outcome of future performances.

There may be various reasons accounting for the detrimental relations of the MAV goals in the current study. Firstly, MAV goals are the latest addition in Elliot's achievement framework, and there are not too many studies on its effects, especially in the sports environment. It may be that along the will to master something comes eventually also the fear of not being able to do so, as was suggested by Sideridis (2008). Sideridis concluded that MAV goals were related to negative cognitions, negative affect and psychological arousal, and that these effects were significantly greater than those of the other achievement goals, much like in the study of Van Yperen, Elliot, and Anseel (2009) and also in the current study. When something is really important to a person, the loss of it can be a bigger setback and result in enhanced emotional cost. Secondly, different contexts elicit different results. As Kaplan and Maehr (2007) concluded, individuals recognise different emphases on purpose within achievement contexts, they adapt to them, and start behaving accordingly. There might have been certain emphases on purpose also in the current study that may have influenced the results. Thirdly, in the current study, the MAV goals did not correlate with the MAP goals, although they theoretically share half of their base, namely the same mastery orientation. The mean value of the MAV goals was the lowest we have seen in any study, whereas the respective value for the MAP goals was really high. It may be that the theoretical background of the MAV goals and the items measuring them in the questionnaires need further revising and evaluation in the sports environment. However, there are also other studies (Gao et al., 2012; Morris & Kavussanu, 2009) with similar relationships between the two mastery goals, so this was not an exceptional feature of the current study. It is possible that achievement environments include more of those players who are higher on competitiveness, as well as on determination to become professionals, and who are at the same time low in MAV goals and high on MAP goals. It would be interesting to collect a meta-analysis of the various studies completed about the versatile relations

of the MAV goals to find out if something in the sample quality or study settings affected the results.

Out of the five aversive consequences of failure, it was FSE that was most often featured in the final models of the regression analyses, being mostly responsible for the connections between the five lower-order FFs and PAp goals, enjoyment in trainings and enjoyment in games. It is noteworthy though, that also FUF, FUIO, as well as FIOLI had similar amounts of correlation as FSE with the enjoyment variables. However, when the shared explanatory portion of the lower-order FFs was taken into account, it was solely FSE that had a significant impact on enjoyment among the other lower-order FFs. FSE has also previously been linked to PAp goals (Conroy & Elliot, 2004), as well as to enjoyment (Ntoumanis et al., 2010). Those players who reported FSE as an aversive consequence of failure were more often also adopting PAp goals, possibly in order to succeed instead of failing. Interestingly, this was not connected to an increase in persistence/effort, which one would think would be a possible consequence for those who want to become better in relation to the others. It might be, that adopting PAp goals was more of a thought following FF which did not lead into action, in others words into an actual increase in effort or persistence. Meanwhile, focusing on such a negative motivational source like FSE was at the same time connected to the decrease of enjoyment in both trainings and games, which could in the long run have led to a halt in individual development and perhaps even lead to dropout from the hobby. These conclusions concerning FSE would need a more detailed research-setting to be verified, perhaps one that is focusing on individual profiles.

When the background variables (age, location and length of the coach-player relationship) were taken into account, the views between the players and their coaches regarding the persistence and effort of the players converged to a small extent. Looking at the frequency tables about the distribution of the differences between the views revealed, that there nevertheless was a recognisable difference between the views in every third instance regarding persistence and effort. These differences between the views were evenly distributed in the case of effort, as the coaches evaluated their players' effort higher in as many cases as the players evaluated their own effort higher than the coaches. However, in the case of persistence, the coaches had evaluated the players' persistence higher than their players two times more often than vice versa. As Chan et al. (2012) concluded, it is possible that the coaches more easily noticed attributes in players they themselves valued and cherished for. In our study, the coaches' focus on certain attributes, such as persistence, might have tempted the players to exaggerate these attributes in their own achievement behaviour when they knew the coaches were watching. This may then have distorted the image their coaches were receiving about the players' persistence.

Contrary to the results achieved with persistence and effort, the views of the players and coaches did not converge with relation to the enjoyment in trainings nor in games, when the background variables had been taken into account. The frequency tables of the enjoyment variables did not reveal any notable differences compared to the ones in the case of persistence and effort, meaning that the differences between the views regarding enjoyment were not extreme. The results of enjoyment in trainings resembled those of effort, as there was an equal amount of instances in which the coaches evaluated their players' enjoyment in trainings higher than the players themselves as there was the other way around. It might be that effort and enjoyment in trainings were more prone to daily fluctuation, such as changing mood or tiredness, which might have accounted for the coaches evaluating the players' attributes sometimes higher and sometimes lower. In terms of enjoyment in games, the players evaluated their enjoyment in games a lot more often higher than the coaches. There might be something in the nature of the games that accounted for this difference. The intensity in the games is high and the focus often in the result of the game. The result may not even reflect the actual happenings on the field, since the team can be dominating but simultaneously losing. In addition to this, as previous researches have concluded (Jowett & Clark-Carter, 2006; Lorimer & Jowett, 2009a, b), part of the problem for the coaches to correctly infer the actual feelings and behaviours of the players in team sports lies in the lack of time to spend on one player, since the coaches more often look at the team as a whole. Thus, the result of the game and the focus on the team's performance instead of any particular individual may at least partly have accounted for the divergence between the views regarding enjoyment in games. In all, the differing results between the views regarding enjoyment in trainings and games might have hinted that the enjoyment of the players was not noticed or observed well enough by the coaches.

To our knowledge, there have not been previous studies that have focused on the divergence between the coaches' and players' views regarding the players' persistence, effort and enjoyment in a similar manner than the current study has done. Previous studies on respective issues have nevertheless concluded, that the coaches have been able to accurately estimate the athletes' goals and win orientations (Huddleston et al., 1995), but not their athletes' behaviours, feelings or thoughts (Huddleston et al., 1995; Lorimer & Jowett, 2009a). In our study, we were only interested in the comparison between the players' and coaches' thoughts on the players' achievement behaviours instead of the goals and win orientations of the players. Our results partly supported the previous findings, which have concluded that the coaches are not able to accurately estimate the players' achievement behaviour. In about every third coach-player relationship in the current study, there was a notable difference between the views regarding persistence and effort, and the results were similar with respect to enjoyment. However, these differences between the views were never

extreme, and the views converged to some extent in the case of persistence and effort. On the other hand, the views diverged in the case of enjoyment. Hence, it is difficult to say, that the coaches could or could not accurately estimate the achievement behaviour of their players, as “accuracy” is a loose and ambiguous term. It is also hard to say, to which amount these differences are harmful in a practical sense. Yet, we can say that there were differences between the views, and especially those concerning enjoyment need closer inspection in the future, as enjoyment is a critical ingredient in the dropout effect.

The length of the coach-player relationship had no effect on the divergence between the views, which was contradictory to the study of Jowett and Clark-Carter (2006), in which the shorter relationships had resulted in more empathic accuracy than the over-two-years-long relationships. However, due to the sparse amount of studies completed on the subject, it would be interesting to more closely address the issue of the length of the coach-player relationship, as well as the quality of the time spent together and their effects on the mutual understanding between the player and the coach.

There were some limitations to the current study. First, this being a cross-sectional study limited the possibility to draw long-sighted interpretations, as the results of the study were situational. Second, our sample size could have been bigger in order to be more competently able to generalise the results. The participation rates between the teams also varied a lot, so one cannot know for sure what kind of players were left out of the study. However, as our study focused on competitive teams, it is likely that all of the teams in the study were more homogenous in their competitiveness and achievement orientation compared to their peers in general, so the absence of some players from the survey most likely did not dramatically affect the results. Part of the players who did not participate in the survey were absent due to obligatory national service, and had as a result a natural excuse not to take part in the study. The general competitive edge of the players can also be observed in the low amount of avoidance goals and high amount of MAp goals, partly also accounting for the non-existent correlation between the two mastery goals. Thirdly, although we tried to create a peaceful and calm situation during the survey where the players did not communicate with each other, it was nevertheless difficult to know how much the general atmosphere of the teams affected the answers given. Fourth, we wanted to keep the scales assessing the achievement behaviours the same as they had been in the previous studies to be better able to compare the results between various studies. Thus, we used a narrower scale to assess enjoyment compared to the scale used with persistence and effort, which made the interpretation and comparison of the views between the players and their coaches more challenging, though not

impossible. Finally, a similar study should be completed to girls' teams as well to have a wider understanding of the current study questions and to include possible gender differences.

There were also strengths to our study. First, the Cronbach's alphas of the achievement goals, persistence/effort, FF and the enjoyment variables were all really strong, meaning that the questionnaires worked well with respect to our study sample. Second, our study sample was clearly defined, as we were interested in competitive adolescents who had themselves chosen to seize their potential and were willing to invest in their improvement. The unanimously detrimental effects of the MAV goals in the current study might thus be better understood, since these negative consequences might be a feature of competitive achievement environments. This would also explain, why the previous studies on the effects of the MAV goals had been so mixed, as the samples in most of the previous studies had included also individuals with less competitive interests. Finally, the notion that the study settings were clearly defined also means that the results are to some extent generalisable to other highly achievement-oriented team sport contexts as well, where the outside pressure and the will to strive towards achievement already eliminate the less competitive adolescents.

As the current study was unique in its approach in comparing the views of the players and their coaches, it evoked some ideas to be applied in the everyday work of the coaches. Failure often precedes the adoption of achievement goals, and therefore it is essential to be able to interpret failure in a more constructive way. Although the players are not far away from each other in relation to achievement goals and general skills, there are naturally differences between the players in a way they interpret and handle different happenings, such as success or failure. One concrete example that could in the light of the current study help the players is setting realistic and manageable, yet not too easy goals for each individual in addition to general team goals. This could strengthen the players' perception of their own competences and make them less vulnerable to FF and the adoption of MAV goals. In addition to this, coaches and clubs should find ways to increase the time spent on individual players, since the results of this study hinted that there is still work to be done to make the coaches to better interpret the achievement behaviours, and especially enjoyment, of their players. Whether this means appointing a sport psychologist or other people around the coach to be there to support the players relies not only on the resources available, but also on the understanding of the importance of this support and guidance. Focusing on the enjoyment of the players also provides a chance to dig deeper into the players' thoughts about their hobby, and to find out why they are not possibly enjoying what they are doing. An open and reflective environment where the players feel confident to share their fears and uncertainties is essential for development since at this age, the competitive achievement environments start often

bringing in more pressure on performance and success. As the coaches' motivational ability is partly dependent on the mutual understanding between the coaches and their players, one cannot overstress the importance of honest one-to-one communications, personal support and guidance.

The current study addressed some of the important factors leading to the players' development, as well as possible reasons for dropout, in achievement contexts. The results further stressed the harmful effects of FF on achievement goals, persistence, effort and enjoyment. The MAV goals proved to be the most detrimental among the achievement goals in the current study, which calls for future research to clarify the role of the MAV goals in achievement-oriented sports contexts. The decision to include coach-player comparisons regarding the achievement behaviours provided a fairly new dimension and depth to the study, where the achievement behaviour of the player was looked at from different angles. As the coaches have often proven to be the most influential persons in the adolescents' hobbies, it was important to see how well they were able to interpret the achievement behaviours of their players. Although the study settings were not the most generalisable, it nevertheless was noteworthy that there were differences between the views, and especially regarding the enjoyment of the players. Yet none of these differences were extreme, so it remains unknown how much the differences between the views affected the practical side of the coach-player relationship. But if one wants to offer the best possible circumstances for development and to prevent the early dropout of talented players, all the margins need to be taken into account. In this light, these results should awaken the interest to further pursue the idea of the convergence between the views presented in the current study, as well as to clarify the true nature and role of the MAV goals in competitive achievement settings.

## REFERENCES

- Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*, 261.
- Ames, C., & Archer, J. (1988). Achievement goals in the classroom: Students' learning strategies and motivation processes. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 80*, 260–267.
- Bing, M. N. (2002). The integrative model of personality assessment for achievement motivation and fear of failure: Implications for the prediction of effort and performance. Doctoral dissertation. University of Tennessee, Knoxville. Retrieved from [http://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3536&context=utk\\_graddiss](http://trace.tennessee.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=3536&context=utk_graddiss)
- Birney, R., Burdick, H., & Teevan, R. (1969). Fear of failure. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- Chan, D. K., Lonsdale, C., & Fung, H. H. (2012). Influences of coaches, parents and peers on the motivational patterns of child and adolescent athletes. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports, 22*, 558–568.
- Chen, L. H., Wu, C-H., Kee, Y. H., Lin, M-S., & Shui, S-H. (2009). Fear of failure, 2 x 2 achievement goal and self-handicapping: An examination of the hierarchical model of achievement motivation in physical education. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 34*, 298–305.
- Coatsworth, J. D., & Conroy, D. E. (2006). Coach training as a strategy for promoting youth social development. *The Sport Psychologist, 20*, 128–144.
- Conroy, D. E. (2001a). Fear of failure: An exemplar for social development research in sport. *Quest, 53*, 165–183.
- Conroy, D. E. (2001b). Progress in the development of a multidimensional measure of fear of failure: The Performance Failure Appraisal Inventory (PFAI). *Anxiety, Stress and Coping, 14*, 431–452.
- Conroy, D. E. (2004). The unique psychological meanings of multidimensional fears of failing. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 26*, 484–491.
- Conroy, D. E. (2008). Fear of failure in the context of competitive sport. A commentary. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 3*, 179–183.
- Conroy, D. E., & Elliot, A. J. (2004). Fear of failure and achievement goals in sport: Addressing the issue of the chicken and the egg. *Anxiety, Stress and Coping, 17*, 271–285.

- Conroy, D. E., Elliot, A. J., & Hofer, S. M. (2003). A 2x2 achievement goals questionnaire for sport: Evidence for factorial invariance, temporal stability, and external validity. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 25*, 456–476.
- Conroy, D. E., Poczwadowski, A., & Henschen, K. P. (2001). Evaluative criteria and consequences associated with failure and success for elite athletes and performing artists. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 13*, 300–322.
- Conroy, D. E., Willow, J. P., & Metzler, J. N. (2002). Multidimensional fear of failure measurement: The Performance Failure Appraisal Inventory. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 14*, 76–90.
- Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 18*, 105–115.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*, 68–78.
- Diener, C. I., & Dweck C. S. (1978). An analysis of learned helplessness: Continuous changes in performance, strategy, and achievement cognitions following failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*, 451–462.
- Diener, C. I., & Dweck C. S. (1980). An analysis of learned helplessness: II. The processing of success. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39*, 940–952.
- Dweck, C. S. (1986). Motivational processes affecting learning. *American Psychologist, 41*, 1040–1048.
- Dweck C. S., & Leggett E. L. (1988). A social cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95*, 256–273.
- Elliot A. J. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educational Psychologist, 34*, 169–189.
- Elliot, A. J., & Church, M.A. (1997). A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 218–232.

- Elliot A. J., & Harackiewicz J. M. (1996). Approach and avoidance achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*, 461–475.
- Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2x2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80*, 501–519.
- Elliot, A. J., McGregor, H. A., & Gable, S. (1999). Achievement goals, study strategies, and exam performance: A mediational analysis. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*, 549–563.
- Elliot, A. J., & Thrash, T. M. (2001). Achievement goals and the hierarchical model of achievement motivation. *Educational Psychology Review, 12*, 139–156.
- Gao, Z., Podlog, L. W., & Harrison, L. (2012). College students' goal orientations, situational motivation and effort/persistence in physical activity classes. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 31*, 246–260.
- Gillet, N., Vallerand, R., Amoura, S., & Baldes, B. (2010). Influence of coaches' autonomy support on athletes' motivation and sport performance: A test of the hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 11*, 155–161.
- Guan, J., Xiang, P., McBride, R., & Bruene, A. (2006). Achievement goals, social goals, and students' reported persistence and effort in high school physical education. *Journal of Teaching In Physical Education, 25*, 58–74.
- Guan, J., Xiang, P., McBride, R., & Keating, X. D. (2013). Achievement goals, social goals, and students' reported persistence and effort in high school athletic settings. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 36*, 149–170.
- Huddlestone, S., Ahrabi-Fard, I., & Garvin, G. W. (1995). Self-evaluation compared to coaches' evaluation of athletes' competitive orientation. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 18*, 209–214.
- Jowett, S., & Clark-Carter, D. (2006). Perceptions of empathic accuracy and assumed similarity in the coach-athlete relationship. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 45*, 617–637.
- Kaplan, A., & Maehr, M. (2007). The contributions and prospects of goal orientation theory. *Educational Psychology Review, 19*, 141–184.
- Keegan, R., Spray, C., Harwood, C., & Lavallee, D. (2010). The motivational atmosphere in youth sport: Coach, parent, and peer influences on motivation in specializing sport participants. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 22*, 87–105.

- Leptokaridou, E. T., Vlachopoulos, S. P., & Papaioannou, A. G. (2016). Experimental longitudinal test of the influence of autonomy-supportive teaching on motivation for participation in elementary school physical education. *Educational Psychology, 36*, 1138–1159.
- Liukkonen, J. (1998). *Enjoyment in youth sports: A goal perspectives approach*. University of Jyväskylä. LIKES - Research Center for Sport and Health Sciences. Research Reports on Sport and Health Sciences.
- Lorimer, R., & Jowett, S. (2009a). Empathic accuracy in coach-athlete dyads who participate in team and individual sports. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 10*, 152–158.
- Lorimer, R., & Jowett, S. (2009b). Empathic accuracy, meta-perspective, and satisfaction in the coach-athlete relationship. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 21*, 201–212.
- Maehr, M. L., & Nicholls, J. (1980). Culture and achievement motivation: A second look. In N. Warren (Ed.), *Studies in cross cultural psychology*, Vol. 3 (pp. 221–267). New York: Academic Press.
- Mageau, G. A., & Vallerand, R. J. (2003). The coach-athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sports Science, 21*, 883–904.
- Martin, A. J., & Marsh, H. W. (2003). Fear of failure: Friend or foe? *Australian Psychologist, 38*, 31–38.
- McGregor, H. A., & Elliot, A. J. (2005). The shame of failure: Examining the link between fear of failure and shame. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 218–231.
- Michou, A., Vansteenkiste, M., Mouratidis, A., & Lens, W. (2014). Enriching the hierarchical model of achievement motivation: Autonomous and controlling reasons underlying achievement goals. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*, 650–666.
- Molinero, O., Salguero, A., Tuero, C., Alvarez, E., & Márquez, S. (2006). Dropout reasons in young spanish athletes: Relationship to gender, type of sport and level of competition. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 29*, 255–269.
- Morris, R. L., & Kavussanu M. (2009). The role of approach-avoidance versus task and ego goals in enjoyment and cognitive anxiety in youth sport. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 7*, 185–202.
- Nicholls, J. G. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychological Review, 91*, 328–346.
- Nicholls, J. G., & Miller, A. T. (1984). Development and its discontents: The differentiation of the concept of ability. In J. G. Nicholls (Ed.), *Advances in motivation and achievement, Vol. 3: The development of achievement motivation* (pp. 185–218). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

- Ntoumanis, N., Taylor, I. M., & Standage, M. (2010). Testing a model of antecedents and consequences of defensive pessimism and self-handicapping in school physical education, *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 28, 1515–1525.
- Puente-Díaz, R. (2012). The effect of achievement goals on enjoyment, effort, satisfaction and performance. *International Journal of Psychology*, 47, 102–110.
- Roberts, G. C. (1984). Achievement motivation in children's sport. In J. G. Nicholls (Ed.), *Advances in motivation and achievement, Vol. 3: The development of achievement motivation* (pp. 251–281). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- Roberts, G. C. (2001). Understanding the dynamics of motivation in physical activity: The influence of achievement goals on motivational processes. In G. C. Roberts (Ed.), *Advances of motivation in sport and exercise* (pp. 1–50). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Rothblum, E. D. (1990). Fear of failure: The psychodynamic, need achievement, fear of success, and procrastination models. In H. Leitenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of social evaluation anxiety* (pp. 497–537). New York: Plenum Press.
- Rottensteiner, C., Laakso, L., Pihlaja, T., & Konttinen, N. (2013). Personal reasons for withdrawal from team sports and the influence of significant others among youth athletes. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 8, 19–32.
- Sagar, S. S., Busch, B. K., & Jowett, S. (2010). Success and failure, fear of failure, and coping responses of adolescent academy football players. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 2, 213–230.
- Sagar, S. S., Lavalley, D., & Spray C. M. (2007). Why young elite athletes fear failure: Consequences of failure. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 25, 1171–1184.
- Salguero, A., Gonzalez-Boto, R., Tuero, C., & Marquez, S. (2003). Identification of dropout reasons in young competitive swimmers. *Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness*, 43, 530–534.
- Scanlan, T. K. (1984). Competitive stress and the child athlete. In J. M. Silva & R. S. Weinberg (Eds.), *Psychological foundations of sport* (pp. 118–129). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Scanlan, T. K., Carpenter, P. J., Schmidt, G. W., Simons, J. P., & Keeler, B. (1993). An introduction to the sport commitment model. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 15, 1–15.
- Scanlan, T. K., & Simons, J. P. (1992). The construct of sport enjoyment. In G. C. Roberts (Ed.), *Motivation in Sport and Exercise* (pp. 199–215). Champaign, Ill.: Human Kinetics.

- Sideridis, G. D. (2008). The regulation of affect, anxiety, and stressful arousal from adopting mastery-avoidance goal orientations. *Stress and Health, 24*, 55–69.
- Vansteenkiste, M., Mouratidis, A., & Lens, W. (2010). Detaching reasons from aims: Fair play and well-being in soccer as a function of pursuing performance-approach goals for autonomous or controlling reasons. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 32*, 217–242.
- Van Yperen, N. W., Elliot, A. J., & Anseel, F. (2009). The influence of mastery-avoidance goals on performance improvement. *European Journal of Social Psychology 39*, 932–943.
- Vella, S. A., Oades, L. G., & Crowe, T. P. (2013). The relationship between coach leadership, the coach-athlete relationship, team success and the positive developmental experiences of adolescent soccer players. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 18*, 549-561.
- Wentzel, K. R. (1996). Social and academic motivation in middle school: Concurrent and long-term relations to academic effort. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 16*, 390-406.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Risemberg, R. (1997). Self-regulatory dimensions of academic learning and motivation. In G. Phye (Ed.), *Handbook of academic learning: Construction of knowledge* (pp. 105–125). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix 1

1. Nimi \_\_\_\_\_
2. Seura ja ikäluokka, jossa pelaat tällä kaudella jalkapalloa \_\_\_\_\_
3. Ikä \_\_\_\_\_ vuotta

### JALKAPALLON HARRASTAMINEN

4. Minkä ikäisenä aloitit jalkapallon harrastamisen urheiluseurassa? \_\_\_\_\_ -vuotiaana
5. Oliko jalkapallo ensimmäinen urheiluseurassa harrastamasi urheilulaji?
- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Kyllä  |
| 2 | Ei, ensimmäinen laji oli _____, jonka aloitin _____-vuotiaana. |
6. Miten päädyit harrastamaan jalkapalloa (voit ympyröidä useampia vaihtoehtoja)?
- |    |   |
|----|---|
| 1  | Kaverini harrastivat jalkapalloa                        |
| 2  | Kotini lähellä oli nurmikenttä/ tekonurmi/ hiekkakenttä |
| 3  | Isäni/ äitini vei minut jalkapalloharjoituksiin         |
| 4  | Olin kiinnostunut erityisesti jalkapallosta             |
| 5  | Olin hyvä jalkapallossa                                 |
| 6  | Isäni/ äitini pelasi tai oli pelannut jalkapalloa       |
| 7  | Kotipaikkakunnallani oli menestyvä jalkapallojoukkue    |
| 8  | Veljeni/ sisareni pelasi tai oli pelannut jalkapalloa   |
| 9  | Jalkapalloilijat olivat esikuviani                      |
| 10 | Muu syy, mikä? _____                                    |
7. Mikä on pelipaikkasi (jos pelipaikka vaihtelee usein, mikä on mielestäsi omin pelipaikkasi)?
- |   |             |
|---|-------------|
| 1 | Maalivahti  |
| 2 | Puolustaja  |
| 3 | Keskikenttä |
| 4 | Hyökkääjä   |

### MUU LIIKUNNAN / URHEILUN HARRASTAMINEN

8. Kilpailenko tällä hetkellä muissa urheilulajeissa kuin jalkapallossa?
- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | En kilpaile   |
| 2 | En, mutta olen harkinnut aloittavani, laji(t) _____ |
| 3 | Kyllä, laji(t) _____                                |

**9. Harrastatko tällä hetkellä muita urheilulajeja muuten kuin kilpailumielessä (omatoimisesti tai seurassa)?**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1 | En harrasta   |
| 2 | En, mutta olen harkinnut aloittavani, laji(t) _____ |
| 3 | Kyllä, laji(t) _____                                |

**PELAAJAN OMIA NÄKEMYKSIÄ JALKAPALLOHARRASTUKSESTAAN**

**10. Oheisa on kuvattu tuntemuksia, joita pelaajalla saattaa olla suorittaessaan erilaisia harjoitteita joukkueen harjoituksissa. Kuinka hyvin esitetyt väittämät pitävät paikkansa sinun kohdallasi? Arvioi nousevalla asteikolla, jossa 1 = ei pidä ollenkaan paikkansa, 2 = pitää todella vähän paikkansa, 3 = pitää hieman paikkansa 4 = pitää kohtuullisesti paikkansa 5= pitää melko paljon paikkansa, 6= pitää todella paljon paikkansa ja 7 = pitää täysin paikkansa.**

<b><i>Kun osallistun joukkueeni valmentajan vetämiin harjoituksiin...</i></b>	<b>ei pidä ollenkaan paikkansa</b>					<b>pitää täysin paikkansa</b>	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Minulle on tärkeää, että suoriudun paremmin kuin muut pelaajat.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Minulle on tärkeää, että suoriudun niin hyvin kuin minun on mahdollista suoriutua.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Haluan ainoastaan välttää sitä, että suoriutuisin muita heikommin.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Joskus pelkään, että en ehkä suoriudu niin hyvin kuin haluaisin.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Minulle on tärkeää, että pärjään hyvin muihin verrattuna.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Minulle on tärkeää että hallitsen kaikki suoritukseni osa-alueet.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Tavoitteeni on välttää sitä, että suoriutuisin muita heikommin.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Olen huolissani siitä, että en ehkä suoriudu niin hyvin kun minun olisi mahdollista suoriutua.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Tavoitteeni on pärjätä paremmin kuin useimmat muut.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Haluan suoriutua niin hyvin, kuin minun on mahdollista suoriutua.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Minulle on tärkeää välttää sitä, että olisin yksi ryhmäni heikoimmista.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Mietin usein, että en ehkä kykene suoriutumaan niin hyvin kuin parhaimmillani pystyn suoriutumaan.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**11. Kuinka hyvin oheiset harjoituksia / pelejä koskevat väittämät pitävät paikkansa sinun kohdallasi?**

	<b>ei pidä ollenkaan paikkansa</b>					<b>pitää täysin paikkansa</b>	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Panostan todella paljon peleihin valmistautumiseen.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Kun minulla on vaikeuksia jonkun taidon suorittamisessa, harjoittelen sitä uudestaan ja uudestaan.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Riippumatta siitä, pidänpö joistain harjoitteista vai en, teen kovasti töitä suorittaakseni ne.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Teen kovasti töitä valmistautuakseni peliin.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. Kun jokin harjoittelemani asia tuntuu vaikealta, käytän ylimääräistä aikaa tehdäkseni sen oikein.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Teen kovasti töitä suoriutuakseni hyvin, vaikka en pitäisikään siitä, mitä olemme tekemässä.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Yritän oppia tekemään asiat hyvin silloinkin, kun toiminta on minusta tylsää.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Kiinnitän aina huomiota siihen, mitä valmentaja sanoo.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**HUOM!**

Seuraavissa kohdissa käytetään asteikkoa, jossa 1 = täysin eri mieltä, 2 = jokseenkin eri mieltä, 3 = ei eri eikä samaa mieltä, 4 = jokseenkin samaa mieltä ja 5 = täysin samaa mieltä.

**12. Seuraavat kysymykset liittyvät viihtymiseen harjoituksissa ja peleissä. Kuinka hyvin ne pitävät paikkansa sinun tapauksessasi?**

	Täysin eri mieltä				Täysin samaa mieltä
1. Pidän joukkueemme jalkapalloharjoituksista.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Joukkueemme jalkapalloharjoituksissa on hauskaa.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Joukkueemme jalkapalloharjoitukset tuovat minulle iloa.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Nautin joukkueemme jalkapalloharjoituksista.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Pidän joukkueemme pelitapahtumista.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Joukkueemme pelitapahtumissa on hauskaa.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Joukkueemme pelitapahtumat tuovat minulle iloa.	1	2	3	4	5
8. Nautin joukkueemme pelitapahtumista.	1	2	3	4	5

**13. Urheiluun kuuluvat onnistumisten lisäksi myös epäonnistumiset. Arvioi, mitä Sinä tunnet ja koet silloin kun olet epäonnistunut urheiluun liittyvissä tilanteissa.**

<b><i>Kun en ole onnistunut urheilussa...</i></b>	Täysin eri mieltä				Täysin samaa mieltä
1. Olen vähemmän arvokas verrattuna siihen, kun onnistun.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Alan helposti moittimaan itseäni.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Ihmiset ovat minusta vähemmän kiinnostuneita.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Ihmiset tuntuvat olevan vähemmän avuliaita minua kohtaan.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Ihmisillä on tapana jättää minut omiin oloihini.	1	2	3	4	5
6. Jotkut ihmiset eivät ole enää kiinnostuneita minusta.	1	2	3	4	5
7. Arvoni vähenee joidenkin silmissä.	1	2	3	4	5

***Kun olen epäonnistunut urheilussa...***

1. Minusta on noloa, jos paikalla on muita ihmisiä katsomassa.	1	2	3	4	5
2. Kun epäonnistun, uskon kaikkien tietävän minun epäonnistuneen.	1	2	3	4	5
3. Uskon, että minua epäilleet ihmiset ajattelevat olleensa oikeassa minun suhteeni.	1	2	3	4	5
4. Olen huolissani siitä, mitä muut ihmiset minusta ajattelevat.	1	2	3	4	5
5. Olen huolissani siitä, että muut ihmiset saattavat ajatella, etten yritä tarpeeksi.	1	2	3	4	5

***Kun olen epäonnistunut urheilussa...***

	<b>Täysin eri mieltä</b>					<b>Täysin samaa mieltä</b>				
6. Se johtuu usein siitä, etten ole tarpeeksi "fiksi" onnistuakseni.	1	2	3	4	5					
7. Syytän siitä sitä, etten ole lahjakas.	1	2	3	4	5					
8. Pelkään, etten ehkä ole tarpeeksi lahjakas.	1	2	3	4	5					
9. Vihaan sitä, etten enää kykene vaikuttamaan toiminnan lopputulokseen.	1	2	3	4	5					
10. Jatkosuunnitelmani näyttävät epävarmoilta.	1	2	3	4	5					
11. Uskon jatkosuunnitelmieni muuttuvan.	1	2	3	4	5					
12. Tämä sekoittaa jatkosuunnitelmani.	1	2	3	4	5					
13. En ole huolissani siitä, että tämä vaikuttaisi jatkosuunnitelmiini.	1	2	3	4	5					
14. Se järkyttää minulle tärkeitä ihmisiä.	1	2	3	4	5					
15. Odotan minulle tärkeiden ihmisten arvostelevan minua.	1	2	3	4	5					
16. Menetän minulle tärkeiden ihmisten luottamuksen minua kohtaan.	1	2	3	4	5					
17. Minulle tärkeät ihmiset ovat onnettomia.	1	2	3	4	5					
18. Minulle tärkeät ihmiset ovat pettyneitä.	1	2	3	4	5					



## Appendix 2

### VALMENTAJAN KYSELY

1. Nimi \_\_\_\_\_

2. Valmennettava joukkue ja ikäluokka \_\_\_\_\_

3. Arvioitava pelaaja \_\_\_\_\_

4. Kuinka kauan olet valmentanut pelaajaa (rasti yksi vaihtoehto)

\_\_\_ 0 – 6 kuukautta

\_\_\_ 6 – 12 kuukautta

\_\_\_ 1 – 2 vuotta

\_\_\_ yli 2 vuotta

Arvioi pelaajaa seuraavien ominaisuuksien osalta nousevalla asteikolla 1-7 (1 = ei pidä lainkaan paikkaansa, 2 = pitää todella vähän paikkansa, 3 = pitää hieman paikkansa, 4 = pitää kohtuullisesti paikkansa, 5 = pitää melko paljon paikkansa, 6 = pitää todella paljon paikkansa ja 7 = pitää täysin paikkansa).

### 5. Pitkäjänteisyys

(Kun jokin harjoiteltava asia tai opeteltava taito tuottaa vaikeuksia, pelaaja ei luovuta vaan yrittää tosissaan oppia asian käyttäen mahdollisesti ylimääräistäkin aikaa siihen. Lisäksi pelaaja yrittää tehdä asiat kunnolla silloinkin, kun hän ei niistä niin paljon pidä tai kun toiminta on hänen mielestään tylsää)

1                    2                    3                    4                    5                    6                    7

### 6. Panostaminen

(Pelaaja panostaa paljon ja tekee kovasti töitä valmistautuakseen peleihin. Hän tekee kovasti töitä suoriutuakseen hyvin, vaikkei pitäisikään siitä, mitä ollaan tekemässä. Pelaaja kiinnittää aina huomiota siihen, mitä valmentaja sanoo.)

1                    2                    3                    4                    5                    6                    7

Arvioi pelaajan viihtymistä joukkueen harjoituksissa ja pelitapahtumissa asteikolla 1-5 (1 = täysin eri mieltä, 2 = jokseenkin eri mieltä, 3 = ei eri eikä samaa mieltä, 4 = jokseenkin samaa mieltä ja 5 = täysin samaa mieltä).

### 7. Viihtyminen harjoituksissa

(Pelaaja viihtyy ja nauttii joukkueen jalkapalloharjoituksista. Ne tuovat hänelle iloa ja hänellä on harjoituksissa hauskaa)

1                    2                    3                    4                    5

### 8. Viihtyminen pelitapahtumissa

(Pelaaja viihtyy ja nauttii joukkueen pelitapahtumista. Ne tuovat hänelle iloa ja hänellä on pelitapahtumissa hauskaa)

1                      2                      3                      4                      5

### 8. Minkä tasoinen pelaaja on mielestäsi tällä hetkellä verrattuna oman ikäluokkansa pelaajiin?

- |   |                                   |
|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | Keskitasoa selvästi heikompi      |
| 2 | Keskitasoa jonkin verran heikompi |
| 3 | Keskitasoa                        |
| 4 | Keskitasoa jonkin verran parempi  |
| 5 | Keskitasoa selvästi parempi       |

### 9. Millä tasolla uskot pelaajan pelaavan juniorivuosien jälkeen?

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1 | Kansainvälinen huipputaso                    |
| 2 | Veikkausliiga                                |
| 3 | Ykkönen                                      |
| 4 | Kakkonen tai alemmat sarjatasot              |
| 5 | Harrastejalkapalloa                          |
| 6 | En osaa sanoa                                |
| 7 | Ei aio jatkaa pelaamista aikuisten sarjoissa |

**Muita huomioita joita meidän olisi hyvä tietää pelaajasta jo kysytyihin kysymyksiin liittyen (esim. täsmennyksiä joihinkin kohtiin).**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Allekirjoitus

---

Paikka ja aika