



## LJMU Research Online

Tod, D, McEwan, HE, Whitehead, A and Marchant, D

**A Penny for your Thoughts: Athletes' and Trainee Sport Psychologists' Internal Dialogue during Consultations**

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/22133/>

### Article

**Citation** (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

**Tod, D, McEwan, HE, Whitehead, A and Marchant, D (2024) A Penny for your Thoughts: Athletes' and Trainee Sport Psychologists' Internal Dialogue during Consultations. Sport Psychologist. pp. 1-9. ISSN 0888-4781**

LJMU has developed **LJMU Research Online** for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact [researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk](mailto:researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk)

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

1 **A Penny for your Thoughts: Athletes' and Trainee Sport Psychologists' Internal Dialogue**  
2 **during Consultations**

3  
4 **Tod, D<sup>1</sup>, McEwan, H.E<sup>2</sup>, & Whitehead A.E<sup>3</sup>**

5  
6 **University of Lancaster, UK.<sup>2</sup>**

7 **University of the West of Scotland, UK.<sup>2</sup>**

8 **Liverpool John Moores University, UK.<sup>3</sup>**

9

10

11

**Abstract**

The purpose of this study was to explore the internal dialogue of trainee sport psychologists (TSPs) and athletes immediately following athlete-practitioner consultations. TSPs (4 males and 3 females, aged 22-32 years) and athletes (4 males, 3 females, aged 19-29 years) completed a thought-listing procedure twice, while watching video recordings of their previous consultations. The thought-listing procedure involved participants pausing the video to record the in-session internal dialogue they had experienced during the consultation. Participant's responses were categorised into six dimensions: time, place, focus, locus, orientation, and mode. TSPs' and athletes' retrospective accounts provided evidence that their in-session internal dialogue was (a) present focused, (b) about in-session material, (c) about the athletes or themselves, (d) about internal and external events, (e) professional (i.e., related to the session), and (f) neutral. Findings provide trainees and inexperienced practitioners with insights into the thought content of TSPs and athletes to guide their own athlete-interactions.

*Keywords:* Internal Dialogue; Thought-Listing; Applied Sport Psychology; Cognition



1 2017). When researchers have examined internal dialogue, it has most commonly been under the  
2 guise of the term self-talk. There is overlap between the terms internal dialogue and self-talk and to  
3 orientate the reader, we consider both as statements, phrases, or cue words that: are addressed to the  
4 self, might be said automatically or strategically, can be aloud or silent, can have an element of  
5 interpretation, and include similar grammar to ordinary speech (Latinjak, 2019).

6 To date, researchers have built an understanding of athletes' internal dialogue related to  
7 performance (see for example, Aitchison et al., 2013; Whitehead et al., 2018). From an athlete  
8 performance perspective, researchers have identified how internal dialogue can be influenced by the  
9 intensity of the activity (Aitchison et al., 2013), and how athletes' internal dialogue changes over  
10 the duration of an activity (Whitehead et al., 2018). Collectively, from a cognitive-behavioural  
11 perspective, the research demonstrates that internal dialogue is a key influence on feelings and  
12 behaviours (Eubank et al., 2020). However, within a consulting context, we may also consider that  
13 in-session internal dialogue (just as between-session reflection) influences practitioners' emotions,  
14 decisions, behaviours, and indirectly, service-delivery outcomes. Findings on athlete internal  
15 dialogue or self-talk provide a basis for further study, particularly as applied to practitioner  
16 development. Understanding athlete and practitioner internal thought processes may contribute to  
17 knowledge on how applied sport psychology is experienced. Counselling researchers have found  
18 that retrospective accounts of therapist self-talk and internal dialogue are related to other aspects of  
19 therapy, such as perceived helpfulness (Nutt Williams, 2008). For example, client focused internal  
20 dialogue is associated with clients' perceptions of therapist helpfulness. Potentially, the findings  
21 from psychotherapy have parallels in sport and exercise psychology but require context-specific  
22 investigation. Within the professional development literature in sport and exercise psychology,  
23 trainee's internal dialogue can function as a distractor to being cognitively and emotionally present  
24 with clients (McEwan & Tod, 2023). While it is insightful to know that trainee psychologists  
25 struggle to manage being present during service-delivery, this information was captured using  
26 retrospective semi-structured interviews and did not seek to gain direct understanding of the  
27 concurrent thought processes of participants (i.e., reflection-in-action).



1 dialogue that we have attempted to examine. For the purposes of this study, we focus on what  
2 Basch (1980) terms manifest content (the spoken rather than the unspoken content). Although a  
3 reality exists, however, we realise that our knowledge of it is constructed and theory-laden,  
4 reflecting our constructionist epistemology (Ronkainen & Wiltshire, 2021). Our knowledge is  
5 fallible because we, as researchers, and our methods are imperfect and influenced by the context  
6 and our own biases. For example, in constructing our study we needed to make choices about the  
7 most feasible methods, not the perfect methods (which do not exist). This choice involved  
8 balancing the advantages and disadvantages of competing methods. Although, for example, in the  
9 retrospective recall method we used there is delay between the trainee-athlete sessions and data  
10 collection, the advantage is that the consultations were uninterrupted by our attempts to collect data  
11 and occurred as naturally as possible. The competing method of collecting real-time data would  
12 have disrupted the trainee-athlete sessions to the point of being meaningless. In employing the  
13 retrospect recall method, we have followed the guidelines underpinning its use and have explained  
14 these below. As a second example, two individuals analysed the data independently from which we  
15 calculated inter-rater reliability to help ensure that data analysis was not subject to the biases of one  
16 individual.

### 17 **Participants**

18         The Australian TSPs (4 females, 3 males, ranging in ages from 22 to 32 years) were enrolled  
19 in either a Master of Applied Psychology or Professional Doctorate degree specialising in sport and  
20 exercise psychology. The TSPs had completed the first four years of psychology training prescribed  
21 by the Australian Psychological Society (a three-year undergraduate degree followed by a 4<sup>th</sup> year  
22 labelled as either an honours or postgraduate diploma). Two individuals had previous counselling  
23 experience prior to their enrolment on their sport psychology degree. The remaining individuals had  
24 started counselling clients the same year that we collected data for the current study. Although  
25 trainees were enrolled in either a Masters or Professional Doctorate, they were all in the first year of  
26 their postgraduate education and were enrolled in the same modules, focused on research methods,  
27 sport and exercise psychology, and psychological practice. Full details of the requirements of their

1 studies can be found on the Australian Psychological Society (2022) study pathways website. The  
2 trainees followed a counselling framework based on Egan and Reese's (2021) process. The  
3 trainees' practice philosophy was influenced by the cognitive-behavioural, psychodynamic, and  
4 humanistic approaches as they understood them from their lecturers and supervisors.

5         The Australian athletes (4 males, 3 females, ranging in ages from 19 to 29 years) were  
6 students enrolled in undergraduate degrees, majoring in either human movement or psychology.  
7 The primary sports athletes played included basketball, cricket, netball, tennis, track and field, and  
8 wakeboarding, and their participation ranged from club to national level competitions. To be  
9 eligible for inclusion, athletes had to be regularly participating in competitive sports, and have  
10 personal or sporting concerns they wished to discuss with a sport psychologist. Having an issue  
11 they wished to discuss helped ensure the consultancies were meaningful encounters.

## 12 **Procedure**

13         *Recruitment.* After the institution's human research ethics committee provided ethical  
14 clearance, we contacted the TSPs on an individual basis, and explained the study's purpose, risks,  
15 and safeguards before inviting them to participate both verbally and in written form. Prior to  
16 participating in the study, individuals provided written informed consent. We focused on TSPs  
17 because at the beginning of professional development trainees experience much conscious cognitive  
18 activity when helping clients compared to seasoned practitioners (Skovholt & Ronnestad, 2012).  
19 Having much conscious cognitive activity may have helped these individuals recall their cognitions  
20 during the thought-listing exercise. To identify potential athletes, we explained the study's purpose,  
21 risks, and safeguards to students enrolled in undergraduate sport psychology classes and asked them  
22 to indicate privately if they were interested in learning more about the study. Four athletes were  
23 interested and available to meet with practitioners. The remaining student athletes learned about the  
24 study via their informal social networks, and we invited them to participate after they expressed  
25 interest in the study. The issues athletes wished to discuss with a practitioner included anxiety  
26 management, returning to competition after injuries, concentration, motivation, and relationship  
27 difficulties. All athletes provided written informed consent before participating in the study. We

1 acknowledge that we set-up the trainee-athlete sessions and they did not arise organically. The  
2 screening process helped ensure the athletes had an issue they wished to explore with a practitioner,  
3 and they were not participating to gain course credit. Previous research has shown the screening  
4 process ensures that meaningful discussions occur between practitioners and clients (Williams &  
5 Hill, 1996).

6 *The TSP-athlete consultations.* Each student athlete met with a TSP on three occasions, at  
7 times and locations of mutual convenience. Participants chose to space the consultations at least  
8 seven days apart, and the dyads took between three and six weeks to complete the planned sessions.  
9 To aid data collection, we filmed the first and third consultations. After starting the video camera,  
10 we left the interview room before the consultations started. Participants stopped the video camera  
11 after they had finished. The recorded consultations lasted 25 to 90 minutes. Times and locations for  
12 further athlete-practitioner consultations were then arranged.

### 13 **Thought-Listing Exercise**

14 After the first and third consultations, the TSPs and the athletes completed the thought-  
15 listing procedures while watching a video recording of the previous athlete-practitioner  
16 consultation. We selected the thought-listing exercise used because previous research has shown  
17 that it provides the best insight into counselling participants' in-session cognitions without  
18 disrupting service-delivery as occurs with think aloud procedures (Borders et al., 1988; Cacioppo et  
19 al., 1997; Dole et al., 1981). Thought-listing involved the recording being paused after each  
20 practitioner-athlete couplet, defined as a practitioner's statement followed by an athlete's response  
21 (Dole et al., 1981). During the pause, participants recorded the in-session internal dialogue they had  
22 experienced at that moment in the consultation. To familiarize participants after the first session, we  
23 reminded them of the purpose of the study. Then we explained the thought-listing activity and for  
24 the first minute of the video, we engaged in interactive training to help the participants become  
25 comfortable with the task. Our instructions focused on asking participants to record whatever  
26 internal dialogue they had had at that moment in the consultation. Participants were free to ask any  
27 questions they wished. To help the participants feel comfortable with the exercise, we told them all

1 responses were acceptable, even if irrelevant to the consultation, and they could record “blank” if  
2 unable to remember what they had been thinking. We did not share participants responses with  
3 other people involved in the study (e.g., we did not share the athletes’ responses with the TSPs).  
4 TSPs may have benefitted from learning about the athletes’ cognitions (see below in the  
5 discussion), but we felt doing so would not mimic naturally occurring practitioner-client  
6 interactions. The thought listing exercise occurred within 24 hours of the athlete-practitioner  
7 session.

### 8 **Data Analysis and Reliability**

9         To start, we transcribed participants’ responses verbatim and identified individual thought-  
10 listing text units (Cacioppo et al., 1997). We categorised the text units according to Dole et al.’s  
11 (1981) classification framework. Using Dole et al.’s (1981) system each text unit is assessed across  
12 six independent dimensions: *time*, *place*, *focus*, *locus*, *orientation*, and *mode*. With the first  
13 dimension, time, text units were assessed according to whether they related to *past* (e.g., “she went  
14 to practice last night”), *present* (e.g., “this session is helping him”), or *future events* (e.g., “I hope  
15 she tries this idea at training”). In the second dimension, place, text units were classified according  
16 to whether they related to events occurring either *in-session* (e.g., “this topic is easy to think about”)  
17 or *out-of-session* (e.g., “my supervisor told me to be more direct”). In the third dimension, focus,  
18 text units were classified according to whether they are about the *client* (e.g., “she is talking a lot  
19 today”), *practitioner* (e.g., “I just made a great suggestion”), or *client/practitioner unit* (e.g., “we  
20 are really in sync today”). With the fourth dimension, locus, text units were categorised as referring  
21 to either *internal* states (e.g., “she is happy”) or *external* events (e.g., “he is smiling”). In the fifth  
22 dimension, orientation, text units were either *related* to therapy (and labelled professional; e.g., “I  
23 need to focus on her story”) or *unrelated* to therapy (and termed personal; e.g., “I forgot to pay the  
24 telephone bill”). In the sixth dimension, mode, text units were classified as *neutral* (e.g., “I am  
25 sitting down”), *positive* (e.g., “I am clever to offer that suggestion”), or *negative* (e.g., “how stupid  
26 am I?”). Dole et al.’s (1981) procedures helped structure the data analysis, not data collection; that  
27 is, we did not share the system with participants. Instead, we allowed participants to report their



1 results for both the first and third consultations in Table 1, with the equivalent athlete data presented  
2 in Table 2.

### 3 **TSPs' Internal Dialogue**

4 *Time.* Just over half of the TSPs' internal dialogue in both consultations was focused on  
5 present events. Examples of present focused internal dialogue included "this is not ground-breaking  
6 stuff. but I think she likes it," "I feel confident talking about this," and "what is her motivation for  
7 playing?" Practitioners focused approximately 30% of their internal dialogue on future events, both  
8 in and after the current consultation. Examples of future oriented internal dialogue included "the  
9 next few sessions will look at strategies relating to concentration and attention," "there will be days  
10 when I'm a sport psych and I feel tired and have to work," and "fuck, here comes the weight issue."  
11 The remaining internal dialogue was focused on past events and examples included "I wonder if she  
12 played to her expectations?" "I remember that cold day and Dad was rubbing my hands," and "oh  
13 that used to happen to me all the time."

14 *Place.* Across both consultations, practitioners focused approximately 80% of their internal  
15 dialogue on in-session material. Examples included "I need further clarification," "I need to  
16 summarise," and "I need to keep up with her story." Practitioners focused approximately 20% of  
17 their internal dialogue on out-of-session material. Examples included "we need to organise times  
18 for the next sessions," "I can't believe I did a presentation on this [topic] a few weeks ago," and  
19 "there is no urgent need to see each other again."

20 *Focus.* Approximately 40% of the practitioner's internal dialogue was about the athlete and  
21 examples included "she's asking me for my opinion," "just let her say what she feels," and "her  
22 body language is still urgent around this." TSPs' focused around 40% of their internal dialogue on  
23 themselves. Examples included "I am feeling more relaxed," "good summary and reflective  
24 listening," and "how do I explain this question?" About 5% of the practitioners' internal dialogue  
25 was about the relationships between themselves and the athletes. Examples included "I hope I  
26 didn't destroy any of the working rapport we had generated," and "have I got a good enough  
27 rapport and background info. to work with him?" Thoughts about supervisors included the

1 following statements: “I will show [my supervisor] that I have decent counselling skills,” and “[My  
2 supervisor] would have put up a huge neon sign here!” The remaining 15% of TSP internal  
3 dialogue was about other topics and examples included “automatic or automated?” “What’s the  
4 time?” And “the old breathing technique – most people don’t breathe properly.”

5 *Locus.* Slightly more than 50% of practitioner internal dialogue was about observable events  
6 and just less than 50% was focused on inferred traits and cognitions. Examples of internal dialogue  
7 about observable events included “I need to not waffle,” and “I am yawning.” Examples of internal  
8 dialogue about inferred traits and cognitions included “I wonder what she thought of that?” “She  
9 likes positive reinforcement,” and “bugger it, she needs to know I understand her sport.”

10 *Orientation.* About 95% of practitioner internal dialogue was professional and relevant to  
11 the consultation. Examples included “let’s give a bit of dramatic self-disclosure,” “I think I am  
12 going overboard on this [topic],” and “that was such an interpretation.” TSPs remaining 5% of  
13 internal dialogue focused on personal issues not relevant to the consultation. An example was “[my  
14 brother] has no clues, probably never will.”

15 *Mode.* About 8% of internal dialogue was positive in tone and about 12% was negative.  
16 Examples of positive statements included “good open question,” “it’s good she disclosed that,” and  
17 “good reflective listening.” Examples of negative statements included “why did I ask ‘how do you  
18 interpret that?’ Stupid question!” “I don’t feel qualified,” and “I am a dickhead!” Approximately  
19 50% of practitioner internal dialogue was neutral in tone, and slightly less than 30% involved  
20 planning statements. Examples of planning statements included “I really need to keep track of the  
21 time,” “I need to give a bit back, so she knows I’m listening,” and “ask her about her week to  
22 develop more rapport.”

### 23 **Athletes’ Internal Dialogue**

24 *Time.* Approximately 60% of athlete internal dialogue across both consultations concerned  
25 currently occurring events. Examples included “she is giving me real direction,” “she may be  
26 getting at something,” and “I like it when she sums things up.” Athletes focused just less than 30%  
27 of internal dialogue on past events and about 13% was about future events. Examples of internal

1 dialogue about past events included “I’ve been [performing] really well lately,” and “have I left out  
2 anything that may be important?” Examples of future oriented internal dialogue included “It will be  
3 good to try some of these things [ideas] out,” “I hope this routine will help,” and “what have I got  
4 coming up in the next few weeks?”

5 *Place.* Approximately 65% of athlete internal dialogue focused on in-session content,  
6 whereas about 35% was about out-of-session material. Examples of in-session focused internal  
7 dialogue included “she is going to have a preconceived idea that I’m really good,” “I can’t really  
8 think of anything else to say,” and “do I sound like a spoiled brat who gets upset when things don’t  
9 go their way?” Out-of-session internal dialogue examples included “I’ve tried basketball, and I  
10 know I’m crap,” “I remember how it felt when I became unfit,” and “[player’s name] is a good  
11 person to have on the team.”

12 *Focus.* Just less than 50% of the athletes’ internal dialogue was about themselves and  
13 examples included “I always am pretty self-critical,” “I can’t believe how much I couldn’t be  
14 bothered playing,” and “I felt a bit rushed.” Athletes focused just less than 30% of their internal  
15 dialogue on the practitioner. Examples of internal dialogue about the TSPs included “she’s made a  
16 good point,” “I like her comment of making ‘clear-cut’ assertive comments,” and “what she’s  
17 saying makes sense.” About 7% of athlete internal dialogue was oriented towards the relationships  
18 they had with practitioners, and examples included “I feel very comfortable talking to  
19 [practitioner],” and “[it’s] amazing how easy it is to tell her this.” Two athletes thought about their  
20 coaches during their second consultations. One athlete had one internal dialogue statement about  
21 her coach and thought, “[my coach] would like that.” The other athlete thought, “not too many  
22 coaches have done a good job as far as I am concerned,” “the coach will kill me and give me a hard  
23 time,” and “the coach was really a pain in the arse.” Approximately 15% of the athlete internal  
24 dialogue was about other topics. Examples included “work keeps getting more and more,” “that was  
25 a good game,” and “sport is great!”

26 *Locus.* About 50% of athlete internal dialogue referred to observable events, whereas 50%  
27 was about inferred traits and cognitions. Examples of internal dialogue about observable events

1 included “this session has been very long,” and “hasn’t she asked me that before?” Examples of  
2 internal dialogue about inferred traits and cognitions included “some of my team mates probably  
3 never understood the word team,” “why do I actually play my sport?” And “[I] have not really  
4 thought about that yet!”

5 *Orientation.* About 95% of athletes’ internal dialogue was professional and relevant to the  
6 consultations. Examples included “this [session] has been really helpful,” “she’s doing so well to  
7 remember things about [my sport],” and “I hope I’m doing this right [a relaxation exercise].” Less  
8 than 5% of athlete internal dialogue was about personal issues that seemed irrelevant to the  
9 consultations. Examples included “I have to pick up mum,” and “there is so much I have to do  
10 tonight.”

11 *Mode.* Slightly more than 20% of athlete internal dialogue was positive in tone, whereas  
12 slightly less than 10% was negative. Examples of internal dialogue statements that were positive in  
13 tone included “that was a really good technique,” “wow, that was unreal, I can really feel and see  
14 it,” and “she is caring about what I am saying.” Examples of internal dialogue statements that were  
15 negative in tone included “now that I’m thinking about it, the apprehension is worrying me,” and “I  
16 am really nervous about my knee next Saturday,” Approximately 65% of athlete internal dialogue  
17 was neutral in tone and less than 5% involved planning statements. Examples of planning  
18 statements included “let’s get started,” and “keep this answer short.”

## 19 **Discussion**

20 In the current study, TSPs’ retrospective accounts provided evidence that their in-session  
21 internal dialogue statements were generally (a) present focused, (b) about in-session material, (c)  
22 about the athletes or themselves, (d) about both internal and external events, (e) professional (i.e.,  
23 related to the session), and (f) either neutral or planning statements. The athlete’s retrospective  
24 accounts indicated their internal dialogue statements were generally (a) present focused; (b) about  
25 in-session material; (c) about themselves, and to a lesser extent the practitioners; (d) about both  
26 internal and external events; (e) professional (i.e., related to the session); and (f) neutral. These  
27 results provide a novel description of the internal dialogue that trainees and athletes experience

1 when collaborating.

2           The finding that TSPs' retrospective internal dialogue was neutral in emotional tone,  
3 focused on present, professional, and in-session material, and contained planning statements is  
4 consistent with results of previous research (see Nutt-Williams, 2008 for a review of the research).  
5 Perhaps when TSPs' focus their internal dialogue on present in-session material, clients, and  
6 service-delivery processes it reflects that they are listening to athletes' stories. The findings that  
7 athlete's internal dialogue was professional, present-oriented, and in-session focused reveals that  
8 they may have found the consultations engaging.

9           It is understandable that the TSPs thought about the athletes during the consultations.  
10 Helping athletes with their issues was the primary purpose of the consultations. The TSPs also  
11 thought more frequently about themselves than experienced therapists examined in previous studies  
12 (e.g., Oddli & Halvorsen, 2014), and this difference might be expected. TSPs have previously  
13 described a change from attending to their own in-session internal dialogue to including the  
14 experiences of clients in service-delivery owing to reflection and experience (McEwan & Tod,  
15 2023).

16           The percentages of internal dialogue focused on external and internal events were different  
17 from those of some previous studies (e.g., Borders, 1989; Borders et al., 1988). The TSPs in the  
18 current study thought about external and internal events with similar frequencies. Trainee  
19 counsellors in some previous studies have focused more on internal events (e.g., Borders, 1989).  
20 The topics that practitioners and athletes discuss may influence TSPs' internal dialogue (whether  
21 positive or negative). The focus on sport in the trainee practitioner-athlete consultations may have  
22 increased the frequencies that the TSPs thought about external behaviours and events, such as  
23 performance. Researchers could further explore the factors that influence in-session internal  
24 dialogue.

25           The variations in TSPs' internal dialogue frequencies were similar with those in previous  
26 investigations (e.g., Borders, 1991). The measures used in the present and existing studies provide  
27 evidence that participants varied in their internal dialogue. In this study, the trainee practitioners'

1 internal dialogue findings might have been understandable given their counselling backgrounds. For  
2 example, TSPs with the highest frequencies of negative internal dialogue also had little counselling  
3 experience compared with some peers in the sample. Much of their negative internal dialogue was  
4 self-focussed, and examples included “I’m struggling here,” “I am a dickhead,” and “I don’t feel  
5 qualified.” Researchers have also found that neophyte practitioners often doubt their counselling  
6 abilities and feel inadequate when initially interacting with clients (e.g., Owton et al., 2014;  
7 Rønnestad & Skovholt, 2012).

8         The TSPs with the highest levels of negative internal dialogue commented on being anxious  
9 about their client interactions. For example, one participant with one of the highest levels of  
10 negative internal dialogue in the third consultation said,

11         I probably felt more nervous in this last session than any of them [the previous  
12 consultations], performance anxiety. I suppose because I felt like I was on camera, I had to  
13 show some significant progress today, that we had worked on something really great that  
14 had come off. She had to go away with something. That’s just my own stupid expectations  
15 on myself.

16 A relationship could exist between TSPs’ negative internal dialogue and their anxieties; it was not  
17 our intention to investigate any relationships between internal dialogue and practitioner anxiety.  
18 Researchers could complement in-session internal dialogue data by collecting information about  
19 participants’ perceptions of their internal dialogue.

20         On most of the dimensions in the Dole et al (1981) scoring system, the TSPs’ retrospective  
21 internal dialogue accounts were like those of trainee counselling psychologists (e.g., Borders,  
22 1991). In addition, other in-session internal dialogue findings from psychotherapy research also  
23 have parallels with sport psychology. For example, TSPs’ in-session internal dialogue reflects  
24 findings such as service-delivery experience, perceived helpfulness, perceived counselling  
25 performance, and ego development that have emerged from counselling psychology research (Nutt  
26 Williams, 2008; Nutt Williams & Fauth, 2005). There is scope for researchers to examine the extent  
27 that psychotherapy in-session internal dialogue findings apply to sport and exercise psychology.

1           Our findings reflect the dynamic interplay between intuitive spontaneous internal dialogue  
2 and goal-oriented dialogue (Latinjak, 2019). Spontaneous internal dialogue came in the form of  
3 cognitive reactions to the unfolding practitioner-athlete dialogue and was mostly a reflection of  
4 other psychological processes (e.g., processing tasks the person needed to attend to later that day)  
5 (Latinjak et al., 2020). The spontaneous internal dialogue refers to participants' more uncontrolled  
6 thoughts, such as things that come to mind unwillingly (Fritsch et al., 2022). Goal-oriented internal  
7 dialogue was part of the participants self-regulation processes, such as trying to make progress with  
8 the client and involved reasoning and decision-making (Latinjak et al., 2019) (e.g., trainees telling  
9 themselves to summarise, to keep the client on track).

10           The current study extended literature by examining clients' and TSPs' internal dialogue. We  
11 might further extend knowledge about what occurs during TSPs' athlete consultations by drawing  
12 on relevant counselling psychology literature. For example, Williams (Nutt Williams, 2008;  
13 Williams, 2020) has broadened her research on internal dialogue by advocating for more process  
14 research examining areas such as practitioners' self-awareness and reaction management strategies.  
15 Findings have provided evidence that trainee counsellors experience a range of emotions and  
16 critical internal dialogue during client interactions, some of which interfere with their service-  
17 delivery abilities (e.g., McEwan & Tod, 2023). Adopting a client focus, self-coaching and self-  
18 disclosure, and suppressing their feelings are strategies neophyte practitioners use to manage their  
19 personal reactions (Nutt Williams, 2008). TSPs might learn about ways to manage their emotions,  
20 internal dialogue, and personal reactions by reading Williams' work (e.g., Morgan & Nutt  
21 Williams, 2021). In addition, research, which examines TSPs' experiences and self-management  
22 strategies, might yield ways that Williams' work is applicable to sport and exercise psychology  
23 service-delivery.

24           Some issues regarding the scope of the current study's results warrant further consideration.  
25 For example, participants' awareness of partaking in the current study may have influenced their  
26 behaviour, internal dialogue, and emotions during the practitioner-athlete consultations. It is  
27 difficult to conceive of ways to examine in-session internal dialogue without possibly distorting

1 practitioners' and athletes' behaviour, thoughts, and feelings somewhat. In these instances,  
2 reactivity may occur, where participants may modify their behaviour in response to the researchers  
3 asking them to report their internal dialogue (Double & Birney, 2019). Further, with the  
4 interviewer's presence during the thought-listing exercise, participants ironically may have censored  
5 some of their thoughts and self-talk. Participants did not have a dependent relationship with the  
6 interviewer. The interviewer was not one of their lecturers, supervisors, assessors, or classmates.  
7 Instead, participants knew little about the interviewer other than the individual had an interest in  
8 sport psychology and was conducting research in the area. Although difficult to overcome  
9 reactivity, researchers may consider conducting thought-listing exercises over more than one  
10 occasion to help participants become comfortable with the process and experience less reactivity.  
11 Authors make similar recommendations in other verbal reporting methods such as Think Aloud  
12 (TA). TA involves participants verbalising what they are thinking concurrently during a task.  
13 Recent works using TA (e.g., Birch & Whitehead, 2020) could support methods of data collection  
14 and examination of practitioner's in-session internal dialogue. For example, Birch and Whitehead  
15 (2020) emphasise the importance of 'warm up' exercises to ensure that participants are familiar  
16 with verbalising their thoughts aloud.

17 Collecting internal dialogue data retrospectively is another limitation. Some factors could  
18 influence participants' retrospective accounts. First, the reflections participants had between the  
19 athlete-practitioner consultations and the thought-listing exercises may have affected their  
20 responses. It was desirable, but not practical in this instance, to complete the thought-listing  
21 exercises immediately after the practitioner-athlete consultations. Memory decay influences  
22 reporting accuracy of any kind of retrospective reporting (Ericsson & Simon, 1993). The  
23 participants' retrospective accounts may have differed from their actual in-session internal dialogue,  
24 but the degree of distortion is unknown. To progress the current work, researchers could ask  
25 participants to verbalise what they are thinking concurrently (i.e., think aloud) during service-  
26 delivery. Researchers could achieve this by taking advantage of increased online service-delivery  
27 post-pandemic. For example, it may be possible to record practitioner's in-the-moment experiences

1 during online consultations where the practitioner mutes her or himself to record their internal  
2 dialogue. This approach could be examined using timed intervals (e.g., 5 mins) or at more natural  
3 turning and stopping points in the athlete-practitioner exchange. Such a methodological  
4 development would allow for more immediate and potentially more accurate internal dialogue than  
5 the postsession retrospective thought-listing procedure. Furthermore, it would demonstrate how  
6 practitioners typically listen using multiple channels simultaneously to process information such as  
7 client external manifest content and practitioner internal manifest content.

8 Our final consideration related to the scope of the current study's results is the use of  
9 frequencies. Frequencies do not indicate the meaningfulness of internal dialogue (see Krane et al.,  
10 1997). For example, in the current study about 50% of practitioners' and 65% of athletes' internal  
11 dialogue was neutral in emotional tone whereas less than 10% was negative for both groups.  
12 Possibly, however, negative internal dialogue (e.g., "I am a dickhead") had more influence on  
13 participants' emotions than neutral statements (e.g., "we need to organise times for the next  
14 sessions").

### 15 **Future Applied Research**

16 Potentially, thought-listing procedures have several uses for sport psychology professionals  
17 beyond examining internal dialogue and justifies future research. Instead of asking participants to  
18 record their internal dialogue, we could focus on questions about the critical issues they believe  
19 athlete-clients raised. Thought-listing procedures may help investigators study how practitioners of  
20 varying experience levels react to stimuli such as specific athlete behaviours. For example, we  
21 might expand our perspective on practitioner cognition by repeating the thought-listing exercise  
22 with people at divergent phases in their career (e.g., early, middle, late). We might find distinct  
23 types of thoughts along with varied management strategies depending on individual's career phase.

24 As applied sport psychology is a helping process made up of a series of judgements and  
25 decisions (Martindale & Collins, 2013), there is scope to use thought-listing procedures to act as  
26 formal reflection exercises and to develop practitioners' awareness of their thinking, for example in  
27 relation to case conceptualisations and intervention plans. Practitioners may find thought-listing a

1 useful exercise in articulating events in service-delivery to provide perspective (e.g., recording  
2 one's thoughts and listening back) for critical examination purposes. This process could facilitate  
3 the development of individual's case conceptualisation skills. This would encourage practitioners to  
4 reflect on their 'in-action' reflections (Cropley et al., 2023). From an athlete perspective, the use of  
5 thought-listing could develop practitioner's understanding of athlete-clients' experiences of service-  
6 delivery (e.g., Bell et al., 2020). Although we did not share athletes' thoughts with the TSPs,  
7 researchers and supervisors could do so for scientific and educational reasons. For example,  
8 researchers could compare what practitioners thought athletes were thinking with what athletes  
9 reported they were thinking, and such investigations could examine how attuned the two parties are  
10 during service-delivery. During supervision, learning about athletes' cognitions during service-  
11 delivery may provide opportunities for TSPs to develop their ability to empathize and help clients.

12         There is potential to support sport psychology educational processes through thought-listing  
13 procedures and provide scope for educational research. For example, some supervisors and  
14 supervisees may watch recordings of trainees' athlete consultations during supervision sessions  
15 (e.g., Hutter et al., 2017). Studies on the use of thought-listing procedures during sport psychology  
16 supervision may provide information that helps professionals learn ways to make optimal use of the  
17 method. Qualitative case studies can document supervisees' and supervisors' experiences and  
18 functions of thought-listing procedures. In longitudinal studies, investigators could examine the  
19 types of influences thought-listing have on subsequent practitioner behaviour.

20

21

1 Table 1  
 2 *TSPs' Internal Dialogue in the First and Third Consultations (Expressed as Percentages)*

Internal dialogue dimension	First consultation		Third consultation	
	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Time				
Past	14.9	10.3 - 18.3	18.7	10.0 - 29.4
Present	51.8	44.7 - 59.2	54.1	46.8 - 63.0
Future	33.3	23.2 - 44.7	27.3	21.2 - 31.3
Place				
In-session	79.7	53.9 - 95.0	81.2	61.7 - 93.3
Out-session	20.3	5.0 - 46.2	18.8	6.7 - 38.3
Focus				
Athlete	38.2	23.7 - 60.0	46.1	23.5 - 74.3
Practitioner	38.8	25.0 - 55.2	35.3	8.6 - 58.8
Relationship	6.3	0 - 12.9	4.4	0 - 8.3
Supervisor	0.3	0 - 1.6	0.0	0 - 0
Other	16.5	10.0 - 25.6	14.2	7.3 - 21.3
Locus				
External	53.9	40 - 63.2	51.0	37.1 - 63.5
Internal	46.1	36.8 - 60.0	49.0	36.5 - 63.0
Orientation				
Professional	93.8	79.5 - 97.5	95.9	87.2 - 100.0
Personal	6.2	2.5 - 20.5	4.1	0 - 12.8
Mode				
Neutral	47.0	32.8 - 60.8	54.6	40.8 - 62.9
Planning	34.7	20.8 - 44.7	23.4	12.9 - 29.3
Positive	5.5	0 - 10.4	9.9	0 - 22.4
Negative	12.2	5.3 - 19.5	12.5	8.6 - 17.6

3

4

5

1 Table 2  
 2 *Athletes' Internal dialogue in the First and Third Consultations (Expressed as Percentages)*

Internal dialogue dimension	First consultation		Third consultation	
	Mean	Range	Mean	Range
Time				
Past	29.0	21.2 - 38.2	26.36	5.6 - 37.3
Present	58.2	46.7 - 68.8	60.6	34.9 - 88.8
Future	12.7	5.0 - 26.7	13.1	5.6 - 32.6
Place				
In-session	71.2	25.8 - 93.3	58.4	20.9 - 91.7
Out-session	28.9	6.7 - 74.2	41.9	8.3 - 79.1
Focus				
Athlete	52.4	40.0 - 80.9	45.7	19.4 - 60.5
Practitioner	27.0	7.9 - 43.8	29.5	2.3 - 63.9
	9.5	0 - 26.7	6.0	2.8 - 14.0
Relationship				
Coach	0.0	0 - 0	1.3	0 - 5.1
Other	11.1	0 - 28.6	18.1	11.1 - 30.4
Locus				
External	50.0	35.0 - 61.7	49.0	37.0 - 59.3
Internal	50.0	38.3 - 65.0	51.0	40.7 - 63.0
Orientation	98.0	93.6 - 100.0	95.7	85.7 - 100.0
Professional				
Personal	2.0	0 - 6.4	4.3	0 - 14.3
Mode				
Neutral	65.0	60.0 - 66.7	66.0	60.6 - 71.2
Planning	4.1	0 - 13.3	3.3	0 - 7.4
Positive	20.4	7.9 - 27.5	21.9	8.9 - 34.4
Negative	10.1	0 - 21.35	8.8	0 - 17.7

3

4

5

6

7

**References**

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Aitchison, C., Turner, L. A., Ansley, L., Thompson, K. G., Micklewright, D., & Gibson, A. S. C.  
5 (2013). Internal dialogue and its relationship to perceived exertion during different running  
6 intensities. *Perceptual and motor skills*, 117(1), 11-30.  
7 <https://doi.org/10.2466/06.30.PMS.117x11z3>
- 8 Atkinson, H. L., & Nixon-Cave, K. (2011). A tool for clinical reasoning and reflection using the  
9 international classification of functioning, disability and health (ICF) framework and patient  
10 management model. *Physical Therapy*, 91(3), 416-430.  
11 <https://doi.org/10.2522/ptj.20090226>
- 12 Australian Psychological Society. (2022). *Study pathways*. Available at:  
13 <https://psychology.org.au/training-and-careers/careers-and-studying-psychology/studying->  
14 [psychology/study-pathways](https://psychology.org.au/training-and-careers/careers-and-studying-psychology/studying-psychology/study-pathways). Retrieved 20/06/2022.
- 15 Banning, M. (2008). A review of clinical decision making: Models and current research. *Journal of*  
16 *Clinical Nursing*, 17, 187-195. DOI: 0.1111/j.1365-2702.2006.01791.x
- 17 Basch, M. F. (1980). *Doing Psychotherapy*, Basic Books, New York.
- 18 Bell, A. F., Knight, C. J., Lovett, V. E., & Shearer, C. (2020). Understanding elite youth athletes'  
19 knowledge and perceptions of sport psychology. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 1-23.  
20 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2020.1719556>
- 21 Birch, P. D., & Whitehead, A. E. (2020). Investigating the comparative suitability of traditional and  
22 task-specific think aloud training. *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, 127(1), 202–224.  
23 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0031512519882274>
- 24 Borders, L. D. (1989). Developmental cognitions of first practicum supervisees. *Journal of*  
25 *Counseling Psychology*, 36, 163-169. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.36.2.163>
- 26 Borders, L. D., Fong-Beyette, M. L., & Cron, E. A. (1988). In-session cognitions of a counseling  
27 student: A case study. *Counselor Education & Supervision*, 28, 59-70.  
28 <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.1988.tb00788.x>

- 1 Borders, L. D. (1991). Developmental Changes During Their Supervisees' First Practicum. *The*  
2 *Clinical Supervisor*, 8(2), 157-167. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J001v08n02\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1300/J001v08n02_12)
- 3 Cacioppo, J., von Hippel, W., & Ernst, J. (1997). Mapping cognitive structures and processes  
4 through verbal content: The thought-listing technique. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical*  
5 *Psychology*, 65(6), 928-940. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.65.6.928>
- 6 Cropley, B., Knowles, Z., Miles, A., & Huntley, E. (Eds.). (2023). *Reflective Practice in the Sport*  
7 *and Exercise Sciences: Critical Perspectives, Pedagogy, and Applied Case Studies*. Taylor  
8 & Francis.
- 9 Dole, A. A., DiTomasso, R. A., Johnson, M., Sachs, R., Young, J., Learner, J., Maurer, L., Weiner,  
10 W., Dyke, B., Celebre, J., Eichel, S. D., Gilbert, S., Gorko, S., Hall-Apicella, V., Jannell, E.,  
11 Jones, M., Knight, B., Kurlansik, S., Lipetz, J., Marsh, M., Mikols, P., & Slavin, C. (1981).  
12 *Six dimensions of retrospections by therapists and counselors-- A manual for research*.  
13 University of Pennsylvania
- 14 Double, K.S., & Birney, D.P. (2019). Reactivity to Measures of Metacognition. *Frontiers in*  
15 *Psychology*, 10 (2755). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02755>
- 16 Ericsson, K. A., & Simon, H. A. (1993). *Protocol analysis: Verbal reports as data (revised edition)*.  
17 The MIT Press.
- 18 Egan, G., & Reese, R. J. (2021). *The skilled helper*. Cengage.
- 19 Elder-Vass, D. (2012). *The reality of social construction*. Cambridge University Press.
- 20 Eubank, M., Morris, R., & Cunliffe, M. (2020). Cognitive therapy approaches. In D. Tod & M.  
21 Eubank (Eds.), *Applied Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology* (pp. 53-69).  
22 Routledge.
- 23 Fritsch, J., Feil, K., Jekauc, D., Latinjak, A. T., & Hatzigeorgiadis, A. (2022). The relationship  
24 between self-talk and affective processes in sports: a scoping review. *International Review*  
25 *of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 1-34. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1750984X.2021.2021543>
- 26

- 1 Hutter, R. I., Oldenhof-Veldman, T., Pijpers, J. R., & Oudejans, R. R. D. (2017). Professional  
2 development in sport psychology: Relating learning experiences to learning outcomes.  
3 *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 29(1), 1-16.  
4 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2016.1183152>
- 5 Krane, V., Andersen, M. B., & Streat, W. B. (1997). Issues of qualitative research methods and  
6 presentation. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 19(2), 213-  
7 218. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsep.19.2.213>
- 8 Latinjak, A. T., Hatzigeorgiadis, A., Comoutos, N., & Hardy, J. (2019). Speaking clearly . . . 10  
9 years on: The case for an integrative perspective of self-talk in sport. *Sport, Exercise, and*  
10 *Performance Psychology*, 8(4), 353–367. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000160>
- 11 Latinjak, A. T., Masó, M., Calmeiro, L., & Hatzigeorgiadis, A. (2020). Athletes' use of goal-  
12 directed self-talk: Situational determinants and functions. *International Journal of Sport and*  
13 *Exercise Psychology*, 18(6), 733-748. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2019.1611899>
- 14 Martindale, A., & Collins, D. (2013). The development of professional judgment and decision  
15 making expertise in applied sport psychology. *The Sport Psychologist*, 27(4), 390-398.  
16 <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.27.4.390>
- 17 MacPhail, C., Khoza, N., Abler, L., & Ranganathan, M. (2016). Process guidelines for  
18 establishing Inter-coder Reliability in qualitative studies. *Qualitative Research*, 16,  
19 198–212. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794115577012>.
- 20 McEwan, H. E., & Tod, D. (2023). Trainee clinical, and sport and exercise psychologists'  
21 experiences of professional development: A longitudinal study. *Psychology of Sport and*  
22 *Exercise*, 64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2022.102343>
- 23 Morgan, E., & Nutt Williams, E. (2021). A qualitative study of psychotherapists' in-session tears.  
24 *Psychotherapy*, 58(1), 150-159. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pst0000298>
- 25 Nutt Williams, E. (2008). A psychotherapy researcher's perspective on therapist self-awareness and  
26 self-focused attention after a decade of research. *Psychotherapy Research*, 18(2), 139-146.  
27 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10503300701691656>

- 1 Nutt Williams, E., & Fauth, J. (2005). A psychotherapy process study of therapist in session self-  
2 awareness. *Psychotherapy Research*, *15*(4), 374-381.  
3 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10503300500091355>
- 4 Oddli, H. W., & Halvorsen, M. S. (2014). Experienced psychotherapists' reports of their  
5 assessments, predictions, and decision making in the early phase of psychotherapy.  
6 *Psychotherapy*, *51*(2), 295-307. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029843>
- 7 Owton, H., Bond, K., & Tod, D. (2014). "It's my dream to work with Olympic athletes": Neophyte  
8 sport psychologists' expectations and initial experiences regarding service delivery. *Journal*  
9 *of Applied Sport Psychology*, *26*(3), 241-255. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2013.847509>
- 10 Poczwardowski, A. (2017). Deconstructing sport and performance psychology consultant: Expert,  
11 person, performer, and self-regulator. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise*  
12 *Psychology*, *1*, 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2017.1390484>
- 13 Rønnestad, M. H., & Skovholt, T. M. (2012). *The developing practitioner: Growth and stagnation*  
14 *of therapists and counselors*. Routledge.
- 15 Ronkainen, N. J., & Wiltshire, G. (2021). Rethinking validity in qualitative sport and exercise  
16 psychology research: A realist perspective. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise*  
17 *Psychology*, *19*(1), 13-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2019.1637363>
- 18 Schon, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action* (p. 1983). New  
19 York: Basic Books.
- 20 Tod, D., Hutter, R. I., & Eubank, M. (2017). Professional development for sport psychology  
21 practice. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *16*, 134-137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/2017.05.007>
- 22 Van Raalte, J. L., & Vincent, A. (2017). Self-talk in sport and performance. In: *Oxford Research*  
23 *Encyclopaedia, Psychology*. Available:  
24 [https://oxfordre.com/psychology/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190236557.001.0001/acrefore-](https://oxfordre.com/psychology/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190236557.001.0001/acrefore-9780190236557-e-157)  
25 [9780190236557-e-157](https://oxfordre.com/psychology/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190236557.001.0001/acrefore-9780190236557-e-157)
- 26 Whitehead, A. E., Jones, H. S., Williams, E. L., Rowley, C., Quayle, L., Marchant, D. C., &  
27 Polman, R. C. (2018). Investigating the relationship between cognitions, pacing strategies

- 1           and performance in 16.1 km cycling time trials using a think aloud protocol. *Psychology of*  
2           *Sport and Exercise*, 34, 95–109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.10.001>
- 3 Williams, E. N. (2020). Putting psychotherapy outcomes in context: The need for more exploratory  
4           and process research. *Journal of Psychotherapy Integration*, 30(4), 528-534.  
5           <https://doi.org/10.1037/int0000237>
- 6 Yalom, I. D. (1989). *Love's executioner and other tales of psychotherapy*. Penguin.