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Abstract

Sports coaching has struggled to gain credibility as a profession. It has previously been described as a pseudo profession, though in recent years there have been a number of attempts to rectify this view in order to formally recognize coaching as a profession. Most literature on the professions focuses on the more established professions, with very little research undertaken into the professional development of football (soccer) coaches. The research undertaken examined the ways in which Scottish football coaches learnt their ‘trade’ once they had achieved their initial certification – in other words, how they became socialised into the profession of football coach in Scotland. In order to achieve this aim a number of different samples were examined. First, a sample of aspiring, young professional players were examined, followed by a sample of full time young professionals. Further, two samples of coaches undertaking their initial accreditation courses (SFA UEFA ‘B’ Licence and SFA UEFA ‘A’ License - this latter award being essential to become a full time professional football coach in Scotland). Finally, a sample of senior coaches (those that had been practicing for at least five years) was examined. The methodology of choice was that of Personal Construct Psychology (PCP) which enabled an idiographic analysis of each coach to be carried out. Using the Repertory Grid (Repgrid) technique all samples, which were exclusively male, completed a grid and the group of senior coaches also had their grid data further analysed using the ‘Laddering’ approach, which enabled a more detailed set of core constructs to be derived. In addition, the development of the ‘Snake’ interview approach, enabled a more detailed examination of senior, elite coaches’ development. This format enabled the senior coaches to describe perceived critical incidents that had occurred in their professional lives and discussed what meaning such incidents had in their professional development. Results indicated that there was a mismatch between what young professional players thought that coaches should do and what coaches actually did in their daily practice. Further, differences in constructs between “B” level, coaches and “A” level coaches and senior coaches were clearly definable. There was little evidence to support idealistic notions of what should happen in learning situations with senior professional coaches and reasons for such were discussed. It was argued that much more attention should be paid by the National Governing Body, the
Scottish Football Association (SFA), to ensure that courses should be better structured to be more relevant to neophyte coaches in their initial learning. Thus, once these coaches become formally qualified (certificated) more precise mechanisms, in terms of realistic Continuing Professional Development (CPD) programmes, mentoring of coaches at all levels and the establishment and encouragement of ongoing and accepted communities of practice, coaches will benefit and develop as professionals from such continuous life-long learning opportunities.
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Chapter 1 - Personal Construct Theory

Introduction
This chapter will introduce the work of George Kelly, examine his Personal Construct Theory (PCT), discuss how extensively his approach has been used and examine two particular ways that have evolved from his approach - Laddering (Hinkle, 1965) and Snake Interviews (Pope & Denicolo, 2001).

Kelly’s Personal Construct Psychology
Kelly’s Personal Construct Psychology (PCP), often referred to as Personal Construct Theory (PCT), formed the very basis of the approach taken in this study. George Alexander Kelly was the originator of the theory that became known as Personal Construct Theory with the publication of his magnum opus, The Psychology of Personal Constructs (1955). Fransella and Neimeyer (2005) cite a comment from Jerome Bruner (1956) in which he states (when referring to Kelly’s work):

“These excellent, original and infuriatingly prolix two volumes easily nominate themselves for the distinction of being the single greatest contribution of the past decade to the theory of personality functioning” (p. 355).

However, Kelly’s approach was more than just another “theory of personality”. Born in Kansas in 1905 he hardly received any formal education in the first 12 years of his life though later studied physics and mathematics and gained a B Ed degree from the University of Edinburgh in 1930, a Masters degree then eventually a PhD on the common factors of reading and speech disabilities in 1931.

Faced with the existing human suffering largely brought on by the economic hardship of the time, Kelly moved away from his earlier interest in physiological psychology and concentrated on the psychological diagnosis and remedial services to children in the hard pressed country areas of western Kansas. He began to develop his theory of psychological change which resulted in personal construct theory in which his philosophy of constructive alternativism and the basics of fixed role therapy eventually lead to personal construct theory. Rejecting Freud’s view of interpreting an individual’s experiences in favour of concentrating on what the individual client experienced, as being the central issue he began to focus on the meaning individuals ascribed to their own lives.
Kelly was vehemently opposed to the ruling psychological fashion of the day – behaviourism – as well as the psychodynamic approach, as he believed that both approaches denied individuals the ‘right to be in charge of their own life’. He thought that behaviourism made a person the passive respondent to environmental events, something Bannister (1966) agreed with when describing it as ‘a ping pong ball with a memory’. Other major influences on Kelly’s development were John Dewey, a variety of phenomenologists as well as his own studies in physics and mathematics. Clearly his religious upbringing and early work with desperately poor communities in 1930’s USA honed his overall approach too.

One useful way of explaining Kelly’s approach is to follow the example given by Dalton and Dunnett (1992) when they distinguish between three major aspects of Kelly’s approach – basic philosophy, the man (person)-the-scientist metaphor and the notion of reflexivity.

**Philosophy**

Kelly makes explicit his philosophy from the outset of his writings and defines his philosophy as one of ‘constructive alternativism’. Essentially this means that a person always tries to make sense of the real world though, in reality, only constructs his/her own version of it. A vast range of alternative ways of understanding/making sense of any one event is possible though the one that the individual comes up with is real for him/her. This is summed up in Kelly’s oft quoted paragraph:

“We tend to stand where there are always some alternative constructions available to choose in dealing with the world. No one needs to paint himself (sic) into a corner; no one needs to be completely hemmed in by circumstances; no one needs to be a victim of his (sic) own biography. We call this philosophical position constructive alternativism” (cited in Dalton & Dunnett, 1992, p. 6).

Butt and Burr (2004) state that “It is from this basic tenet (constructive alternativism) that all PCP flows” (p. 11). This fundamental principle states that situations, events, relationships etc. do not come to us with ready-made, convenient, labels but rather we impose our own interpretation (constructions) so that what we perceive around us has some form of order and pattern. “Essentially we have one perspective among an infinite number of possible alternative explanations or
Further, Butt and Burr (2004), in discussing the issue of fact or fiction, suggest that things do not have irrevocable meaning but rather have an infinite variety of meanings or constructions which may be attached to them. This is what Kelly calls “constructive alternativism” and enables us to understand how individuals try to understand the thoughts, feelings and actions that they undertake.

There are a vast range of examples of how different concepts can have different interpretations – e.g., a holiday for one person might be travelling abroad for another it may simply be the absence of being at work. In Kellyan terms there are no right nor wrong answers to questions merely the way in which an individual decides to interpret his or her own response. Butt and Burr (2004) believed that constructions should not be judged in terms of their truth or correctness, but only in terms of their usefulness to the individual.

Kelly makes the important distinction between concepts and constructs. Concepts are indeed derived from logic and are “a kind of category into which things are (metaphorically) put, on the basis of some common factor or classification system. Vegetable, furniture, science and psychology are concepts and we use them in our day-to-day lives” (Butt & Burr, 2004, p. 14). The use of concepts becomes part of our mental processes. A construction on the other hand, is different in that it is a process, it is something that we actually do. Construing is how we use concepts which help us make sense of everyday situations. Importantly, constructs are always bipolar as it would not make sense to question a concept such as teacher if we were not able to discriminate what it would be not to be a teacher. It is our ability to understand a concept of teacher in a wider, social, context that gives meaning to our construct of teacher.

Kelly’s PCT differed markedly from other psychological approaches (such as Freudian and trait theories). Basically Kelly rejected the notion of deterministic views which emphasised the importance of genetic endowment. Kelly did not see people as subject to universal psychological laws which the behaviourist tried to impose by emphasising the environmental overriding nature of the influence of environments so that people would be seen as functionally equivalent in reacting in the same way to similar environmental stimuli. Rather, Kelly saw people in a constant state of psychological motion, perpetually in the process of construing and acting upon their
world. Thus, Kelly’s view of individuals was characterised as dynamic rather than static.

**Man (Person) - the - Scientist Metaphor**

In order to elaborate on his philosophical position Kelly used the metaphor of ‘man (person)-the-scientist’. By this he meant that individuals acted essentially like scientists in making theories about the real world. Once these theories had been formulated, and predictions made, people proceeded on the basis of these and discovered through experimentation whether or not these worked in the real world. If they did not they were re-evaluated, altered and consequently reorganised. People are shaped by experience, providing the framework for future actions. Kelly firmly believed that if people were to change then they must come to an understanding of the constructions they are placing on the world and when dealing with others – such as a coach, teacher or therapist for example, an attempt to appreciate other people’s construction systems is equally essential.

**Reflexivity**

Importantly Kelly stressed that the metaphor applied to everyone. The processes that govern our lives psychologically are governed by the same set of rules, though clearly everyone has their own, unique set of circumstances. This process was called ‘reflexivity’. This implies that there is a straightforward and somewhat simple way of how we can understand how individuals operate, psychologically, be that in an effective manner or when individuals make errors. Consequently, PCT provides people with a system of normal functioning and also helps them become aware of what might happen when this system breaks down. Such an awareness can therefore be helpful in restoring a person’s ‘operating system’ to ‘normal functioning’.

Fransella (2003) believes it is this particular feature of the theory which distinguishes it most sharply from traditional psychological viewpoints. It is also the aspect of the theory that has received the least attention and analysis and she believes that this might be because it “…is an embarrassment in conventional psychological discourse. Reflexivity demands that a theory accounts for its own construction. Psychologizing (sic) in all its forms, inventing personal construct theory or proposing any other psychological theory is a human act, a piece of human behaviour”
(Fransella, 2003, p. 35). Reflexivity therefore becomes the actual bedrock of personal construct theory and any use of its approach, in all its details therefore means that the practitioner or theorist must accept that the principles proposed are as applicable to him/herself as they are to the participants in any study or practice and in general too. Thus Kelly was intent on developing a theory of experience and not just behaviour.

The Theory

The theory of personal constructs is comprised of a fundamental postulate and eleven corollaries that expand upon this position. The fundamental postulate states that:

“A person’s processes are psychologically channelized by the way in which he (sic) anticipates events.” (Kelly, G. 1955, p. 46). Kelly explains this by stating that the “person” is the very focus of the theory as a whole. It sees the individual in a complete, holistic way. By ‘processes’ Kelly meant that the person was in a state of continual motion and this is what was being considered. The person was seen as behaving as an organism not just in a temporary state of motion but a form of motion. Further, Kelly (1955) described what he means by ‘psychologically’ by stating “when we use the term psychologically, we mean that we are conceptualising processes in a psychological manner, not that the processes are psychological rather than anything else” (p. 47). Again, Kelly explained what he meant by channelized by stating that these processes worked through a network of pathways which has a clear structure but is also flexible. By ‘anticipates’ Kelly was referring to the predictive and motivational elements of the theory – the network of pathways look to the future so that the person is enabled to anticipate it. He saw this as “the push and pull of the psychology of personal construct psychology” (Kelly, 1955, p. 49). The final word of importance in his fundamental postulate, ‘events’, implied that a person was trying to anticipate real events – anticipation being carried out not just for its own sake but so that the future reality may be better represented.

The Corollaries

A corollary is essentially a statement which follows on from one already made as an immediate deduction, inference or consequence. Together with the fundamental
postulate the corollaries provide a framework upon which the entire theory rests. Kelly set out 11 separate corollaries as follows:

- **Construction.** ‘A person anticipates their events by construing their replications’. This corollary emphasises the point that anticipation is the major motivation underlying a person’s processes. It introduces the notion of ‘construing’ which in Kellyan terms means ‘placing an interpretation upon’ and often is used interchangeably with perceiving in its widest sense. In order to make sense of an event a person attempts to construe it, erecting a structure which has meaning for the individual. When presented with a series of elements (these could be people, situations etc.), an individual looks to see what aspects are similar to each other and different from others. Constructs are therefore a means of discriminating between such events or objects and each construct created is bipolar – this usually is stated as having both an ‘emergent’ and an ‘implicit’ pole. Quite clearly one could not make sense of something that was seen as ‘black’ without having something to contrast it with, that was, therefore, not black. Importantly, constructs are personal creations of the individual and are what they decide rather than what is seen as correct or incorrect.

- **Individuality** ‘Persons differ from each other in their construction of events’. Though individuals may have similar constructions with others these are never identical events. Constructive alternativism states that there is an infinity of different ways of construing an event. Because individuals have their own unique construction systems, so they may also anticipate the same events differently. Two people watching the same film may have quite distinctive ways of actually construing the film in terms of their perceptions, values etc. It is crucial then that when one individual tries to understand someone else they need to try to make sense of the other person’s constructions.

- **Organisation** ‘Each person characteristically evolves, for his/her convenience in anticipating events, a construction system embracing ordinal relationships between constructs’. People do not just differ in the way that they construct events they also differ in the way that these events are organised. Constructs become the basic building blocks for this organisation or structure. Many writers (Hinkle, 1965; Dalton & Dunnett, 1992; Fransella, 2003) have used the example of scaffolding when explaining this corollary and constructs thus are seen as existing in some form of ordinal relationship. Dalton and Dunnett (1992) believe that constructs
at the bottom of this structure are normally seen as more concrete while those at the top usually are more abstract. Abstract constructs thus are said to subsume lower order (i.e., more concrete) ones and are therefore superordinate to them in this hierarchical system. Finally, it is important to point out that this construction system is not a finished, completed static one. It is continuously changing and being developed by the person who has created it.

• **Dichotomy** ‘A person’s construct system is composed of a finite number of dichotomous constructs’. This corollary merely emphasises that all constructs have two poles – emergent and implicit (often called a ‘contrast’, though not implying directly an opposite) and are thus, dichotomous. This similarity and dissimilarity has to be regarded in relation to the same aspect that is being viewed. Distinguishing between three apples as two being green while the third was savoury would not make sense. Constructs have two poles and the discriminating feature has to be applied to the element upon which it is brought to bear. Also any construct system has a finite number of constructs, though an individual’s ability to change these constructs is infinite.

• **Choice** ‘A person chooses for him/herself that alternative in a dichotomised construct which he/she anticipates the greater possibility for extension and definition of her/his system’. When making a decision in relation to any element regarding a construct a person must choose that pole of the construct that is most appropriate. A person must have some reason for making a choice and it usually means that the choice is made on the basis of providing the greatest possibility of extension or elaboration of the construct system. Kelly used the term ‘elaborative choice’ and implies that one’s construct system can be confirmed, developed or redefined in an ongoing way.

• **Range** ‘A construct is convenient for the anticipation for a finite range of events only’. A person’s construct system does not have universal utility and each one has what is known as a ‘range of convenience’, which simply means that any construct system only applies to a specific group of elements. Using the construct ‘strong/weak’ when considering the arrival of a train would probably not be useful while such constructs as ‘on time/late’ or ‘empty/full’ would be more appropriate. Trying to apply constructs outside a range of convenience therefore would lessen the possibility of prediction or anticipation.
• **Experience** ‘A person’s construct system varies as she/he successfully construes the replications of events’. Construct systems are perpetually in motion as individuals constantly check out their predictions, even microscopically and use the results of these little ‘experiments’ to alter and change their construct system. Fransella (2003) states that “the amount of a man’s experience is not measured by a number of events with which he collides, but by the investments he has made in his anticipations and revisions in his constructions that he had in facing up to consequences” (p. 12).

• **Modulation** (Permeability) ‘The variation in a person’s construct system is limited by the permeability of the constructs within whose range of convenience the variants lie’. This corollary, together with the experience corollary, focuses on how a person goes about altering his/her construct system. Kelly (1955) explained that a person’s construct system has to be open to new elements which have not yet been construed. Such a notion of permeability implies a capacity to be used ‘as a referent for novel events’ which can lead to the acceptance of new subordinate constructions within its range of convenience.

• **Fragmentation** ‘A person might successfully employ a variety of construction sub-systems which are inferentially incompatible with each other’. It is possible for different construct subsystems to exist at the same time and be used at different times without necessitating the change of system itself and without being necessarily incompatible. For example, a person might have strong views in support of the National Health Service as a public body though when faced with a personal necessity of having his sick child treated immediately might seek private health care. Such type of behaviour can cause conflict and if not resolvable due to the separate subsystems of constructs, fragmentation can be said to have occurred.

• **Commonality** ‘To the extent that one person employs a construction of experience which is similar to that employed by another, his/her psychological processes are similar to those of the other person’. Though individuals are seen as being unique it is possible for two people who have confronted different events might end up with similar constructions of their experiences. People construe differently, anticipate differently and organise and use their constructs differently. Fundamentally this means that this corollary is pointing out is that when two people see things in the same way, then in that aspect of their system their psychological processes are similar.
• **Sociality** ‘To the extent that one person construes the construction processes of another, he/she may play a role in a social process involving the other person’.

Though the previous corollaries have centred on the idiosyncratic nature of construing this one emphasises that personal interaction is important in ensuring that we learn from others and in so doing need to have some awareness and understanding of that person’s construct system. The more one gets to know another person’s construct system the better one is able to play a social role in relation to them. Clearly this has great import for the therapist as getting to understand a client’s world is crucial in developing a holistic and therapeutic relationship with them.

**Personal Construct Psychology, Phenomenology and Constructivism**

The position of Personal Construct Psychology (PCP) and its relationship with related theories such as phenomenology and constructivism in general “has been discussed for decades” (2010, p. 1). In a seminal article which discussed the use of PCP research in education, she states the fact that constructivism is indeed a broad term encapsulating several different theories sharing assumptions and “commonalities of ‘lived experiences’ and ‘personal meaning’ of individuals” (p. 1). It is clear that Personal Construct Psychology (PCP) has strong connections to other constructivist theories such as radical constructivism and social constructivism (cf. Butt, 2006; Fransella, 2005; Warren, 2004) as well as different philosophical theories predominantly from phenomenology approaches (Apelgren, 2010; Butt, 2003; 2004). Apelgren believes that education has to do with personal meaning and meaning making and the researchers’ task is to “bring to light the participants’ personal meanings of particular events and situations” (Apelgren, 2010, p. 1). Research in the field of education, though not exclusively, in its broadest sense, is, by its very nature, interpretive and constructive and is possibly best described, by Hilgard (1997) as hermeneutic.

Personal Construct Psychology differs from phenomenology in a number of ways (cf. Husserl, 1913 and Kelly, 1955). In the philosophy of phenomenology the knowledge base is logic (i.e., thinking, be it that of the researcher) as compared to the empirical knowledge base of PCP, where the participants’ thinking are the focal point of attention. In addition, the aims of the research differ. In phenomenology “the essence or absolute knowledge of a phenomenon is the ultimate research objective, in
PCP the focus is on the individuals’ experience of a phenomenon.” (Apelgren, 2010, p. 2).

Warren (2004) explores the importance of the social aspects of PCP theory by discussing the philosophical underpinnings of social constructivism and pragmatism which permit an understanding of the ways in which social aspects are natural parts of a theory of PCP. He describes how an individual compares his or her meaning of the world with that of others. In this way “activity on personal construct psychology is an activity of validating one’s constructions...what is built firmly into the theory is the notion that one goes to one’s social context to validate one’s construing” (Warren, 2004, p. 40). Further, Pope and Denicolo (2001) emphasise the importance of the social aspects of education from the point of view of Kelly’s Sociality Corollary (see further detail p. 4 of Apelgren). Expanding on Kelly’s Man-the-Scientist metaphor Pope and Denicolo (2001) use their notion of ‘person-the storyteller’ to supply an additional research method which specifically focuses on and emphasises an interpretive view of research with particular reference to educational studies.

**Studies utilising PCP**

Researchers who have utilised Kelly’s PCP have come from such diverse fields as education (Oberg, 1987, 1989; Ravenette, 1977; Rossi & Hooper, 2001), business (Stewart, 1998; Stewart, Stewart, & Fonda, 1981; Fromm, 2004), sport (Clarke, 2005, 2007; Cripps, 1999; Feixas, Marti & Villegas, 1989; Gucciardi & Gordon, 2008a, 2008b; Gucciardi, Gordon & Dimmock, 2009; Savage, 2003), mental health (Winter & Viney, 2005; Viney, Metcalfe & Winter, 2005; Pollock, 2006; Watson, Winter & Rossotti, 1997; Winter 1982). However, only limited use of Repgrid methodology has been used to ascertain perceptions of coaching behaviours (such as Clarke, 2005, 2007) and the present research will be directed at expanding evidence in this area.

**The Laddering Procedure**

In 1965, Hinkle, a former student of Kelly, produced a seminal and well reported PhD dissertation entitled ‘The change of personal constructs from the viewpoint of a theory of implications’ in which he first examined the degree to which individual constructs were resistant to change. His argument was that the more abstract (superordinate) constructs are the more likely these are to resist change.
Hinkle’s method was described as “laddering” by Bannister and Mair (1968). It was merely one of a number of such methods – others being known as snake interviews (Pope & Denicolo, 2001; Cabaroglu & Denicolo, 2008), self-characterisation sketches, the “Core Process Interview” (Jones, 1993), Tscudi’s (1977) ABC model; “pyramiding” (Landfield, 1971), which followed the example of Bannister and Mair’s (1968) approach of a ‘laddering down’ procedure, and a variety of lesser used ones. Other published research papers using laddering come from Clarke (1994b), Fransella (2003) and Brophy, Fransella and Reed (2003) and Fransella, Bell and Bannister (2003).

There are no formal instructions for the laddering process though it basically involves asking a person why they would be preferred to be described by one pole of a personal construct rather than the other. The construct “laddered” usually ends up with a statement of the values that underlie a person’s construing of their personal world. It is these values that are likely to have wide ranges of implications and, thereby, are more resistant to change than constructs lower down the ladder (Enquirewithin 02/04/08 Web based source). Costigan, Closs and Eustace (2000) believe that “Hinkle’s Laddering technique represents a highly regarded and widely used development of personal construct methodology” (p. 150) and though there have been a number of concerns about the laddering approach (e.g., Landfield & Epting, 1987), who preferred to use pyramiding (or laddering down), validation support for such a methodology has come from the publication by Neimeyer, Anderson and Stockton (2001) and these authors provide a ten point list of principles that should be borne in mind when conducting a laddering interview. When discussing the laddering procedure Fransella (2003) states that “It is difficult to know if laddering is a skill or a tool. It really is both” (p. 112). Its primary use is to elicit superordinate, more value-laden constructs.

Initially the participant is asked to generate constructs/contrasts to a given set of elements (in the case of the present research these were either football players, with the young players, or coaches with professional players, SFA course attendees or senior coaches). Once these have been established the individual is then asked to indicate which side of a construct-contrast (emergent/implicit poles) does s/he prefer. Once the appropriate pole has been indicated client is then asked the question of ‘why is this the case’? This procedure continues (there are no set limits on how many times
this needs to be asked) until the client cannot generate any further ideas pertaining to
the construct. Fransella (2005) believes that laddering is more than just a simple
interviewing technique and is in fact quite a complex skill. She goes on to state that “it
requires the use of three skills – the ability to be a credulous listener, to suspend one’s
own value system and, thereby, to be able to subsume the client’s construing” (p. 113).
She emphasises that laddering is a structured interview and is under the control of the
interviewer in ensuring that the client does not stray ‘off the ladder’ and remains
focused on the ladder. Fransella, (2003) recalls her own research in which deciding
which construct to ladder is in reality a matter of personal preference. There is no one
agreed format for this procedure – it is “an evaluative choice” (p.113).

In terms of deciding just how many constructs should be ‘laddered’, Fransella
(2005) states: “If it is in the context of helping a person reconstrue then I use three
criteria: the two or at the most three constructs to be laddered should be relatively
subordinate, should look different from each other and look as if they are likely to
develop my understanding of my client’s construed world” (p. 113). However, she is
at pains to point out that “The relative subordinacy of a construct is, of course, a very
evaluative choice. What is subordinate to me may well not be to my client” (p. 113). It
was with this very much in mind that the present study emphasised the use of such
constructs initially with each participant though was flexible enough to ensure that
each participant was not dogmatically treated in the very same way as clients respond,
at times, quite differently to laddering sessions. Equally it is central to Kellyan theory
that individuals are indeed idiosyncratic in their perceptions of their reality and a
standard approach, even to the laddering analysis would not have met this criterion.

The actual use of the constructs to be examined in reality depends on the
interviewer’s skills and as such involves somewhat an evaluative process. There is no
one set way of carrying out this procedure and in my own research (e.g. Clarke 2005),
the three most significant (statistically) that were derived through the principle
component analysis (PrinCom) statistical procedure in the Gaines and Shaw (2009)
Rep V programme were used. This is in accord with the work of Fransella (2003) who
proposes that three criteria should be used “two, or at the most three constructs to be
laddered should be relatively subordinate, should look different from each other and
look as if they are likely to develop my understanding of the client’s construed world”
(p. 113).
Hinkle’s (1965) standard instructions regarding how to begin the laddering process should start by asking the following:

“Now on this construct do you preferred this side to that side. What I want to understand now is why you prefer to be here rather than there… What are the advantages of this side to you in contrast to the disadvantages of that side as you see it?” (pp. 32-33).

The answer given is another construct that is superordinate to the first and which also has a preferred side. The “why?” question is again posed about the preferred side of the new construct – it is usually obvious which is the preferred pole after the first question. The question ‘why?’ is asked of each new construct until the person is unable (or unwilling) to produce more. Essentially, the procedure progresses with “recursive questioning” (Fransella, Bell, & Bannister, 2003) until the client completes his/her task. Butler (2009) explains how laddering can enable the “fundamental essence of a person to be glimpsed” (p. 123). Further, Butler goes on to state that “At the pinnacle of the hierarchy of self-construing lies what Kelly described as core construing – higher order constructs which govern the maintenance of a person’s identity. Such constructs lie fundamentally at the heart of a person’s sense of self, guiding each anticipatory choice, action and stance they take. They may justifiably be viewed as the banner under which a person fights. Importantly, compared to constructs at a lower level, core constructs appear to remain invariably stable, reflecting Kelly’s idea of permeability, meanings are much more likely to be resistant to change and are thus central to a person’s psychological framework.

Laddering is used by many practitioners, often in clinical settings (Price, 2002; Fransella et al., 2003; Landfield, 1971) and is said to be the most powerful means of eliciting those values that a person holds dear and with which they organise their world. The Laddering procedure has been used extensively. Porter (2005) used the technique in workshops with officers of the (London) Metropolitan police to help investigate issues pertaining to themselves in their roles as policemen. Honikman (1977), in a study of architecture, used laddering to examine a person’s perception of room design while Reynolds and Gutman (1988) examined consumers’ perceptions of product in relation to their overall value systems. Costigan, Closs and Eustace (2000) examined marketing situations and a variety of similar studies in the business area have been undertaken – e.g. Consumer behaviour (Saaka, Sidon and Blake (2004);
market research (Veludo de Valiera, Ikeda and Componar (2006); food hazards (Roininen, Arvola & Lahteenmaki, 2006); production managers values (Bourne and Jenkins, 2005). A number of studies using Laddering have been in clinical settings. For example, Pollock (2006) sought to examine how psychiatric nurses came to terms with their changing roles at work while Winter (1982) examined constructs relationships with the connections to psychological disorder and therapeutic change in neurotic patients. In addition, Corbridge, Rugg, Major and Burton (1994) utilised the Laddering procedure when investigating knowledge acquisition in engineers as did Greyling (2012) when examining trainee language teachers.

Hawley (2009), in an attempt to investigate core values and beliefs in marketing practitioners, discussed the use of Laddering as a research tool. Though he agreed that “Laddering can be tedious for participants” (p. 5) and “conducting a formal Laddering interview is difficult” (p. 6), he believed that it was a useful technique for uncovering a person’s root values, though believed it is clearly a challenging exercise to complete properly. Veludo de Oliveira et al. (2006) also addressed these issues relating to possible difficulties associated with Laddering and believed that Laddering involves more than a simple in-depth interview and suggested that it “showed itself as an advantageous tool for understanding behaviour” (p. 303).

However, there are clearly a number of definite advantages for using Laddering as an interview technique. The interviewer has, according to Rugg and McGeorge (1995) “much more control over the direction that the elicitation session takes and so the session can be much more focussed” (p.343). Further they state that “a key assumption of Laddering is that a person’s conceptual structure is hierarchically organised. Laddering thus imposes a hierarchical structure on the knowledge elicited. This type of hierarchical structure is difficult to capture using (some) other techniques, such as traditional repertory grids.” (p. 314). Thus, they suggest that Laddering is a very desirable complement to repertory grids.

Responding to Butt’s (1995) criticism of laddering methodology, Neimeyer, Anderson and Stockton (2001), in a study directly devoted to the validation of Laddering as a technique for accessing the hierarchical structure of concepts, provided some evidence that “Laddering does indeed elicit core constructions that are distinguished from peripheral constructs... (p. 86). Though agreeing with the cautions outlined by Leitner (1985) and Butt (1995) by stating that these “cannot be
disregarded” (p. 98), they formulated a set of 10 heuristics that may help guide users in their future laddering research:

- Select a starting point that permits the clear development of a clear construct.
- Solicit, rather than assume, the interviewee’s pole preference.
- Note the occurrence of negative preferences.
- Prompt the interviewee to condense lengthy elaborations.
- Refrain from commenting on constructs until the ladder is completed.
- Request placement of actual (or present) self-element after the ladder is finished.
- Use imagery or metaphor to stretch the capacity of language to symbolise superordinate dimensions.
- Stop laddering when constructs begin to repeat themselves.
- Discuss significant moments of the laddering procedure.
- Process the ladder using facilitative questions.


To the experienced user of the laddering procedure, most of these heuristics would normally be in place though some would not be directly relevant. This will become obvious in the Results section dealing explicitly with the laddered studies. Korenini (2012) talked about how to adopt a ‘consistent laddering approach’ which aimed at mitigating some perceived shortcomings in Laddering technique and proposed two further aspects of Laddering interviews – laddering up and laddering down (a technique that Bannister and Mair, 1968, proposed) though the present study did not follow such a course of action and instead utilised the Snake interview procedure established by Denicolo and Pope (2001) to develop the results of the ladders further. Butt (2007) emphasises the importance of laddering as a procedure as an “interesting technique that reaches parts that other orthodox phenomenological methods don’t” (p. 13), while at the same time still resisting the notion that it automatically ascends a construct system. He believes that “some constructs systems are more important and central than others” (p.14) though as the lived world is often ambiguous it is often extremely difficult to be categorical about its nature. Laddering would seem to add “to the phenomenologist’s toolbox” (p.14) in its attempt to delve into the world of the individual and as such is an additional and helpful method to
access such a world. An example of a completed Ladder is included in the Methods chapter.

**The Snake Interview**

Denicolo and Pope (1990) suggest that the Snake interview, often referred to as “River of Experience” technique, is a constructivist technique used to promote reflection on critical (i.e., important) incidents in the life history of participants, in this case experienced soccer coaches. Fundamentally, it is a diagrammatic flow chart that “depicts some specified aspects of a person’s life” (Cabaroglu & Denicolo, 2008, p. 2) which, in the context of the present study, was that period in the coaches’ career after they had achieved their top level coaching award and worked as a professional coach (in Scotland) for at least five years. Cabaroglu and Denicolo (2008) present a diagrammatic example of how they used the Snake to enable participants in their research (mainly teachers) to discuss central factors in their professional development in a pictorial format, starting with early influencing factors and then progressing systematically to more recent events.

The term ‘critical incidents’, was first coined by Calderhead (1981), and followed from the work of Bloom (1953) in relation to ‘stimulated recall’, and Brogan and Taylor (1975, pp. 13-14) suggested that such an approach was phenomenological in nature as:

“The phenomenologist views human behaviour... as a product of how people interpret their world. The task of the phenomenologist is to capture this process of interpretation.... In order to grasp the meanings of a person’s behaviour, the phenomenologist attempts to see things from that person’s point of view.”

Gaier (1954) used a research approach based on Bloom’s (1953) work (using using audio recordings) and suggested that such a technique attempted to tap into the conscious thoughts and feelings an individual has previously experienced. The connection to the Personal Construct approach of Kelly is obvious.

Brookfield (1990) believes that the process of critical reflection (in which critical incidents play an essential part) can be viewed as comprising three phases – identifying the assumptions that underlie our thoughts and actions; scrutinising the accuracy and validity of how they connect to, or are discrepant with, our experience of reality, and reconstituting these assumptions to make them more inclusive and
integrative. Brookfield (1990) believes that assumptions “can be viewed as the interpretive glue that binds the various meaning schemes comprising our structures of understanding” (p. 177). He believes that as a means of probing learners’ assumptive worlds “the critical incident technique is rooted in the phenomenological research tradition and presumes that learners’ general assumptions are embedded in, and can be interpreted from, their specific descriptions of particular events” (pp. 178-179).

**Using other biographical data**

Closely analogous to the Snake technique is the use of (auto)biographies and similar approaches for collecting idiographic data – ‘stream of consciousness’ journals, personal diaries and professional logs, field notes etc. - to gain an understanding of an individual’s thinking. Various studies have used specific biographical data (many using teachers as their sample) (Berk, 1980; Butt, 1984). Kelchtermans (1993a) used a biographical perspective to examine professional development of teachers and Butt (1984) similarly used biography to examine an understanding of teacher thinking. Kelchtermans (1993b) believed that critical incidents and critical phases are crucially important in leading to an understanding of changes in professional behaviour and as such can provide some insight into how coaches might explain relevant aspects of their own professional development.

Clearly, the use of such biographical data must take account of and be embedded in the structural, cultural and organisational context in which professional football coaches exist. Nias (1989) emphasises this point (when referring specifically to teachers) by stating “No matter how pervasive particular aspects of a shared social or occupational culture may be or how well individuals are socialised into it, the attitudes and actions of each are rooted in their own ways of perceiving their world’ (in Day, Calderhead & Denicolo, 1993, p. 203).

Berk (1980) believed that “a biography is a formative history of an individual’s life experience” (p. 90) as it attempts to infer how a person comes to be the way they are. He believes that it addresses attitudes, feelings and thoughts and is “not the collection of chronological record of tapes.” (p.95). He states that it is a deliberate critical procedure that aims to make sense of such matters as thoughts, actions, feelings and experiences. As such biographies (and autobiographies) go beyond a mere repetition of one’s life events and enable a deeper understanding of
patterns underlying one’s personal history to be presented. Though Kelly was highly critical of studies that had an over reliance on psychometric methods he did not totally disavow quantitative methods per se. He did, however, wish to lead to an emancipation of the participant in any research study and produced a number of techniques, Repgrids being merely one such, that sought to “get beyond the words” (Denicolo, 2003, p. 124). Snake interviews are in effect another aspect of the Kellyan approach. Indeed, Sexton (1994) used stimulated recall with police officers undergoing annual review and Sexton and Denicolo (1997) used this approach when conducting a longitudinal study of probationary police officers and student nurses through the first two years of their service.

Kompf (1993), when studying teachers’ personal development through career mapping, spoke of “life review” (p. 170) which gave a macro view of an individual’s construct system. Though he suggested that such life reviews were normally associated with crises or as a function of some psychotherapeutic process, they could also relate to more meaningful understanding of the self or bring closure and resolution through the verbalisation of such events. Denicolo (in Fransella, 2003, p. 123), referring to the sort of questioning that underpins Repgrid methodology, suggests that “despite Kelly’s suggestion that in relation to self characterisation that if you want to know something about a person then ask him (sic) and he may tell you, the mode of asking using any technique certainly has an effect on the answers received”. Day, Pope and Denicolo (1990), in a study of adult learners, explained that though the Snake procedure is seen as an interview, the procedure followed “is more akin to personal interrogation by the participant of their own reasons for isolating a particular incident and personal reflection on its import for and effects on their practice” (p. 160).

**Reasons for using Snake interviews.**

The underlying principle for using this technique lies in Kelly’s (1955) Personal Construct Theory (PCT). Though, arguably, all Kelly’s corollaries are relevant to an individual, the main ones that pertain to the use of Snake Interviews are as follows: The Fundamental Postulate, which states that a person anticipates events through their personal constructions of reality; the Range Corollary, where a construction is convenient for the anticipation of a finite range of events only (in this
case events pertaining to their coaching experiences); the Experience Corollary, whereby a person’s construction system varies as s/he successively construes the replication of events plus the Sociality Corollary, where individuals construe the construction process of another and may play a role in the social processes involving that other person. These would seem to be especially relevant and pertinent to a person’s autobiographical account of their professional development. Pope and Denicolo (1993, p. 540) expand upon this by stating “Constructs evolve over time and are particularly influenced, consciously or unconsciously, by formative experiences”. They expand upon this (Pope & Denicolo, 2001) by stating that in order to understand the present, one needs to compare and contrast it with previous experiences and use the results to predict the future. They designed the Snake Interview technique as a tool for understanding how critical incidents contribute to the formation of constructs elicited later in life.

In contrast to pre-determined interview questions, Albanese (1997) believes that Snake interviews not only yield information concerning what a person believes but also provide clues as to what has led an individual to his or her beliefs by unraveling the personal history of the individual. Above all, he states that “they enable the participants to use their own words and to indicate issues which are personally important, reducing interviewer bias and producing highly authentic and rich data.” (Pope and Denicolo, 1993, p.541).

According to Cabaroglu and Denicolo (2008) when discussing issues relating to matters of reliability and validity, some reasons for using Snake interviews can be itemised thus:

- Help in the exploration of changes/developments – if there are any – in participants’ beliefs and attitudes and how they might interpret such

- Facilitate the participants’ expression of their beliefs and attitudes which can be notoriously difficult to explain and measure


Cabaroglu and Denicolo (2008) explain that the Snake interview helps people articulate the constructs they employ in particular situations. Such as in the case of the present research when experienced coaches were asked to discuss how their learning
had been influenced once they became “professionals.” Citing a report from Denicolo, (2003) they use the following quote to emphasise their view:

“Contrary as it may seem, the anticipatory power of constructs lies in the past. In order to come to an understanding of the present we need to compare and contrast it with experiences we have had previously and use these to predict the future. Thus biography has an important influence on the constructs we bring to bear on any situation in which we find ourselves. The ones that predominate while engaged in a particular activity are likely to be the ones that served us well in what appear to have similar circumstances in the past. Since life is hectic, encouraging action rather than reflection, we are often unaware of constructs guiding that action and from whence, in our pasts, these are derived. This means that, although well established, some of our personal constructs may now be redundant or even counter-productive. However, unless we become consciously aware of them, they cannot be challenged and they remain influential in orientating our being (p. 129).

The real value of the Snake technique can be summarised thus:

• It allows participants to identify their own agenda in terms of what was salient for them to discuss in relation to their development as professional coaches.

• Helps to provide an outline of useful background information in explaining differences they may have perceived over time.

• Has a genuine methodological advantage over traditional interviews in that participants could raise private issues and concerns that traditional interviews could not do. This permits the participant a freedom to express themselves that would not be possible in traditional, standardised interviews.

• Little researcher intervention was necessary and developments and their derivations were provided by the participants themselves. This is especially important for ensuring that the data more accurately reflects the participants own understanding of their worlds rather than reflecting any researcher’s agenda.

• Provides, according to Cabaroglu and Denicolo (2008, p. 38-39), “an ideal complement to the other techniques used in the study so that triangulation of the data was achieved in the sense Mason (1996, p. 149) defines as ‘the concept of triangulation’ – conceived as multiple methods – encourages the researcher to approach their research questions from different angles and to explore their intellectual puzzles in a rounded and multi-faceted way”.
• Finally, Snake Interviews have a general advantage of accessing data that would be difficult to access by standard interview techniques. Otherwise, it would be like “akin to snippets of a film viewed from only half way through.” (Cabaroglu & Penicolo, 2008, p. 39).

Comparison of other autobiographical data collection methods with PCT approaches.

In a seminal article Solas (1992) examined the process of teaching and when working with students and teachers he combined the use of Repgrids with personal biography. He argued that there was a growing trend in educational research for examining teacher thinking and learning that moved away from the previous models which emphasised a more cognitive, information process approach to one that focussed on the perspective of the teachers themselves. He lists a variety of such studies (e.g., Ben-Perez, Bromme & Halkes, 1986; Clarke & Peterson, 1986; Halkes & Olson, 1984) which he believed gave rise to models such as ethnomethodology, phenomenology and symbolic interactionism and led to the use of Kelly’s Personal Construct approach. This emphasised the way in which individuals (such as coaches or teachers) could discover their own personal constructs “in terms of which one experiences attitudes, thoughts and feelings in a personally valid way” (p. 209).

Autobiography and personal construct theory (PCT) have not been without their critics. Some, such as Bruner, 1956; Morrison, 1982) thought that PCT was “excessively cognitive or mentalistic”, though Solas (1992) believed that this was due to the critics “failing to grasp the nature of a construct or the meaning of the person-as-scientist metaphor in the way that Kelly (1955a), intended” (p. 215). A construct is not just a verbal label, it is a personal discrimination that can be expressed in symbolic form. Kelly’s theory attempts to use metaphor to suggest that all people are builders of theories which provide “a basis for an active approach to life, not merely a comfortable armchair from which to contemplate its vicissitudes with detached compliance (Kelly, 1963, pp. 18-19). Addressing the issue of difficulties of using PCT due to its lack of reliability and validity, Fransella and Bannister (1977) point out that “it makes no sense to talk about the reliability of the grid... because there is no such thing as ‘The grid’ (p. 83). Equally, when discussing the validity of a grid Bannister and Fransella (1980, p. 73) believe that as there are so many variations in the use of grids “it makes no sense to ask what is the validity” as grids differ so much in form
that “ultimately validity can be seen as referring to the way in which a mode of understanding enables us to take effective action” (Bannister & Fransella, 1980, p. 74).

Responding to the criticisms of autobiography regarding their lack of reliability and validity, Plummer (1983) argues that “it is possible to assess rigorously the evidence, inferences and generalisations, interpretations and conclusions drawn from, and hence the validity of, accounts” (p.102). Butt and Raymond, (1987) in a study dealing specifically with teachers’ thinking argued strongly that the use of biography (and autobiography) was a valid method for examining what teachers think and provides a useful tool for defining a teacher’s ‘voice’. Equally such an approach should be seen to be acceptable for attempting to find the ‘voice’ of the football coach. It would seem, therefore, perfectly acceptable as a mode of research to combine the use of biography (in the case of this study the use of the Snake interview) with the personal construct approach (in the form of both grids and ensuing Ladders). Both are centred on focusing on the uniqueness of the individual. Solas (1992) following directly from Kelly’s (1955) statement that “Repertory grid and autobiography can be conflated into a synergistic approach which can be used to prevent the teacher from being either ‘a prisoner of his (sic) environment (or) ..... the victim of his (sic) biography” (p.217). There are clearly a number of ways in which this can be done in a rewarding and meaningful fashion (Butt and Raymond, 1987).

Summary

Kelly’s Theory of Personal Constructs takes an ideographic approach to the understanding of personality in its broadest sense. It is heavily related to work of such writers as John Dewey and is very much in the humanistic, phenomenological tradition of psychology. The rationale for utilizing such an approach is to enable a fuller understanding of how individuals, in the case of this study, football coaches in Scotland, arrive at an understanding of the way they operate and behave. By using the Reprgrid method plus two of the more commonly used tools derived from Kellyan theory – Laddering (after Hinkle. 1965 and Denicolo, 1996; 1997) and the Snake Interview (Pope & Denicolo, 2001), a deeper understanding of a sports coach in his/her professional practice can better be obtained and understood.
Chapter 2 - Professional Socialisation

Introduction

This chapter is to examine the concept of ‘becoming a professional’, in particular how this might be relevant to a football coach, and to examine the various factors that may impinge on the ways in which professionals are ‘socialised’ once they become qualified to practice. In addition, how they continue to develop their knowledge in the workplace will be of central importance. The term ‘professional’ is often misused or inappropriately used and this study will attempt to ascertain what research evidence suggests regarding what constitutes ‘being a professional’ or behaving as a professional. This will provide the focus for other areas, such as how a professional becomes socialised into the job after gaining initial accreditation (certification). This is commonly done through undertaking relevant and necessary courses usually sanctioned by a professional body, in the case of the samples studied in this thesis, the Scottish Football Association (SFA) as part of overall professional development. The various ways in which professions ‘socialise’ their members will be referred to with emphasis placed on how coaches might be thus socialised into behaving appropriately. This particular emphasis will centre on research evidence from the teaching profession as this is the one most commonly associated with sport coaching. Indeed, it is the one from which many coaches are recruited. Though the research evidence pertaining to the sports profession as a profession is scanty, the ways in which coaches are in fact socialised once they have gained the necessary governing body award is even scarcer. Also, the ways in which sport coaching has attempted, especially in the recent past, to be accepted as a profession will be examined particularly in relation to the various pressures – political, social as well as sporting - in an attempt to contextualise the modern football coach in Scotland.

Brief historical overview

There is quite an extensive literature on the historical aspects of the development of the professions though only a brief outline will be given here. Freidson (1994) believes that the history of the development of the professions went back as far as medieval Europe, where the universities spawned the idea of the original three professions – law, medicine and the clergy (of which university teaching was a
part). These three professions were commonly referred to as the ‘status professions’ to distinguish them from recent ‘occupational professions’. Though a number of writers have suggested that the study of the professions was no longer of interest to sociologists (Hall 1983), Freidson (1994) believes that changes in the world of work and the activities of the professions over the recent decades have led to renewed interest in this area of study. Thus, there have been a variety of studies that would dispute such a position and there is considerable evidence to suggest that professions and, consequently, professionalization experiences have become more common, especially in such areas as business and law (Schleef, 1997, 2001), accountancy (Anderson-Gough, Grey & Robson, 1998), nursing (Page, 2005), pharmacy (Carter, Brunsen, Hatfield & Valuck, 2000), and education (Hoyle, 1980; Hoyle & John, 1995; Houston, Haberman & Sikula, 1990).

Hoyle (1995, p. 59) states that there has “virtually been a century of debate about the idea of a profession”. He goes on to suggest that “the main protagonists in this debate are those that believe there is a distinctiveness about a profession which is centred on knowledge, judgement, ethics and self-government and those that believe that ‘profession’ (sic) is an ideological term deployed to enhance power, status, remuneration and freedom from accountability” (p.59). Though Hoyle was focussing on the profession of teaching, his analysis of the historical development of professions was rather broader. He suggests that Perkin’s (1989) ‘The Rise of Professional Society’ was a major piece of work that charted the growth of professions from the nineteenth century onwards. According to Anderson-Gough et al. (1998) the first concept of profession was not systematically explored until post World War II. Parsons (1951, 1968) and Evetts (2003) were seen as supporters of the ‘functionalist school, whereby they tried to link the functions of professions to the maintenance of social and economic order. Influenced by the work of Durkheim (1997), the functionalists believed that the professions were distinct from other occupations and that ‘a profession is a group with a high degree of homogeneity and consensus’ (Anderson-Gough et al, 1998, p. 16). Various other writers when trying to verify the approach by Parsons to establish traits such as altruism or a collectivity orientation – seen as important aspects of what professionals were supposed to espouse - attempted to document any unique characteristics that distinguished professional from other occupations. Thus the trait theory was quite similar to the functionalist approach.
However, this attempt was not too successful as the wider aspects of professionalization, such as the impact of different social contexts were not taken into account. Gradually in the 1960s there was a change in writing in the area of the professions and writers taking a Marxist approach, such as Johnson (1972) and Larson (1977), who linked the professions to a method of occupational control and to interest groups linked to the existing class system. Marxist theory basically saw the professions as a product of the division of labour though more recent Marxist accounts have focussed on professions in relation to the State and the ‘proletarianization of professional occupations’ (Anderson-Gough et al., 1998, p. 18). MacDonald (1995) believes that the professions are indeed best understood by the Weberian term ‘social closure’ which happens when professionals come together to further their own interests and exclude others from their group and take the privileges of other groups.

Most of the pre-1970 studies on the professions have focused largely on medicine, though later on various other works had examined law, architecture and engineering and, more recently, such occupations as the police, and teaching. Anderson-Gough et al. (1998) believe that the emergence of the Marxist view brings a new diversity to the study of the professions that have, until recently, been mainly characterised by the Trait/Functionalist approach. Coffey (1993) suggested that after the previous Functionalist/Trait model, the approach of Symbolic Interaction (a product of the Chicago school of sociology) began to take prominence. This approach focused on the everyday, small-scale interactions that reveal how people negotiate situations and gain a social identity. Slater, Coffey, Baker and Evans (2014) examined the notion of social identity in relation to sports groups though their focus was mainly on group membership and not specifically on the role of the coach, emphasising leadership rather than professional development. Coffey’s (1993) study does not expressly see professions as necessarily different from other occupations. In this it differs from many other theories.

Hoyle (1995) believed that “The rise of professional society reached its apogee in the 1960’s in terms of the influence of the professions on social life generally” (p. 69) and many would agree that there has been a gradual decline ever since. However, there has been no sign in the number of occupations that desire to become professions in their own right. In terms of Great Britain, Hoyle (1995) points the finger at the “New Right”, as does Strain (1995) when discussing the changing nature of teaching
as a profession in the UK. This was evidenced, suggests Hoyle (1995) by the policies adopted by the Conservative government from the early 1980s onwards, who, along with succeeding governments, “have sought to control the influence of the professions, render them more financially accountable and deliver services to the wishes of the consumers, or where these are difficult to determine by market forces, the views and values of a central government claiming to act as a proxy for them. Thus, at the heart of this new concept of a profession is the notion of efficient and a skillful delivery” (p. 69). Hoyle (1995) even goes as far as saying “the teaching profession (in the UK) has become largely reduced to compliance with government policy” (p. 66). This ‘assault on the professions’ as Beck and Young (2005) entitled their paper, was reinforced by such authors as Glazer (1978), Hoyle (1980), Hoyle and John (1995) and Ozga (1990, 1995) who have continued to the point that as recently as 2014, in England especially, and, one might argue, in the education sector in particular, radical change to primary and secondary schooling has been extensive and has led to a feeling of great disquiet in all sections of the teaching profession. Clearly there have been economic benefits to consumers’ examples of self-serving behaviours by various professionals – be they doctors, lawyers, social workers, where incompetency, inefficiency and the disdainful treatment of clients has often been exposed and are not acceptable. However, the question arises as to what degree the overall balance has swung too much in one direction against the professions. Only time will answer such a question.

What constitutes a profession?

According to Hoyle and John (1995), “Profession (sic) is an essentially contested concept” (p. 1) and they go further by stating that it reifies common agreement as to its meaning. Often qualities are used to define professions and these usually entail notions of knowledge and responsibility. Hoyle and John (1995) believe that the professions are so consistently defined in terms of the possession of knowledge “that the term ‘the learned professions’ is a pleonasm” (p. 1). So many researchers and academics have attempted to define the terms ‘profession’ and ‘professional’ that a number believe that their use is beyond common agreement. However, as they continue to be used their deployment needs justification, as the idea of professionalization does not make sense until some agreement is made as to what constitutes a profession.
Nisbet (1967) discusses the work of Weber (1978) and Durkheim (1997) when examining the origins of the concept of a profession. They attempted to distinguish between professions and other occupations though the original theorist in the area is generally assumed to be Flexner, whose original paper in 1915 is normally seen as the starting point of this approach. This criterion approach normally entailed inducting a set of distinguishing characteristics and establishing some sort of template against which occupations could be judged in terms of their “profession-ness”. The established professions, such as medicine, the law, the church, architecture, engineering and the military were, by common consent, seen as established and served as the bench mark for comparative purposes. The ten separate criteria usually involved regarding the functionalist approach were summarized by Hoyle (1980) thus:

• A profession is an occupation which performs a social function.
• The exercise of this function requires a considerable degree of skill.
• This skill is exercised in situations which are not wholly routine but in which new problems and situations have to be handled.
• Thus although knowledge gained through experience is important, this recipe-type knowledge is insufficient to meet professional demands, and the practitioner has to draw on a body of systematic knowledge.
• The acquisition of this body of knowledge and the development of specific skills requires a lengthy period of higher education.
• This period of education and training also involves the process of socialization into professional values.
• These values tend to centre on the pre-eminence of client’s interests, and to some degree made explicit in a code of ethics.
• Because knowledge-based skills are exercised in non-routine situations, it is essential for the professional to have the freedom to make his own judgements with regard to appropriate practice.
• Because professional practice is so specialized, the organized profession should have a strong voice in the shaping of public policy, a large degree of control over the exercise of professional responsibilities, and a high degree of autonomy in relation to the state.
• Lengthy training, responsibility and client-centred-ness are necessarily rewarded by high prestige and a high level of remuneration.
Other writers, such as Lieberman (1956), have also produced lists of distinguishing characteristics for the professions. In many ways, attempting to establish a cohesive and overarching set of criteria is fruitless as terms such as semi, quasi and emergent, are now used to describe professions. It might be, Hoyle believes, that establishing some form of continuum, where professions lie at one end and other occupations lie towards the other, is one way of overcoming this dilemma. Equally the same sorts of criteria are not always relevant to all professions that are quite different in the practices and cultures, such as the contrasting professions of engineering and medical doctors.

Houston, Haberman and Sikula (1984, p.100) quote Johnson (1972) who suggests that “instead of trying to define what constitutes a profession we should instead regard ‘professionalism’ as an ideology and ‘professionalization’ as the process by which an occupation seeks to advance its status and progress towards full recognition within that ideology”. When attempting to define what a profession is, Leithwood and Hallinger (2002) believed that a profession is conventionally defined as “an occupation whose members are reputed to possess high levels of knowledge, skill, commitment and trustworthiness” (p. 7). Notions of specialised technical knowledge, such as validated practices, and propositions, such as theoretical models and descriptions that guide the applications of these practices, are also commonly used. Compared to such professions as medicine and law, teaching is “generally considered to fall short of being a profession and to be at best a semi-profession” (Dreeban, 1970, p. 8). The charge being that teaching lacks a core of specialised, technical knowledge. Altrichter, Feldman, Posch and Somekh (1993, p. 9) describe a profession thus:

“The OED definition of a profession: a vocation in which a professed knowledge of some department of learning or science is used in application to the affairs of others or in the practice of an art foundered upon it”.

In everyday usage it has come to mean “a typical combination of monopolised work opportunities that are predominantly non-manual, that offer above average income, prestige and authority and that demand above average qualification” (Hesse 1972, p. 69). Stenhouse (1975) extended this, to include the notion of having the ability to generate and further develop knowledge of one’s practice situation. Strain
(1995, p. 49), quotes the work of Downie (1990) when discussing the hallmarks of a profession. He offers the following criteria:

- Skills or expertise proceeding from a broad knowledge base;
- A special relationship with beneficiaries consisting of an attitude (a desire to help plus a sense of integrity) and a bond (constituted by the role relationship with beneficiaries);
- Recognised authority to speak out on matters of public policy and justice beyond any duties to specific clients;
- Independence (at least in some respects) of the state of commercial interests;
- Possessing education as distinct from training.

Hoyle and John (1995, p. 16) believe that “The term ‘profession’ can refer to any occupation or to relatively distinctive occupations which, despite problems of achieving total consensus, have distinguishing characteristics on which there is a high degree of consensus including knowledge base, autonomy and responsibility”. They go further in explaining the use of the term ‘professionalization’ by including notions of how individuals meet institutional and hence status aspects of a profession - strengthening the boundary, increasing credential requirements, establishing a self-governing body. They also emphasise the other element – that of improving the quality of public service provided through improving the skills and knowledge of practitioners. It is this aspect of being or acting as a professional that has led to researchers examining the very notion of how aspiring professionals learn to adapt to the demands of the professions into which they are catapulted. This is generally known as professional socialisation.

**Professional Socialisation**

The concept of socialisation has been debated for many years and there are a wide variety of views as to what it actually entails. Olsen and Whittaker (1970) saw it as “the process of learning the appropriate way of doing things, of learning how to be in a certain environment of internalising the norms, values, beliefs of a culture. It is often used synonymously with the word ‘enculturation’” (p.22). When applied in a professional setting it has wider aspects. Page (2005) refers to professional socialisation as “the acquisition of values, attitudes, skills and knowledge pertaining to a professional subculture” (p. 105). He questions how the commonly held views of
professional, in terms of attitudes, habits and values are displayed and how, indeed, did these develop and become part of their professional skills. Weinman, Twale and Stein (2001, p. 4) define socialisation in a broad sense as “the process by which persons acquire knowledge, skills and dispositions that make them more or less effective members of society” and believe that there are a wide variety of personal motivations that lie behind the choices individuals make regarding a professional career path. Normally there has to be some form of educational process linked to professional development. With the established professions this is usually through an undergraduate university course related to the profession chosen, such as law, medicine and teaching. This educational process underlies the formal part of training in establishing the necessary knowledge and skills required for eventual accreditation into the profession. It is also helped by the important aspect of informal learning which often takes place unconsciously through the process of learning and participation. These two aspects of professional education – the formal and informal – which are not distinctive in their separateness, account for the eventual professional behaviour, attitudes and values that the individual comes to understand as being necessary for membership of a professional group. Page (2005) uses the term ‘professional language’ to outline how prescribed professional knowledge combines with appropriate professional behaviours to aid overall professional socialisation. He describes the three basic functions of this professional language as being the importance of communication between fellow professionals, the development of group identification amongst professionals and the ethical need to keep appropriate distance between client and professional.

- Shortening the communications between members of the profession because the professional words assume the theory or theories related to them,
- Easing the recognition among professionals and thus encourage group identification, and
- Keeping the distance between client and professional.

(Page, 2005 p. 106).

The study conducted by Page (2005) was specifically directed at the professional socialisation of Valuers (as members of the property profession in Australia) and so utilized the Weinman et al. (2001) model of socialisation, which had as its central core the role provided by universities. However, this model is at total
variance with the training of ‘sport professionals’ where the universities do not play a fundamental training role, some of the issues relating to professional socialisation presented perhaps resonate with how coaches might develop their professional behaviours and attitudes. These four components: the background and predisposition of prospective students; the professional communities provided by practitioners and associations; the personal communities of family, friends and employers and novice professional practitioners, are common themes in research in this area. Zeichner and Gore (1990), when discussing the impact of socialisation on the teaching profession, examined the three main traditions of socialisation: functionalist, interpretive and critical approach. According to them “the oldest and most pervasive approach to (teacher) socialisation, functionalism, is rooted in the tradition of sociological positivism that arose in France (e.g. Comte, 1856; Durkheim, (1997). The functionalist paradigm holds a view of society as ontologically prior to man (sic) and seek(s) to place man and his activities within the wider social context” (p.329). They saw the interpretive approach as being rooted in the German idealistic position of social thought (e.g. Dilthey, 1976; Husserl, 1913; Kant, 1876; Shutz, 1967; Weber, 1978) and believed that “It challenges the validity of the ontological assumptions which underwrite functionalist approaches to sociology” (p.330). Finally, the critical approach was seen as embracing several schools of thought, as do the functionalist and interpretive approaches, “nevertheless it can be seen as combining two major areas – one emphasising reproduction (Althusser, 1979; Bernstein, 1979; Bourdieu, 1977; Bowles & Gintis, 1976) and another emphasising production (Giroux, 1983, Willis, 1977). Zeichner and Gore (1990) emphasise their belief in the production and reproduction, agency and structure when discussing the critical approach and present a quote from Bolster (1983) which states “People must be considered as both creators and producers of the social situations in which they live” (p. 331).

Schempp and Graber (1992), in one of the few articles which examines the socialisation processes of physical educators/coaches, stress the notion of the ‘dialectical struggle’, between professional ideal and the individual nature and proclivities of those who aspire to teach (Schempp & Graber 1992, p. 329). This is exemplified by seeing the process as negotiation between a social system and a person, being equally applicable to the coach as the aspiring teacher. “Upon certification and induction, the novice may discover that he or she must renegotiate
certain fundamental perspectives on teaching and learning with students, parents, administrators and others in the community” (p. 331). It was assumed for many years that, as Zeichner (1979) pointed out, the functionalist view of socialisation suggested that students willingly adapted and conformed to the forces of socialisation though this view did not really take account of those who resisted such pressures. Templin and Schempp (1989) suggested that on the other hand students were active agents in their socialisation in deciding which beliefs and behaviours to adopt or ignore. They believed that such a process was truly dialectical and Giroux (1983) suggested that passive resistance, noncompliance, indirect negotiations and withdrawal are all symptomatic of the dialectics of teacher socialisation. Schempp and Graber (1992) focused on the early phases of socialisation and quote the work of Van Maanan and Schein (1979) where they use the term ‘breakpoints’ (p. 16) to describe such socialisation thus “It is a breakpoint in which established relationships are severed and new ones forged, old behaviour patterns forgotten and new ones learned, former responsibilities abandoned and new ones taken on. In short, breakpoints require the individuals to discover or reformulate certain everyday assumptions about their working life” Van Maanan and Schein (1979, p.16). Schempp and Graber (1992), in a report focusing on the teaching profession which constantly drew comparisons between the way teachers and sports coaches/physical educators might be socialised, suggested there were four such breakpoints – pre-training, pre-service, field experiences and induction.

Firstly, pre-training socialization occurs when “aspiring teachers begin to internalize societal expectations and definitions of teachers’ work from the moment they enter the public school system” (p. 332). Such models as parents, siblings and friends, inform youngsters of the occupational status and professional responsibilities of teachers. Such individuals are therefore socialising agents on the prospective teacher. Drawing on Lortie’s (1975) notion of ‘apprenticeship of observation’, Schempp and Graber (1992) believe that “first-hand experience in the classroom and watching teachers ply their trade represents the first direct introduction to the teaching profession” (p. 333). Stephens (1967) used evolutionary theory which emphasised the role of primitive spontaneous pedagogical tendencies which he sees as largely existing across individuals and cultures, as an example of another influence during this period of socialization. Again, Feiman-Nemser (1983) takes a largely psychoanalytical
approach which points to the considerable important relationships had as children with important adults (such as mothers, fathers, teachers) and thus becoming a teacher is somewhat akin to trying to replicate early childhood relationships. Work by Wright and Tuska (1968) offers empirical support for this notion of ‘childhood romance of teacher development’ whereby there are often examples of children’s conscious identification with a teacher during their childhood.

Finally, and much more realistically, an obvious example of how teacher development might be analogous with coach socialisation lies, in the viewpoint which emphasises the enormous amount of time spent by teachers as pupils, in the way Lortie (1975) has classically described. It is the internalisation of these models that pupils (athletes) spend during their time as pupils (athletes) in close contact with teachers (coaches) that has a dramatic influence on subsequent socialisation. Lortie believes that it is the activation of this latent culture during formal training and later school experience that is a major influence on the perceptions of teachers’ role and role performance. Schempp and Graber (1992) offer further detailed evidence of the learning by prospective teachers when they are students and this could perhaps be comparable to the ways in which athletes learn from their own early coaches as well as how prospective teachers might be recruited.

Secondly, in terms of pre-service teacher socialisation, once a student decides upon a teaching career, the first step forward is normally to select and enter a professional teacher training programme. The idea that students are like blank slates at such a point has been disabused by Schempp and Graber (1992) who stated that “Professional socialization is an interactive process whereby present experiences continually challenge interpretations and assumptions from the past and demand some form of resolution and assimilation (p. 336). The power of assessors (i.e. tutors) is important to recognise in the socialisation process in that they, the assessors, have the power to approve or disapprove the neophyte’s work with obvious ramifications, both positive and negative, for the aspiring professional. This is especially pertinent in the world of neophyte football coaches where ‘jumping through hoops to get the badge’ is a common adage and expressed perception.

Thirdly, Schempp and Graber (1992), with regards those entering the teaching profession, believe it is what they call ‘field experiences’ that is the final act of preparation. In a British teaching context would normally be referred to as ‘teaching
practice’. By this they mean the “only time the preparation programme co-exists with the reality of the teacher’s world” (1992, p. 338). Zeichner and Gore (1990) offer a somewhat different view on this period of teacher socialisation by suggesting that it is not student teaching practice that influences such socialization, as students are indeed active agents in their own professional socialisation. They point out that many studies have “ignored the collective aspects of socialisation into teaching” (p. 334). Different students adopt different approaches, some accepting the implicit demands of institutions in which they serve whereas others “pushed back, sometimes vigorously, against the assumptions and notions they encountered during their teaching practicum experience” (Schempp and Graber, 1992, p. 338). Commenting on these new experiences of neophyte teachers, Freibus (1977) suggests that encountering pupils in schools provides first-hand experience of what is often referred to as ‘reality shock’ or ‘social shock therapy’, in acclimatising prospective students into the everyday demands of teaching life. For example, having to negotiate with demanding and often unruly students - and dealing with the huge demands of professional workloads and all that such might entail. Formal teacher education, according to this approach, is viewed as having little ability to alter the cumulative effects of anticipatory socialisation. This is often exemplified in such comments of the former British Lions rugby coach, Ian McGeechan, in Jones (2006) who openly questioned the validity and utility of coach development courses and their impact on development.

In the fourth and final part, induction, the aspiring student has successfully navigated the initial training and has received his/her certification and enters into the new world of various influences, roles, demands and expectations which may not have been apparent during the training up to this point. Lortie (1966) compared the first year teacher to Robinson Crusoe, both of whom struggle in an environment without the help of colleagues, afraid of asking for help as this might be perceived as incompetence. Various writers (Huberman, 1989; Bullough, 1989) often depict the induction phase as a survival period and believe that it has to be successfully negotiated. Various other phrases have been used to explain the induction period, which do not apply just to teacher training and is probably evident across the professions, such as ‘sink or swim’, ‘battle for survival’, ‘baptism of fire’ though O’Sullivan (1989) and Freedman (1985) take a different, more upbeat approach to student induction.
Zeichner and Gore (1990), in their paper specifically directed at teacher socialisation, emphasised particularly how the ‘ecology of the classroom’ is seen as crucially relevant to socialisation. It is their belief that relating to the role played by colleagues and teacher evaluators has more relevance to the socialisation of coaches. Questioning the weight of the overall influence of classroom context on the socialisation of teachers, Zeichner and Gore (1990) quote the work of Arfwedson (1979), which could easily be translated into how individual professional coaching environments might be similar to those which the coach experiences whereby other important influences may come into play:

“There is no such thing as a common working situation of all teachers. On the contrary, the working conditions of a teacher are strongly linked to the kind of school in which he (sic) serves. Consequently, the occupational socialisation of teachers varies according to the school conditions which are, in turn, dependent on the local society surrounding the school.....” (p. 93).

In the seminal account of professional socialisation (in this case of accountants) Anderson-Gough et al. (1998) discuss professionalization from an organisational perspective “Contained within professional socialisation is the experience of organizational socialisation” (p. 26). They examined the main theories that have been used over the years. They suggest that Functional and Symbolic Interactionist approaches to socialisation differ in not only the way they define professions but also how they see the learning processes undertaken by professionals (Anderson-Gough et al, p. 23). The Functionalist view tends to focus on the characteristics of the occupation that new members must learn whilst the Symbolic Interactionist view focuses on how people are shaped and moulded by social institutions while creating their own professional identities (Coffey, 1993). Anderson-Gough et al. (1998) demonstrate how two of the more seminal works of professional socialisation, those of Merton et al. (1968) and Becker et al. (1970), utilise these when studying the medical profession. Merton et al. (1957) can be seen to use the Functionalist tradition while the Becker et al. study broadly adopted an interactionist approach. As a result the picture painted by these studies regarding student medics’ lives differed markedly. Merton (1968) describes student culture as comprising a ‘little society’ in which professional norms of the faculty are reflected and enforced while the Becker et al. (1961) study saw the student culture almost as ‘an underground
resistance movement’ (Anderson-Gough et al. 1998, p. 23), in which students unite against a hostile and threatening environment. The Becker et al. (1961) study demonstrated how the two central concepts of the medical practice, the value of experience and that of responsibility, were held differentially by staff and students in the medical hierarchy of the hospital. The worlds of medical student and qualified physician are not the same and the meaning either group attaches to notions of responsibility and experience therefore differ. Such perceptions clearly had major significance to the training of neophyte doctors.

Studies of professional socialisation investigate the nature of professions and highlight how individuals are shaped into becoming members of those particular professions, via experience, education and induction. Contained within professional socialisation is the experience and impact of organisational environment which is particular to each profession. Formal procedures such as recruitment, appraisal and training and the informal advice and observation of others provide the newcomer with information on how to behave and give rise to situations in which existing members of the organisation may attempt to shape the behaviour and values of the newcomer. Feldman (1981) located socialisation in three temporal phases and outlines some of the important aspects which pertain to aspiring professionals. These phases are:

- anticipatory (i.e., experiences and values acquired prior to joining an organization)
- encounter (i.e., when an individual starts to get a “true” picture of the organization) and change
- acquisition (i.e., where the socialisation process can be seen to have led to long lasting and satisfactory change).

Accepting that these three phases point to some of the demands put upon the neophyte professional, Feldman (1981) offers a warning, when stating “recruits will resist attempts to change their values and attitudes when their sense of self control and self-determination is threatened” (p. 314). Organisations differ in their respect of values and operating procedures and the diverse nature of such environments consequently will have differential impacts on the new members who are being socialised. Often new members are confronted by the phenomenon known as ‘reality shock’ by which is meant the difficulties experienced in making the transition from school to work. Anderson-Gough et al. (1998) suggest that this is indeed “a shift from
idealism to cynicism” (p. 28) and highlight the suggestion coming from the Becker studies of how neophyte medical students “soon forget their idealistic views about medicine and adopt an approach that focuses on doing whatever it takes to get through medical school (p. 26). The analogy with the coach who has to submit to the certification process of gaining his/her badges is clear and the reality of everyday working as a coach might reflect a gradual increase in cynicism in an attempt at survival. Certainly in professional football this is commonly reported. Examples of such are also given by Harper (1988) with accountants and Eisenschmidt (2010) when demonstrating how neophyte teachers learn their roles.

Development of professionals

Many studies have been conducted in the social sciences, especially in psychology and education, related to the various ways in which individuals learn to become professionals. As the more specific aspects of coach learning will be dealt with in Chapter 3 (Coaching) only the more informal areas of general professional development will be discussed in this chapter. Each professional organization will have its own, unique, set of formal entry requirements, such as having the necessary academic background (a medical degree or an accountancy degree for example) though these are too diverse to discuss here.

a) Reflective Practice (RP)

Definitions

A number of useful definitions of reflective practice (RP) appear in the literature. According to Niven, Knowles and Gilbourne (2004), RP is a process that helps applied practitioners, such as sport psychologists, explore decisions and experiences that aid understanding of their practice. It has become well established in such professions as nursing (Morley, 2007; O’Connor, Hyde & Treacy, 2003), management and sport coaching (e.g. Cropley & Hanton, 2012, Gilbourne & Richardson, 2006; Knowles, Cropley, Huntley & Miles 2014). Though often reported in mainly positive terms, Martindale and Collins (2005) urge caution by stating “there is still further need for clarification as to what we should actually be reflecting on (i.e. the content of the reflection rather than the process) and crucially the criteria against
which we are to reflect” (p. 311). Anderson, Miles, Mahoney and Robinson (2002) suggest that reflective practice can be described as:

- technical (addressing standards or competencies)
- practical (exploring personal meaning in a situation)
- critical (examining how social, political and economic factors constrain action)

Clearly it has the potential to empower both the reflector and the group with whom s/he engages. However, it is noteworthy that different circumstances are likely to require different types of reflection and it is not a question of which type is superior more which type is most appropriate in the circumstances. According to Thompson (2009, p. 58), “A reflective practitioner is a worker who is able to use experience, knowledge and theoretical perspectives to guide and inform practice”. He spoke about the ‘messy situations’ that workers (professionals) encounter which do not come from clearly defined problems but which the professional has to deal with. Thus, as Schon (1987) alludes, reflective practice involves cutting one’s cloth to suit the specific circumstances in which one is engaged. In an editorial in the Journal of Reflective Practice (2011) the editor, T, Ghaye, defined reflective practice thus:

“the term reflective practice conveys meanings that range from questioning of presuppositions and assumptions, through to more explicit engagement in the process of critical and creative thinking in order to make connections between experience and learning in practice and practical action. The process of reflecting for, in and on action makes it possible to change our current understanding of action by framing the issue or encounter in a novel or different way. It is a continuous relationship between action and the reflection process. It allows one to critique taken-for-granted assumptions and opens up different pathways for inquiry. Crucially, then, reflection is a reviewing practice, taking time to step and to ponder the meaning of what has happened, the impact of it and the direction one is taking.” (p. 584).

According to Clegg, Tan and Saeidi (2002), RP is at the heart of many professional development programmes in the UK. Though citing other authors, such as Eraut (1994) as offering some criticism of Schon’s approach, they believe that its implementation in such professional areas as nursing, social work and initial teacher training has led to “reflective practice taking on the veneer of educational orthodoxy”
They believe, in spite of some qualms about the rigor of the concept, that RP should acknowledge the ‘artistry’ in teaching. Coldron and Smith (1999) go as far as saying it provides a philosophical bastion to the technicism of recent policy debates. Based on what they describe as Schon’s intention to promote debate about learning, Clegg and Saeidi (1999) suggest that such an approach provides two challenges – what do educators actually do and how can such practice be theoretically based? However, the procedure is not so straightforward. Though there is increasing theorising about RP, it has been argued by Tomlinson (1999a, 1999b), that many teachers fail to confirm the views of practice suggested by Schon, and often hold on to the belief in the value of practical immersion in the task at hand and deny that they actually engage in reflecting on their actions. Clegg and Saeidi. (1999) believe that “in getting on and practising their craft, teachers and other professionals may in fact be improving their performance” (p.133) without in a sense doing it in a way traditional reflection may suggest. They go further and state that “when academics are exhorted to become reflective practitioners as measured by their capacity to produce a reflective practice assignment, not all choose to do so” (1999, p. 133) and choose other methods and responses to support their practical development.

**Forms of Reflection**

Increasingly applied sport psychologists (ASPs) in the UK have become accountable for the evaluation and development of their professional practice (Cropley et al., 2010a, 2010b; Martindale & Collins 2005). Such bodies as the British Association for Sport and Exercise Sciences (BASES), The British Psychological Society Division of Sport and Exercise Psychology have recently endeavoured to ensure that “both neophytes and professionals develop knowledge through engagements in processes of experiential learning” (Cropley & Hanton, 2012, p. 307). The former logical-positivistic based knowledge is now assumed not to be sufficient to provide practitioners with enough tools for effective practice and a number of writers have suggested that there is a need to draw on a more knowledge-in-action approach, which has also been known as practice-based (Cropley et al., 2010a), tacit (Anderson et al., 2004) and craft knowledge (Knowles and Gilbourne, 2010). Learning from experience is not necessarily a given and it is essential that experience has to be examined, analysed and considered in order to shift it to knowledge (Cropley &
Hanton, 2012) and this suggest that one process that has increasingly been shown to be effective in this matter is RP. They proceed to suggest that such a practice might be especially helpful for neophyte applied sport psychologist and believe that experienced practitioners can also benefit from such a method. Trelfa and Telfer (2014, p. 48), in a very wide ranging definition, believe that RP is “a process through which practitioners individually, and their communities of practice, consider, explore and develop their craft, skills and knowledge alongside a deepening appreciation of intuition (Atkinson & Claxton, 2000), improvisation (Harris, 2012), and set within a context and purpose of professional agency, understanding, knowledge and change”.

Focussing on teacher education, Al-Issa and Al-Bulushi (2010) describe three forms of reflection:

- Firstly, describing and reporting events and providing reasons for justifying their occurrence and seeking best practice. Hall (1997) terms this form of reflection as ‘random’ and ‘descriptive’ and considers it to be the lowest level of reflection.

- The second is deliberate or what Strampel and Oliver (2007) call ‘dialogic’, and is concerned with re-evaluating experience using prior knowledge to critically analyse a situation. “Dialogic occurs when students take a step back while considering, exploring and judging prior knowledge and the current situation or experience to create possible solutions” (Strampel & Oliver, 2007, p. 975).

- The third form, locating learning in the wider social, economic and cultural context, is considered by Hall (1997) to be the most critical, as it attempts to see “students at this level reach deeper levels of learning and develop an ability to evaluate and/or judge .......which leads them to make decisions about the necessity of change in action” (Al-Issa & Al-Bulushi, 2010, p. 42).

Picknell, Cropley, Hanton and Mellalieu (2014) discuss the relationship between RP and expertise when stating “The relationship between reflection and expertise stems from Schon’s influential work within the education literature where he noted that practitioners make judgements and decisions based largely on knowledge in action (otherwise referred to as tacit knowledge)” (p. 28). According to Schon (1983), professionals were able to develop their knowledge-in action which he termed
professional artistry’ from “their diverse range of practical experiences following engagement in two distinct learning processes – reflection-in-action (takes place during the situation) and reflection-on-action (takes place following the completion of an event)” (Picknell et al., 2014, p. 28). More recently, Grant (2016, p. 49) has described reflection-in-action as “an essential tool in the development of coaching experience” and suggests that note taking by coaches during the coaching conversation can help develop the coach’s skills in this area. It would appear, therefore, that there are two major factors that have led to the adoption of reflection as a practice to support professional development in sport and exercise circles – firstly, the professionalization and increased accountability of sport professionals and, secondly, criticisms, often voiced, as to the inappropriateness of those courses that are formally endorsed by professional bodies, who are meant to prepare practitioners for the real world of their sporting environments.

As yet the justification for the wholesale adoption of such reflective practices in sport is primarily based on theoretical and anecdotal reports. This has resulted in what Picknell et al., (2014) state as “a paradox for advocates who contend that reflective practice ‘should work’, based on logical theoretical reasoning, yet are unable to conclusively demonstrate whether it ‘actually works’, with empirically supported evidence” (p. 29). Similar concerns have been voiced in other professions such as nursing (e.g., Peden-McAlpine, et al., 2005; Ruth-Salad, 2005); medical professions (e.g., Mamede, Schmidt & Penafort, 2008; Prenton, Dughill & Hollingsworth, 2014) and health sciences (e.g., Duke & Appleton, 2000; Mann et al., 2009; Tate & Mills, 2002). This points to the need to guard against accepting reflective practice as a universally accepted methodology without consideration of its proven validity.

Fleming (2007), writing about health promotion professionals, defines reflection as “the ability to gain understanding by reflecting on specific issues in practice through critically contextualizing, observing and analysing to generate new knowledge and insights which can enhance practice” (p. 658). He goes on to state that reflection in the practice of such professions as academia, health professions and education are largely directed at practice by individuals at specific time points while reflections “on the practice at the meso and micro levels have been less documented” (p. 659). Reflection, he points out, “can be considered to be a process of reasoned thought which enables a critical assessment of both ‘self’ as a professional and
‘practice’, as an agent of change through realignments in power” (p. 659). Thus, reflection can be used as a tool to facilitate professionals to assess beliefs, values and approaches to practice. As Moon (1999) points out, that while the words ‘critical reflection’, ‘reflective practice’ and ‘reflection’ are often used synonymously, reflection should be considered as a concept which is the basis for reflective practice. Thus the concept of reflective practice is at the core of experiential learning.

Schon’s views on reflection (1983, 1987) are based on technical rationality where theory is perceived from two perspectives: firstly, espoused theory, which arises from formal professional engagement and is the ‘official’ theory which informs professional practices. Secondly, ‘theories in use’ are generated from every day professional life and circumstances which in fact reflect the ‘real life’ of the professional. Fleming (2007) argues that the dissonance between these two approaches can produce a sense of crisis for the professional (he uses the term ‘praxis’ in distinguishing between theory and practice) and can lead to two different forms of reflection - reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action. The former suggesting that the professional is able to ‘think on his/her feet’ while the latter ‘is the ability to consider the process and outcomes of any particular element of practice’.

b) Mentoring

Though the activity of mentoring has increasingly become more accepted as part of professional development in recent years in many of the professions, this section will deal mainly with explaining what it might be and how it has impacted primarily on teachers and sports coaches. Mentoring has been defined by Hobson, Ashby, Malderez and Tomlinson (2009, p. 207) as “the one-to-one support for a novice or less experienced practitioner (mentee) by a more experienced practitioner (mentor), designed primarily to assist in the development of the mentee’s expertise and facilitate their induction into the culture of a profession.....and into the specific local context of that profession”. Since the late 1980s in education, school based mentoring has come to play an increasingly prominent role in supporting the initial preparation, induction and early professional development of teachers in many parts of the world (Hobson et al., 2009). It seems that issues pertaining to difficulties aspiring teachers face once they engage in their initial teaching experiences are not uncommon. Patrick (2013), using an Australian sample in her work, suggested there are “persistent
problems with professional experience” (p. 207) and pointed to the need for an improvement in teacher education in order to develop a sustainable and high quality teaching professional. A great deal of the evidence in the literature is derived from the United States though these studies often rely on practices “known as the Professional Development School Model for university/school partnerships” (Patrick, 2013, p. 208). In Australia, however, matters are rather different and she cites Le Cornu (2012) in proposing that mentoring relationships are more commonly an administrative partnership and “tends to involve an apprenticeship model whereby pre-service teachers observe mentoring teacher practice and perform in ways that the mentor, as assessor, consider appropriate” (p. 208). The inherent dangers of such a model are numerous and there is clearly a power imbalance between mentor and mentee as well as there being a possibility of education practices merely reproducing themselves rather than there being any challenge and consequently, innovation of practice.

Some years ago Zeichner and Gore (1990) argued for a change in the approaches to the practice of professional experience in education. They argue that supervision is often uneven, low priority is often given to professional experience in schools and often there is a discrepancy in the role of teacher as a reflective practitioner or technician. In Britain, as well as Australia, there have been, recently, calls for a rethinking of the traditional apprenticeship model in favour of more collaborative processes and enhanced partnerships between universities and schools. As the prime purpose of relationships between pre-service teachers, tutors, universities and schools is the enhancement of the student’s learning, Patrick (2013) believes that “A commitment to collaboration and reciprocity through learning communities of teachers, pre-service teachers and university staff is critical for high quality learning experiences” (p. 209).

A clear distinction needs to be made between mentoring and supervision though clearly the roles are often combined at times and can be problematical. Supervision is normally seen as a more traditional, hierarchical relationship. Mentoring is usually seen as reciprocal and where the personal and professional outcomes for the mentee are at the forefront of the interaction. Irby (2012) believes that increasing pressures from government policies regarding such matters as accountability can endanger the collaborative relationship between mentor and mentee. To date there seems to be little research that has examined the points of view
of mentors and mentees about how teacher and pre-service teacher roles in professional experience interact.

Learning during professional experience can be fraught depending to a large extent on how the relationship between mentee and mentor progresses. The pre-service teacher has little power when undergoing training and such an imbalance can have a direct impact on the student’s learning to the point where conflicts can arise. Phelan, Sawa, Barlow, Hurlock et al. (2008) go as far as talking about ‘the silencing of the pre-service teacher’s voice’ which could result in teaching practice being compromised. Axford (2005) in discussing tensions that can arise in the mentor-mentee relationship due to the political and ethical dimensions of their professional experience relationships, believes that pre-service teachers “are caught in the minimal space between student and practitioner and spend considerable energy negotiating that space, often unconsciously ‘playing the game’ in order to be assessed favourably” (p. 88). Almost certainly such incidents occur in other professions where the lines between mentor as assessor or supportive colleague are not always clearly defined. Keogh, Dole and Hudson (2006) further examined the difficulties of proper collaboration by focusing on the way that teachers are seen as ‘experts’ while beginning teachers are seen as ‘novices’. The unidirectional element of the relationship is thus seen as the dominant model and collaboration and reciprocity do not always follow. Clearly collaboration is extremely important for beginner teachers moving into a profession and this would seem crucial in any profession wishing to maintain and, indeed, enhance its integrity.

There is limited agreement on what constitutes good mentoring practice. Gibson (2004), in a review of mentoring practice in business and industry, found no consistent definition of mentoring or descriptions of the mentor’s role or functions. Parsloe and Wray (2000) believe that there were almost as many definitions of mentoring as there were coaches, mentors or tutors. They cite the existence of ‘corporate mentors’ who act as advisors at various stages in someone’s career. They also state ‘qualification mentors’ are required by professional associations to help a candidate through a programme of study and ‘community mentors’ who are more likely to act as friends or expert advisors. Potential definitions abound where a mentor can be seen as a supporter, a guide, an experienced person who shares his/her expertise with a younger neophyte, a mixture of parent and peer or where an
experienced ‘pro’ willingly shares relevant experiences with another in a collaborative and trusting fashion to help develop an individual’s practice. Jones, Harris and Miles (2009) are univocal in their belief that no matter which definition one takes it seems undeniable that again and again words such as ‘support’, ‘guide’, ‘helper’ and ‘enabler’ are usually at the fore. Perhaps the definition offered by Roberts (2000) should be well considered as it covers many of the expressions just made. He sees mentoring as a “formalised process whereby a more knowledgeable and experienced person adopts a supportive role of overseeing and encouraging reflection and learning with a less experienced and knowledgeable person so as to facilitate that person’s career and personal development” (p. 162). Jones et al. (2009) believed that by utilising such a view of mentoring “it can be seen as doing something with as opposed to a trainee – it is an investment in total personal growth of the individual” (p. 269).

**Mentoring in nursing**

In the study by Jones et al. (2009) the authors examine the area of mentoring in various professions and outline the recent developments of mentoring in the nursing profession. “The catalyst here was the ‘Fitness for Practice’ (FFP) curriculum set up by the UK Central commission for Nursing and Midwifery Education aimed at measuring students’ competence to practice effectively” (p. 269). It was felt that students in the nursing profession needed to be supported in both clinical practice and education to facilitate their learning. The personal tutor role, often used in universities in the UK became redefined as a mentoring role and Hughes (2004) suggests that its basic aim was to “strengthen students’ theoretical knowledge, while ensuring that they were fit for practice” (cited in Jones et al., 2009, p. 269). Such an approach had its problems. Definitions of what constituted mentoring, type of mentoring (one-to-one or even E-mentoring) led to confusion. However, according to Byrne and Keefe (2002), many students believed they had a positive benefit from mentoring and consistently rated themselves more effective and supportive than those who had not been mentored. Both Chenoweth and Lo (2001) and Theobald and Mitchell (2002) reported that students believed that mentoring alleviated the stress often associated with the transition to practice for graduate nurses, while it also helped in the development of their professional growth. The time given to, and frequency of, mentoring beginning nurses seem to have been extensive. Busen and Engebretson (1999) coined the term
‘precepting’ where “the preceptor facilitates the students’ clinical learning, acts as a role model, promotes role socialization, encourages independence and promotes self-confidence” (p.2). Jones et al. (2009) suggest that this approach models the apprenticeship or competency approach that exists elsewhere though the roles of mentor and preceptor are often overlapping and not always directly comparable.

- Yoder (1990) defined mentoring in nursing as having three critical attributes (i.e., a structured role, an organisational role and a career developmental relationship) although Stewart and Krueger (1996) suggest that there could be at least a number of other characteristics of the mentoring role.

Though the picture of mentoring in nurses initially looks positive it is obvious that there can be individual and even systemic differences that are common in other professions, such as toxic personal relationships. Busen and Engebretson (1999) even go as far as saying that it is possible to describe such negative aspects of mentoring in nursing in terms of three metaphors:

- The ‘sculptor’ which would seem to have its origins in older models of childrearing and emphasises how parents might want to mould their child in ways that might not allow the child enough freedom to develop their own ideas.

- The ‘show-biz mom’ also takes its example from parenting where the child is perceived as helpless and in a submissive role and the child becomes an extension of a parent (usually the mother).

- Finally the ‘master-slave metaphor’ where the mentor is in a position of total power and controls the experience of his/her protégé. This is seen as the most abusive and toxic form of relationships. Here the superior, in a position of unchallenged power, totally controls the experience of the protégé (Busen and Engebretson, 1999). The mentees are given too much help and direction and are generally not allowed to struggle through problems or even experience failure, thus inhibiting the mentee’s learning.

**Mentoring in education**

Mentoring has been a long established practice in education. Jones et al., (2009) state that the idea of experienced teachers mentoring new teachers at the beginning of their careers is often done in collaboration with universities, in order “to
scaffold neophytes’ developing competencies” (p. 271). There appears to be a three-way partnership between pre-service teacher, mentor and university where the importance of theoretical knowledge and practical experience are valued. Thus, mentors would appear to have a critical role in such dialogues. Fletcher (2000) discusses a mentor’s remit and, along with other writers (Furlong, 2013; Cassidy, Jones & Potrac, 2004) points to the importance of such factors as exploring the personal dimensions and related anxieties of novice teachers, assisting with the integration of new ‘members of staff’ into a school and providing a wide range of guidance to the new teacher. They saw giving direct support for a neophyte’s teaching practice to be important and suggested possible alternative strategies for teaching within a supportive environment. Encouraging new teachers to actively, if empathetically, challenge their practice as s/he moves through their career paths, was also deemed to be a valuable activity. Fletcher (2000) also believes this will force teachers to constantly evaluate their performance. Though mentors themselves have been shown to derive some benefits from their mentoring activities (Wright & Smith, 2000), the asymmetrical relationship between mentor and mentee almost certainly is done from different power perspectives. Echoing similar concerns regarding mentoring in nursing, Beck and Kosinik (2002) believed that mentoring in education environments, often has negative aspects and can at times lead to an imposition of a conservative agenda on the mentee and at times can even be ‘hurtful’, a view reinforced by other writers in this area (Maguire 2001; Young et al., 2005). This would seem to point to the importance of the individual personal relationship between mentee and mentor being somewhat harmonious as well as the necessity of a proper examination of the role of a mentor within a school administration system. For instance, do they get paid extra for such a role or are they given appropriate time to engage in such an activity as well as carrying out their normal teacher roles? Lack of either of these things may lead to dissatisfaction on the mentor’s part, with consequent deleterious knock-on effects to the relationship with the mentee.

Much has been written about mentoring models and Jones et al. (2009) suggest that perhaps the three most relevant ones include the apprenticeship model, competency model and reflective practitioner model.

- The Apprenticeship Model assumes that the mentor’s role is to provide a model for the neophyte to emulate, similar to the precept model in nursing.
Criticism of such an approach points to the assumed inability of the experienced teacher to support the neophyte teacher as well as the possibility that the mentee become a clone of the mentor and even creative thinking by the mentee could be stifled.

- The Competency Model differs little from the Apprenticeship model and is based on the assumption that teaching involves developing a specific set of competencies (Geen, 2002). This model implies that the mentor acts as a sort of coach or trainer who observes the mentee during practice and suggests ways of improving. Critics often suggest that teaching cannot be so easily broken down into a set series of tasks or proficiencies.

- The Reflective Practitioner Model is based on the idea of personal reflection and analysis and all professionals, not just mentees, are encouraged to question their own practice and what reasons they may have for undertaking such. Reflection has become a massive growth area in research though there are some criticisms of the model from the point of view of mentees. Tann (1994) pointed out that mentees often want their mentors to offer opinions on their teaching rather than present questions that encourage self-reflection and Drever and Cope (1999) found that reflection was the far less favoured model of mentoring.

When discussing the issues commonly expressed by new teachers on entering the profession, Ingersoll and Strong (2011) found that teachers did not have the kind of support programmes found in both blue collar and white collar occupations. They suggest that often such induction procedures, where they do exist, are often haphazard and incoming teachers are often left on their own to sink or swim in the confines of the classroom, in isolation from colleagues. Lortie (1975) even described such experiences as a kind of trial by fire. Though many occupations suffer from the issue of newcomers leaving, often over very short periods of time, the attrition rate in teaching profession is often quite high in relation to other professions such as lawyers, engineers, architects, nurses and pharmacists (Ingersoll, 2003). It can be even higher within students in their first year of teaching (Ingersoll & Strong, 2011). Of even greater concern is the fact stated by Ingersoll and May (2011), that large numbers of teachers depart long before retirement and lack of support is often seen as a prime cause of this.
Induction, fundamentally, seeks to attend to the idea that as teaching is a very complex activity, teacher preparation rarely is sufficient to provide all the knowledge and skills necessary for successful teaching. Induction programmes are meant to address such issues and there is some evidence from writers such as Ingersoll and Strong (2011), Feiman-Nemser (2001) and Ganser (2002) who believe that as a significant amount of teacher learning can only be accessed while on the job it is the duty and role of schools to structure environmental support systems where novices can learn their craft, survive and succeed as teachers. Zey (1984) utilised social exchange theory to highlight the importance of a mutual benefits model whereby individuals enter into and remain part of relationships to meet certain needs, so long as both parties benefit from the interaction. Thus, there are a variety of different ways in which schools might design their induction process so that these are suitable for the individual school context. Writers such as Fideler and Haselkorn (1999) and Strong (2009), suggest that teacher mentoring programmes should play a large part in any induction procedures, and believe that at times the words ‘induction’ and ‘mentoring’ are often used, erroneously or in an interchangeable way. Ingersoll and Strong (2011) however, point out that one of the major issues for schools in providing detailed induction and even mentoring programmes, is that in the light of a significant portion of new teachers leaving the profession, as they may see it as “a temporary line of work and plan to leave soon…the investment in human capital will be lost to the school” (p. 204).

Haggarty and Postlethwaite (2012) describe how initial teacher education (ITE) became a major ideological struggle in the UK between the government and others who had a vested interest in the professional formation of teachers. Richards, Harding and Webb (1997) believed that the government wanted a “cadre of skilled technicians to deliver the National Curriculum programmes of study in an effective and efficient way” (p. 6). It became clear that the government’s view of teaching and those actively involved in education had quite different perceptions about the very nature of teaching. The impression given was that government believed that “it is well known which teaching approaches and strategies ‘work’ and make clear prescriptions for teachers’ practice” (Calderhead, 2001, p. 780). However, the educational establishment in general may have held a different view believing that teachers were involved in a complex activity and needed to respond to the competing demands of the
students with whom they were engaged. Openly stating that the government was extremely powerful in shaping ITE practices in England, Haggarty and Postlethwaite (2012) cite Furlong et al. (2000, pp.148-149) as saying “In the course of the past 15 years, the system has been moved from one of diversity and autonomy to one of homogeneity and central control. What the government and particularly the TTA (the Teacher Training Agency) had wanted was a common system with common standards and procedures no matter who was providing the training or where: this was how the TTA defined quality. By the end of the 1990s this had been largely achieved”. This dichotomy of perceptions saw the government’s view of efficient curriculum delivery take the place of “risky attempts at interactively supporting pupil learning” (Edwards and Prothero, 2003, p. 239).

Of the various models of teacher training evolved in the 1980s and onwards that of reflective practice (Schon, 1987) began to attain a position of prominence. RP requires that a task of teaching be planned, enacted, evaluated and then reconceptualised for the undertaking of subsequent tasks. However, Moore and Ash (2002) point out that reflection can be problematic for beginning teachers and has been challenged and extended by a growing number of writers, such as Edwards, Gilroy and (2002), the sociological approach of Bourdieau and Passeron (1990), by aspects of Vygotskian social constructivism (Vitgosky, 1978) and by Hodgkinson and Hodgkinson’s (2005) broader cultural model of learning. Haggarty and Postlethwaite (2012) expand upon two main concepts deriving from Bourdieu’s work – ‘habitus’ and ‘field’. Habitus is defined by James and Bloomer (2001, p. 5) as “a durable set of dispositions representing the physical and mental embodiment of the social but at the same time offering choices”. It points to the importance of individual histories and the social context on what the individual will see as possible in a learning situation in relation to their initial training. Haggarty and Postlethwaite (2012) argue that this would include how a neophyte teacher would see the task of teaching, their expectations of what learning to teach would involve and what they felt was their motivation for wishing to become a teacher. Clearly a wide variety of factors will impact on a student’s habitus - gender, class, ethnicity - as well as their previous history as learners, in a broad sense. Equally, student educators and school mentors would each have their own habitus which will inevitably impact on the learning of the young teacher.
James and Bloomer (2001, p. 5) explain the concept of ‘field’ as “a structured system of social relationship at micro and macro level rather like a field of forces in which positions are defined relationally, that is, in relation to each other”. Implicit in such a concept in terms of teacher education is the inevitable question of power imbalance between tutor and student, mentor and mentee which could impact directly on student learning. The notion of ‘field’ also includes the wider aspects of such things as institutional expectations and the impact institutions will have, perhaps in terms of policies, resource management, assessment procedures, on the student teacher.

Haggarty and Posthlethwaite (2012) point out that the notion of ‘habitus’ “identifies the student as a key player in their own learning” (p. 266), a view which resonates with Vygotsky’s (1962) social constructivist view of learning (elaborated on by Coles et al., 1978) which acknowledges the importance of the individuals who are engaged in the learning process. In addition there are three crucial aspects to this approach – the importance of knowledgeable others; the cognitive and physical tools available to the student learner and the differing motives that the relevant actors on the student’s learning process bring to the joint enterprise. Taken together with the notion of ‘field’ it is clear that student learning is an individual exercise supported by others in a bigger socio-cultural context which will directly impact on the student’s learning.

**Mentoring in Business**

The prime difference between mentoring in education and business seems to be that the focus in education is generally on the development of the person while in business it tends to be focused on organisational outcomes. Though widely used in business these days mentoring can be seen as “a highly effective way of ramping up an employee’s performance” (Jones et al, 2009). At times businesses make use of a sort of ‘reverse mentoring’ approach, whereby a younger member of an organisation, who could possess considerably more knowledge, might be a mentor to an older colleague. Though acceptable theoretically this can prove less straightforward in practice. Klasen and Clutterbuck (2002) discuss the use of ‘peer mentoring’ whereby new employees are matched with a peer mentor for the first few months in a job, a sort of ‘help in getting to know the ropes affair’. It seems that such an arrangement can help the new staff member locate a first point of contact in a new and often stressful situation. Garvey and Alred (2001) found that such mentoring helps newcomers to tolerate the
ambiguity of new situations and helps them remain effective. However, a number of writers have pointed to possible negative aspects of such peer mentoring (Eby and Lockwood, 2005) though these are often similar to many of the reports which focus on normal interpersonal relationship difficulties inherent in mentoring approaches no matter which model might be utilised. While much of the business mentoring research largely has a positive take on the model, Yoder (1990) believes that this could really just be ‘rose coloured’ with a fine line being drawn between mentor and tormentor. Scandura (1998) spoke about toxic mentors, toxic mentees and toxic environments. There seems to be a more recent development to accentuate a triadic model of mentoring in business – organisation, mentor and mentee which could be derived from the shortage of senior mentors, making dyadic mentoring therefore much more demanding.

**Continuing Professional development (CPD)**

Day and Sachs (2004) state that continuing professional development (CPD) is “a term to describe all the activities in which teachers engage during the course of their career which are designed to enhance their work. Yet this is a deceptively simple description of a hugely complex intellectual and emotional endeavour which is at the heart of raising and maintaining standards of teaching, learning and achievement in a range of schools each of which poses its own set of special challenges” (p. 3). Wholesale post Second World War changes in economic, social and knowledge contexts have impacted on the educational service (in the UK and elsewhere) which inevitably has led to a move away from the previous autonomous professional in which decisions about teaching, learning and assessment were regarded as the business of teachers. The state has increasingly sought to impose standards of achievement and teaching and attempted to actively intervene to control such development not just with neophyte teachers but throughout a teacher’s career. Such attempts to enhance accountability and ‘performativity’ (Day & Sachs, 2004, p. 4) have been demonstrated across the world with many governments attempting to take a more hands on approach to controlling professionals. Consequently, CPD is no longer seen as an option but a necessity. However, the implementation of such programmes throughout the world follow different courses depending on such factors as economic growth, political stability and cultural needs are common. Day and Sachs (2004)
believe that there are two main, and distinctive, approaches that currently dominate educational policy regarding the development of teacher professionalism: managerial professionalism and democratic professionalism. Day, Calderhead and Denicolo (1996) argue that the call for greater teacher professionalism is in fact a revisioning of occupational identity which, with fewer resources being directed at education (in the UK) there has been an increased workload, a lessening of public confidence and increased surveillance by politicians who are more demanding in their wish to control professions in general. Day and Sachs (2004) believe that, paradoxically these changes in educational policy and practice "bring into focus the importance of the role that communities of practice (CoPs) has in the development and renewal of the teaching profession" (p. 5). According to Day and Sachs (2004), the version of professionalism that now dominates policy documents mandated by the state can be described as ‘managerial professionalism’ (p.5). They cite Brennan (1996, p. 22) in their explanation of this approach:

“A professional who clearly meets corporate goals, set elsewhere, manages a range of students and documents their achievements and problems for public accountability purposes. The criteria of the successful professional in this corporate model is (sic) one who works efficiently and effectively in meeting the standardised criteria set for the accomplishments of both students and teachers as well as contributing to the school’s formal accountability procedures”.

In contrast, the second discourse is democratic professionalism. Apple (1996) sees this as an approach that seeks to demystify professional work and build alliances between teachers and excluded constituencies of students and members of the community on whose behalf decisions have traditionally been made either by professions or by the state. It emphasises collaborative, cooperative action between teachers and other education stakeholders and believes that the teacher has a wider role in contributing to the overall school system and should not be restricted merely to a classroom role. Both of these forms of professionalism seek to improve the performance and skills of teachers and consequently, of students. “It is just a matter of how each goes about doing this and more importantly perhaps who has control of the process that is crucially important” (Day & Sachs, 2004, p. 7). In terms of teachers’ professional development the managerial approach directly contrasts that of
democratic professionalism. Day and Sachs (2004) firmly believe that “advocates of each of these kinds of professionalism are often at loggerheads with each other because unions and other professional bodies champion democratic professionalism while systems and employers advocate managerial professionalism” (p. 6). Bolam and McMahon (2004, p. 33) state that there are several terms in the literature that relate to CPD practices such as, ”staff development, in-service education and training (INSET), professional development, human resource development, teacher development, continuing education and lifelong learning. Unfortunately, these terms often have overlapping meanings and are defined very differently by different writers”. Day (1997, p. 4) proposes a working definition of professional development in teachers thus:

“Professional development consists of all natural learning experiences and those conscious and planned activities which are intended to be of direct or indirect benefit to the individual, group or school and which contribute to the quality of education in the classroom. It is the process by which alone and with others, teachers review, renew and extend their commitment as change agents to moral purposes of teaching, and by which they acquire and develop critically the knowledge, skills and emotional intelligence essential to good professional thinking, planning and practice with children, young people and colleagues through each phase of their teaching lives”.

Though not unproblematic, this definition does indicate the areas in which culturally relevant and individually focused CPD programmes might be targeted. Opfer and Pedder (2011) quote the OECD (2009) report that found that teachers’ continuing professional development had become a major focus within school reform and school improvement literatures because of “the belief that student learning and success are due, in large part, to the effectiveness of teachers” (p. 3). Thus, the provision of more effective learning activities for teachers, both within schools and related environments is crucial. It is suggested by Opfer and Pedder (2011) that professional teacher development has for too long been piecemeal and unsystematic and too much emphasis is placed on teachers to select their own professional development pathways. Day and Leith (2007) and Loxley et al. (2007) argue that professional development is more effective in improving teachers' knowledge and skills if there is a coherent programme, especially those focussing on academic subject
matter and when teachers are given the opportunity to integrate such practices in their daily work in schools. However, despite the growing awareness and expansion of professional development programmes “most professional development remains traditional in form, less than a week’s duration, increasingly focused on content but with little opportunity for active learning” (Opfer & Pedder, 2011, p. 5). Pedder and MacBeath (2008) suggested that clarity of direction, school wide systems of support for CPD, promoting networking and social capital resources as important organisational conditions for fostering high quality CPD activities. Opfer and Pedder (2011) follow this argument by stating that if professional development is going to improve teaching and learning then “we must attend to three aspects of teacher professional learning: the characteristics of the professional teacher, the characteristics of the professional development activities in which they participate, and the support for professional learning provided by the school” (p. 6). The Opfer and Pedder (2011) study was part of the larger piece of work which was commissioned by the Teacher and Development Agency for Schools (in the UK). It specifically examined the interaction of achievement and professional learning. One major finding was that “Few teachers in England experience the kind of professional learning environments that are associated with improved learning (both for themselves and their pupils). Without both school-level capacity and coherence for teachers’ learning, the usefulness of professional development as a mechanism for school improvement is being lost” (Opfer & Pedder, p. 22).

Gaikhorst et al. (2015) found that a number of studies have shown that professional development programmes can improve teacher quality and believed that it would enhance teacher retention. Citing the work of Gilles, Davis, and MacGlamery (2009) they showed that teachers who participated in professional development programmes remained in the profession longer than those who did not participate in such programmes. However, though there is general agreement regarding the importance of such programmes there is very little agreement as to which form of programme is most effective. “There is a growing consensus that programmes situated in the workplace are more effective than those situated outside the workplace” (Gaikhorst et al., 2015, p. 43). In addition, actual content seems more relevant than the form of the programme. Further, it appeared that programmes that primarily focus on classroom practice are more efficacious. Angelides, Stylianou and Leigh (2007) found
that teacher networks that permit the exchange of views and ideas as well as discussing personal teaching experiences appear to be promising ways for enhancing professional development of teachers. Done et al., (2011) cite Lefstein (2005) who argued that formal professional development of teachers often involves demonstration and imitation that limits opportunities for practitioners to develop their own awareness of the complexities of teaching (p. 391). They describe CPD as a long term and non-linear process and hope that involvement in such activities would not only help retention rates but would also be sensitive to the needs and aspirations of individual teachers.

d) Communities of Practice (CoPs)

Another aspect of informal learning is Wenger’s notion of “communities of practice” (CoPs), (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998a, 1998b). Wenger changed from viewing “the individual as learner to learning as participation” (Cushion, 2011, p. 174). Rovegno (2006) states that Wenger argued against a cognitive approach to learning that separates the learner from the cultural context and activity. This view of learning resonates with other authors, such as Kirk and MacDonald (1998), Armour and Yelling (2004) and Cassidy (2010a; 2010b) who emphasise the social constructivist nature of learning. Cushion & Denstone, 2011, p. 94) stated that Wenger believes that learning is a fundamentally social phenomenon “reflecting our deeply social nature as human beings capable of knowing”. He emphasised the importance of focussing on the relations between socio-cultural structure and social practice. In this way there was to be no division between body, cognition, feeling, activity and socio-cultural world. Thus, this approach emphasises learning as a social engagement where the process of being active was similar to that proposed by Lave and Wenger (1991) who utilised the concept of legitimate peripheral participation (LPP) to explain their view of learning. LPP outlined the way learners progressed from less important tasks towards more crucial, core ones, thus moving from peripheral to full or more central participation. As this unfolds the learner develops an understanding of the activity. The learner is thus engaged in a community of practice (CoP) and facilitates learning through mutual engagement in an activity” (Cushion & Denstone, 2011, p. 95). Cushion (2010) believes that Wenger’s work has “strongly influenced thinking in the field of learning across a range of domains, including
coaching (p. 66). Learners enter a community, such as when a neophyte coach, at the periphery and over time, moves closer to fuller participation as they gain knowledge within the (coaching) community. Thus, as a coach engages more and more with his/her community of practice (other coaches/athletes) they learn to understand such aspects as relevant history, traditions, standards of practice etc. Learning then among ‘peripheral participants’ can be demonstrated, for example, when a neophyte coach learns from more experienced colleagues. It resonates with ideas of professional socialisation in the development of coaches and a number of writers, Saury and Durand (1998) and Cassidy and Rossi (2006) emphasise this type of informal apprenticeship which is common in the relationship between neophyte and experienced coach. Cushion (2011) also hold the view that constant interaction with peers has been shown to be one of the best sources of learning for expert coaches.

A closely related area to CoPs is that of professional learning communities (PLC). “The concept of professional learning communities (PLC) has been embraced widely in schools as a means for teachers to engage in professional development leading to enhanced pupil learning” (Watson, 2014, p. 18). The danger is that the term has become so ubiquitous that “it is in danger of losing all meaning, or worse, of reifying ‘teacher learning’ within a narrowly defined ambit which loses sight of the essentially contestable concepts which underpin it” (Watson, 2014, p. 18). Some writers believe that professional learning communities (PLCs) have become “a means to overcome the shortcomings associated with episodic, decontextualised professional development conducted in isolation from practice” (Webster-Wright, 2009, p. 702). Stoll et al. (2006, p. 229) define a PLC as “a group of people sharing and critically interrogating their practice in an ongoing, reflective, collaborative, inclusive, learning-orientated, growth-promoting way”. The fundamental purpose behind this statement is to enhance teacher effectiveness as professionals which, ultimately, will benefit the pupils with whom they engage. Probably emerging from the wider field of ‘learning organisation’, the model has effectively developed from the relationship between working, learning and innovation in a broader context than just education.

According to Watson (2014) a learning organisation evokes a business orientation which could be seen at odds with the world of education though the growing notion of accountability and relevant funding issues and such problems are not dissimilar. However, it is clear that the actual terminology, professional, learning
communities has been contested. Chia and Holt (2006, p. 2) believe that practices are ‘social sites in which events, entities and meaning help to compose one another’ which leads Watson (2014) to state that the notion of knowledge can no longer be considered as solely belonging to individuals but “instead becomes a property of groups with their material setups” (p. 21). This leads Gherardi (2001) to state that knowledge resides in social relations and thus knowing is “part of a social habit – an idea which clearly has important implications for any considerations of the PLC” (p. 13). Further, Fendler (2004) believes that community becomes a mechanism of governance and a forum for specifying norms and rules of participation, which legitimises agencies of control. Watson (2014) also believes that the term ‘professional’ also raises questions of inclusion whether one considers a PLC as a community of professional learning or as a community in which professional learning takes place. While communities of learning will necessarily involve the participation of teachers as professionals (however this is defined) there are implications for the wider participation in PLCs and thus the implication this might have for schools. If, however, according to Watson (2014), ‘professional learning’ is understood “as a form of learning undertaken by professionals then this potentially produces tensions between the processes by and through which this learning is theorized to occur and the pedagogical practices that it gives rise to” (p. 21). Bolam et al. (2005) define an effective PLC as one which has “the capacity to promote and sustain the learning of all professionals and other staff in the school community with the collective purpose of enhancing pupil learning” (p. 30) though such a definition hides a number of difficult issues that need defining accurately. Bolam et al’s (2005) extensive review of the literature on PLCs suggested that the most important aspect of PLCs was that of ‘shared values and vision’. Other writers, such as Vescio, Ross and Adams (2008), also emphasise the importance of trust, support and openness which reflect a desire to counter the notion of “traditional understanding of teaching as a strangely solitary activity taking place behind closed doors (p. 8)” and Watson (2014, p. 22) guards against using openness as “a form of increased surveillance, a pervasive feature of schools and other work places today”. Lave and Wenger (1991) theorised that learning takes place through CoPs in workplaces, such as schools, offices etc, where there are living communities. This notion of communities of practice places knowledge and learning as situated in the individual’s own experience, be it teacher, coach or other
professional. Lave and Wenger (1991) believe that by engaging in collaboration with colleagues, teachers (and thus, presumably, other professionals) construct their own knowledge and understanding of practice. “When viewing the socialization and identity formation (of teacher educators) through the lens of communities of practice, collaboration becomes a key mechanism for teacher learning and development” (p.56).

**Developing a Professional identity**

Becoming a competent professional practitioner is closely linked with how one develops an identity in relation to the profession in which one engages. Sachs (2005) states that teacher identity is the way that people understand their own individual experience and how they act and identify with various groups. In an early attempt to examine what constitutes a ‘good teacher’, Coombs, et al. (1974) stated that there were three main approaches: teacher as “knower”; teacher as competent and finally teacher as a whole person. Over a decade later Liston and Zeichner (1991) developed a model using critical reflection with beginner teachers in urban schools in the USA to examine how teacher identity might develop. Feineman-Nemser and Schwillie (1999) examined various aspects of the induction procedures of neophyte teachers as an important aspect of their growing professional identity formation. Other theorists have proposed other models and Oshrat-Fink (2014) believes that they all are built on “a chronological framework that places the various approaches in a historical sequence, reflecting the developments that had occurred regarding the ideas of knowledge and the implications of these for defining the ideal teacher” (p.730). The general backlash against behaviourism was reflected in teacher training which began to take more account of teachers’ reflective abilities in developing the students as people in classroom settings of which behaviourism did not seem to take account (Feiman-Nemser & Schwillie 1999).

Lamote and Engels (2010) believed that when student teachers started their teacher education training, in establishing their developing teacher identities they follow a strong pupil-oriented approach to teaching. Further, it is believed that student teachers create a network that filters new information to the extent that pre-service teacher beliefs are so strong that ”they resist change during their teacher education” (Richardson, 1996; cited in Stenberg et al. (2014, p. 204). It is thus suggested that teacher educators should be aware of student teachers’ starting points in order to
support their professional development in meaningful and effective ways. The growing understanding of the role that teacher identities play in teacher development continues to increase. As Sachs (2005, p. 8) argues in the development of professional identity “teachers draw on their own experiences as a student, as a teacher, their personal and professional histories inside and outside of schools as well as the images of teachers presented in the popular media, films, fiction and so on”. It is probably similar to that which occurs with coaches when establishing their own professional identity. Stenberg et al. (2014, p. 205) quote the work of Smith and Sparkes (2008) who differentiate four aspects of identity formation:

- psycho-social (the focus is on the individual’s inner world)
- inter-subjective (the individual and social are equally important)
- a storied resource perspective (identity forms in social and cultural contexts)
- dialogical (identity develops within discourses and ongoing dialogues that are bound by social, cultural and political contexts).

Thus, there is a great deal of agreement that teacher identity is developed via an ongoing process where, through dialogue, different positions have their own voices and aims. The teacher is a” pedagogue, a dialectical professional, a subject matter specialist, a member of a school, a member of society and so on” (Stenberg et al., 2014, p. 205).

Smit, Fritz and Mabalane (2010) examined the topic of how teachers saw themselves in the context of political and social change in South Africa at the time. They adopted an activity theory which came from the cultural historical theory of Stetsenko and Arievitch (2010). They agree with other writers that the workplace of schools is, like identity itself, neither fixed nor static but “a site for intersecting networks of relationships” (p. 93). Smit et al. (2010) quote Stetsenko and Arievitch (2004) whereby “research on the self which would imply identity, has evolved toward viewing the self as being embedded within socio-cultural contexts and intrinsically interwoven with them...human development is not ‘located under the skull’ but in the process of social interaction” (p. 95). The individual identity is therefore a composite of activity in context and space. The political, cultural, economic and socio-cultural changes will clearly impact on schools and therefore on how teachers develop their identities within schools. Paraphrasing McGregor (2003), Smit et al. (2010) state that “schools have been considered bounded containers in which professional identities of
teachers are shaped by practices and social interaction” (p. 95) though argue that more recent views suggest that the schools are now recognised as more complex systems embedded within the wider socio-cultural networks.

Another commentator regarding the development of identity by teacher educators is Izadinia (2014). She thought the relevance of the findings impacted on the development of identity by teachers in general. Quoting Berger and Luckman (1991), she states that identity is a lifelong learning process shaped through social relations and process (p. 426). In a similar fashion teacher identity is shaped through the interplay between personal theories of teaching, perceptions of self and occupational contexts. Timmerman (2009) believes that professional identity has been recognised as a central process in becoming a teacher. There is a clear connection between identity and practice. Various writers such as McGregor et al. (2010), Murray (2008) and Poyas and Smith (2007) have attested to the interconnecting areas of importance to the development of identity – communities of practice, reflection and continuing professional development practices – in helping sustain and develop identity which applies across many professions and not just in teaching.

Furlong (2013) states that the late 1980s and 1990s “witnessed a burgeoning of research focussed on student teacher identity examining in the main how teacher identity is formed, its robust nature and how teacher identity influences classroom practices” (p. 68). She emphasises the point that identity is not static, nor a fixed product and it is a complex phenomenon. Teacher identity will develop as teachers progress through their careers, something that has been reinforced by such writers as Alsurp (2006), Beauchamp and Thomas (2009) and Beijaard, Meijer and Verloop (2004). Gunter (2002) believes that as an individual’s identity is not fixed at any one point in time, it is socialised and this socialising process, therefore, shapes the individual. It seems that part of the notion of the self is framed by life histories and the apprenticeship of observation (Lortie, 1975) whereby there is an inter-play between self and social setting. Sugrue (1997) believes that both the former and the latter create a system of beliefs, values and attitudes that generate the basis for student teacher identity. Self is crucial to the development of identity and Furlong (2013), quoting Bullough (1998) who argues that who you are as a person has a profound influence on what you will or will not learn in teacher education, but perhaps more importantly, it shapes what you will be as a teacher (p.69).
Mead (1934) states that crucial to the understanding of the concept of identity is the notion of the self. Self is socially constructed and is a result of numerous processes. Identity is formed by, and results from, our attitudes and beliefs about ourselves and that their origins in life experiences and its memories. Students who arrive on pre-service education courses do not come value free but bring with them ideas of teacher behaviour from observations and their life histories as students and pupils. A number of writers, such as Calderhead and Robson (1991) and Knowles and Holt-Reynolds (1991), have attested to the value and importance of such previous learning in the production of student teacher identity and the ways in which they will influence their thinking and learning. Consequently this will have a “major significance for initial teacher education” (Furlong, 2013, p. 70). Thus, neophyte student teachers will bring with them a well-defined system of knowledge relating to teaching and perhaps to subject matter beliefs.

Cross and Ndofirepi (2015) point to the importance of three factors that impinge on the development of teacher identity - the role of learning communities (CoPs), the role of teacher workplaces and formal teacher education. They also use the term ‘fictive’ which, they suggest, helps individuals makes use of imagination as part of their learning experience. In addition, workplaces appear to consolidate teacher identities as well as other social spaces. Also, the way they use personal histories, particularly critical incidents that might reinforce choices and decisions about chosen careers, such as becoming a teacher. They argue that “professional identification is not just an outcome of transposition of teaching skills or how teachers negotiate the discourses of democratic and managerial professionalism, but also a product of complex contextual processes through which meaning is negotiated” (p.110). In such ways a teacher’s identity is forged.

Viczeko and Wright (2010) examined the role played by identity formation when student teachers become teacher educators. They describe how in the socialisation process of becoming a teacher the new CoPs (Lave & Wenger, 1991: Wenger, 1998a, 1998b) have impacted on the new role identities that are central to the ongoing process of such learning to the development of a teacher. Wenger (1998a) believed that identity is formed by a dialogical process: an experience and its social interpretation inform each other. How we construct knowledge about the teaching profession and how we interpret our position are “negotiated in the course of doing the
job and interacting with others. It is shaped by belonging to a community but with a unique identity. It depends on engaging in practice, but with a unique experience” (Wenger, 1998a, p. 146). Britzman (2003) argued that identity is unstable and often contradictory. Identity in teaching therefore, she argued, is shaped by tensions in the relationship between theory and practice, knowledge and experience, thought and action. She believed that such relationships are not neat dichotomies but rather ‘dialogical’ meaning that they are shaped as they shape each other “in the process of coming to know through social interaction” (p.26).

**Summary**

This chapter consisted of a brief historical overview of the professions and provided a range of definitions as to what it might mean to be a professional. Attention also focused on how professional socialization might occur and the various ways in which individuals learned to develop a professional identity – using examples of activities such as reflective practice, mentoring, communities of practice – in the fields of business, education and nursing, were presented. Sports coaching has not yet achieved the status of being accepted as a profession and even notable researchers in this area (Jones, 2006; Lyle & Cushion, 2010), accept that there is some way to go before coaching is established as a profession in its own right. The following chapter will be dedicated to an in depth analysis of how professional socialization might occur with sports coaches, with particular attention being given to football coaching in Scotland.
Chapter 3 – Coach Learning

Introduction

The aims of this chapter are to examine the historical development of coaching as a profession in the UK and to ascertain the importance of relevant aspects of the learning situations that may impact on coach development.

Over the last ten years there has been an increased attention paid to the position of sports coaching in the UK. There has been an increasing awareness, and investment, from government and the position of the sports coach is now much more readily recognised, possibly as a result of the London Olympic Games 2012 and the Glasgow Commonwealth Games 2014. Academics have also shown a much greater interest in the area and a number of research articles and well respected studies have been produced by such writers as Abrahams, Collins and Martindale (2006), Cassidy, Jones and Potrac (2004), Cushion (2006, 2010), Lyle (2002, 2007), Jones (2000); Jones and Wallace (2006), to name but a few. A number of seminal reports on coaching have also been produced in this area by such as The UK Government’s (2001) Plan for Sport; the UK Sport (2001) Vision for Coaching: UKCC (2007) Impact Study: Definitional, Conceptual and Methodological Review; Sports Coach UK (2008) The professionalization of Sports Coaching in the UK: Issues and Concepts, (produced by Taylor and Garratt; 2010b); The UK Coaching Framework (2009), A3-5-7 Year action plan; The UK Coaching Framework (2008): the coaching workforce 2009-2016; the report for UK Sport Coach by Cushion et al. (2010) entitled “Coach Learning and Development”. Each in its own way has contributed to the debate regarding the position of sports coaching in UK.

However, in an attempt to gain professional recognition and acceptability there remains much to be done. What constitutes a professional coach, how such a position would be regulated, what commonality of standards across sports would be accepted and indeed achieved are all questions that remain unanswered. Further, in the UK sport coaching has traditionally been a largely amateur pursuit and the number of coaches practising in a full time paid capacity is small in comparison to the enormous numbers of amateurs so the concept of having coaching established as a profession still may be problematic. This chapter will examine the question of the processes associated with the professionalization of sports coaches and will emphasise how coaches learn along with the socialisation aspects of coaches as they attempt to
achieve professional status. The issue is often clouded by misuse of terms such as sport, physical activity, exercise, leisure, healthy lifestyle and at times it is not clear if the physical education teacher with his/her sessions with primary or secondary school children is really a coach in disguise. The focus of this study will be on examining coaches who eventually work at the elite level, which inevitably means that they will be in full time employment, an important factor in such development.

The Professionalisation of Sports coaching

The foremost writers in the field of the professionalization of sports coaches are Taylor and Garratt. Their body of work (Taylor & Garratt, 2010a, 2010b, 2013) underlines the point that the history of coaching has received scant attention in the academic literature. The transfer of coaching knowledge, often arising from the oral tradition of deliberate training and instruction was referred to in various forms and often relied on the professional performance of the coach in his or her earlier days as an athlete. This growing sense of ‘craft knowledge’ often did not distinguish between ‘the knowledge of’ and the ‘ability to do’ coaching (Taylor & Garratt, 2013, p. 28) and little public scrutiny has been given to such knowledge. The status of coaching as a professional occupation gradually began to receive attention in various countries, such as USA, Canada and Australia and in the UK a number of writers discussed the topic (Lyle, 2002; Taylor & Garratt 2008, 2010a; 2010b; 2013).

“From a research perspective little is known about the professionalization of sports coaching in the United Kingdom” (Taylor and Garratt, 2010a, p. 111). The professionalization of sports coaching has largely been overlooked or ignored by academics and it is still a peripheral activity in comparison to the other established professions, such as the church and medicine. As sports coaching has largely and fundamentally been an amateur activity in Britain, and although coaching is “undergoing unparalleled change” (Taylor & Garratt, 2010a, p. 114), sports coaching is still really seeking to establish its status in the professional world.

The historic development of the professions has been written about extensively (see Chapter 2 on “Professional Socialisation”) and it is apparent that (in GB) a number of ‘new’ occupations are attempting to be seen as professions in their own right such as teachers, nurses and social workers. Taylor and Garratt (2010a) believe that “such notions of professional knowledge are being fashioned and controlled by
the state” (p. 99) though their paper (2010b) takes a much more critical sociological stand point. They state clearly “...we have argued that the professionalization of sport coaching in the UK has been accompanied by the new orthodoxy, technique discourse and definition of professional practice. With origins in the ‘new managerialism’ of neo liberal government and politics, this privileged discourse contains, at its structural core, notions of centralisation, regulation and uniformity” (p. 136). They go on to suggest that this new interpretation of the professional coach leaves the existing practitioner in limbo and will have a direct impact on the coach-athlete relationship. They emphasise the point that “as the professional agenda continues to gather momentum and increase its hold on every fabric of sports coaching there will be an inevitable shift away from the centrality of the coach-athlete/coach – club relationship (as one that defines the centrality of the coach), to one in which the relations between coaches and their accrediting institutions will automatically accede to prominence” (Taylor & Garratt, 2010b, p. 137). The implication was that it was not just those coaches operating at the high performance level who would be impacted as it would occur across the whole spectrum of coaches working in sport.

It was not until the late 1970s that successive UK governments began to see sports coaching as an important area of expertise. A number of Reports were produced to demonstrate the government’s desire to ‘draw tighter links between sport and the State’ (Taylor and Garratt. 2013, p.28). Reports such as the Cobham Report, (1973), and a variety of other reports followed – ‘Sport in the Community – the next ten years’, (The Sports Council, 1982); ‘A National Strategy for Coach Education and Coach Development, The Scottish Sport Council 1988); ‘Coaching Matters: A Review of Coaching and Coach Education’ (The Sports Council, 1991) and the UK Sports Council’s ‘The Development of Coaching in the United Kingdom: A Consultative Document’, (1991). Such accounts demonstrated that coaching had begun to be explicitly identified by government as an important area of political concern and as such received much more attention than in previous years. However, it was probably the lack of elite performance at the Atlanta Olympic Games, 1996, where GB achieved only one gold medal out of a total medal haul of 15 that became the catalyst for a more centralised approach to sport funding and as a consequence sports coaching. Once the government established the Lottery Funding which targeted, in part, elite sport as a viable and politically important area for national concern, funding increased
enormously. Indeed, Wheatcroft (2016), writing in the Guardian, 18 August, paid tribute to a former Prime Minister, John Major, for being the unsung architect for the introduction of Lottery funding, suggesting that such funding was the real hero behind success at the Rio 2016 Olympics:

“Funding to support elite athlete participation at the Atlanta Olympic Games in 1992 was £5 million and the amount for the Rio Games in 2016 was £274 million for athletes plus £74 million for Paralympic athletes. One gold medal out of a combined total of 15, was obtained in Atlanta, 27 gold medals were gained out of a total of 67 were won in Rio, 2016, the best achievement by a GB team overseas in any Olympic Games”. Though a number of writers (Taylor and Garratt, 2010a, 2010b, 2013) have attested to the nefarious impact of government control of elite sport in UK, especially regarding its impact on the regulation of sports coaching, it is obvious that there has been a major impact on sporting performance at the elite level, in some targeted sports. Various UK government reports have examined sport and physical participation in GB and the impact on elite sporting performance is readily visible.


Stronach et al. (2002) believe that successive UK governments have sought to impose a professionalization process on different sectors of society’s workforce and this is now being applied to sports coaching. With the eventual acceptance of a professionalised coaching workforce it is clearly hoped that coaching will gain respect and achieve similar status with existing professions. Taylor and Garratt, (2010a, p. 113) state that “We remain unconvinced that the envisaged model of the coach as a professional is one where the coach is valued as an independent intellectual in which coaching is fundamentally seen as a cognitive activity that has, at its heart, educational intentions”. As long ago as 1984 Chelladurai had misgivings about the
professionalization of sports coaching. When comparing sports coaching with the normally accepted professions such as medicine and the law, Chelladurai suggested that society was unlikely to bestow on coaching the status and authority that it seeks because it was often seen as less serious than either the practice of law or medicine.

A number of writers have now begun to examine the notion of the professionalization of coaches especially Armour, (2010); Cushion, (2010); Lyle, (2002, 2007; Taylor and Garratt (2010a; 2010b; 2013), Lyle, (2002; 2007). According to Taylor and Garret, (2010b), there are a number of difficulties in describing coaching as a profession. In comparison to some of the more established professions, where “there is largely common agreement and understanding with a shared vocabulary for defining the profession (in terms of status, position and formal accreditation), coaching is decidedly more complex and diverse” (p. 101). Some sports have embraced professional coaches in their ranks for many years (e.g. football, golf) while other sports have had some difficulties coming to accept the need for professionals at all and often hark back to the days of the ‘concerned and committed amateur’. Various reports such as those of the Sports Council 1991, UK Sport 2001, (DCMS 2002) were strongly in favour of recommending that coaching be elevated to that of a profession (Taylor & Garratt, 2010a, p. 102) but despite this progress is slow. Lyle (2002) believes that sports coaching is now classified as an associated professional group (p. 200) as a result of “increasing scientification of practice and the value placed on sport itself”.

Finally, taking a more skeptical approach, Taylor and Garratt (2010a) state quite explicitly that “the practice of coaching is a long way from being considered truly professional in any authentic or traditional sense” (p.110) and many hurdles need to be overcome before coaching is properly accepted as a profession.

Coach Learning and Development: Types of learning

a) Formal learning

Often the terminology to describe coach education is imprecise and lacks clarity and “few models of coach preparations and development exist” (Nelson et al., 2006, p. 248). Learning as a behaviour has a long history and extensive research base in psychology and it would be inappropriate to attempt any detailed analysis of such
here. However, a few points need to be stated regarding how coaches might learn and the varying ways this might happen. Learning is an ongoing, life long process and though the simply mantra that ‘you never stop learning’ appears trite it is also of value. In terms of coach education and the continuing development of coaching knowledge perhaps it is useful to start with the approach of Coombs and Ahmed (1974) who use the tripartite example of formal, non-formal and informal learning in their work. Distinguishing between learning and education, which he says is conceptually restrictive, Jarvis (2004) makes the point that although many different learning processes occur during the human lifespan, not all of them can be considered educational. Thus the use of the term “coach learning” would seem to better suit the idea of how coaches become more knowledgeable in their chosen field of expertise.

“Despite recognition of the importance of coach preparation and development and a resulting increase in the number of coach education programmes being implemented worldwide, it could be argued that our understanding of coach learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge lacks a clear conceptual base”. (Nelson et al., 2006, p. 247). In order to gain a better understanding of sports coaching as a profession it is crucial that an awareness of how coaches learn their craft be developed. Callary et al. (2014) conducted a cross cultural study of seven different national high performance coach education programmes (though GB was significantly absent from the list chosen) and pointed out that” large scale formal education programmes have been criticized for not linking theoretical knowledge-based aspects with practical application, thus lacking relevance for coaches whose work often involves a complex mix of tasks through experience on the job” (p. 153).

**Metaphors for learning**

Sfard (1998) used two metaphors for learning - the acquisition metaphor and the participation metaphor - and Trudel and Gilbert (2006, p. 517) show diagrammatically (Figure. 3.1) how this approach to learning can be utilized by sports coaches:
They suggested that Sfard’s two metaphors for learning (acquisition and participation) could be equally applied to sports coach development where learning through formal coach education programmes contrasts with learning through their own experience gained through years of participation in sport. Once (coaching) knowledge has been acquired ‘the knower can apply, transfer and share with others ‘the material goods’ of the learning process. It has been the emphasis of large scale (L-S) programs to deliver these material goods to coaches” (Trudel & Gilbert, 2006, p. 516). In such a way coaches’ learning (acquisition) and experiences (participation) can form the very basis of ongoing coach learning and development. A wide variety of researchers, Jones, Armour and Potrac (2004); Lyle, (2002); Cote et al. (1995) Saury and Durand (1998) have identified a number of situations or events that may develop coaching knowledge – former playing experience, mentoring, interaction with other coaching colleagues – which potentially will add to the coach’s knowledge base. However, Gilbert and Trudel (2006) believe that as coaching certificates are only granted after the successful completion of a formal coach education course “we might expect that this source of learning would be the most important; however, many studies so far have shown instead that formalised learning venues are not valued by coaches as much as their day to day learning experiences in the field” (pp. 198-199). The relatively small amount of time spent on coach education courses in comparison with the huge amount of time coaches will spend at workplaces with athletes and interacting with colleagues might help endorse this.
Utilising Moon’s (1999, 2004) generic view of learning Gilbert and Trudel (2006) expanded on the Sfard model when they describe how learning can be summarised as ‘the building of a brick wall’ and the ‘network’ approach. The first sees the instructor (coach) as providing the learner with all the bricks of knowledge which assumes that the instructor knows how these bricks will fit the pattern of the wall and how such components of knowledge actually stack up. Fundamentally, the brick wall view of learning does not really distinguish between learning and instruction as “in this view without instruction there is no learning” (Werthner & Trudel, 2006, p.199).

In terms of coaching courses this view of learning has often been exemplified by instructors expounding information that the coaches have to digest and then repeat when examined. The candidate’s role is passive. Formal learning in this sense is seen as rather restrictive and top down. The brick wall example is essentially a linear approach which demonstrates that the instructor/tutor provides the learner (i.e. the coach) with the ‘bricks of knowledge’ and the learner soon builds up his/her wall of knowledge.

The role of the coach as learner is quite passive here and gaining accreditation from such courses is mainly perceived as a question of the coach reproducing or just regurgitating the aspects of text handed down by the course tutors. Unfortunately, after years of such NGB courses being taught “there is no study on the effect of these programs on the coaches’ behaviours or decision making before, during or after practices or games with Gilbert and Trudel (1999) being an exception” (cited in Werthner & Tudel, 2006, p. 201).

Moon (2004, p. 16) describes her second metaphor of learning as “a vast but flexible network of ideas and feelings with groups of more tightly associated linked ideas/feelings”. This form of learning takes place in many different ways with a variety of many different individuals and is quite distinct from mere accumulation of knowledge. It should be viewed as a way of learning without the necessary and direct input from tutors and should properly be regarded as a process of changing conceptions and not simply knowledge accumulation. There is also the prospect of internal learning situations where there is “a reconsideration of existing ideas in the coach’s cognitive structure” (Werthner & Trudel, 2006, p. 202) which is related to dynamical, ecological accounts of learning.
Types of formal learning in coaching

According to Coombs and Ahmed (1974) formal learning is defined as something that takes place in an “institutionalised, chronologically graded and hierarchically structured educational system” (p. 8). Formal learning programmes generally require candidates to demonstrate competencies after proceeding through a set curriculum which results in some form of certification, as is standard in most coaching programmes. Nelson et al. (2006, p. 249) state “these are generally low impact endeavours when compared to informal learning activities” and Werthner and Trudel (2006) believe that formal certification courses, contrary to expectation, are not perceived as being most important by coaches. They state “we might expect this sort of learning (formal coach education programmes) would be the most important; however, many of the studies cited instead have shown that formalised learning venues are not valued by coaches as much as their day to day experiences in the field” (pp.198-199). Armour (2010) emphasised this view stating that many coaches are dissatisfied with professional development experiences and a variety of other writers have noted the problems often associated with formal coach education courses (Mesquita et al., 2014; Trudel et al., 2010; Mallet et al., 2009; Taylor & Garratt 2013). Jones, Armour and Potrac (2003) using interviews to record coach’s views of their learning cite a comment from Ian McGeechan, famous British Lions and Scotland rugby coach, that “a coaching course has never produced an international coach” (p 59). Cushion (2011) utilises Bourdieu’s concept of habitus to explain why many coaches might not be overly disposed towards feeling positive about coach education programmes in that many courses can be viewed as attempts to indoctrinate the attending coaches on such courses. Nelson et al. (2006) also use the term ‘indoctrination’ when discussing coach education courses and link it to the idea of training rather than education. They describe such provision as activities set out to convince us that there is a ‘right’ way of thinking, feeling and behaving thus denying the learner choice, and instead expose the learner to a single set of attitudes and values which coaches are meant to acquire and abide by. Coaches thus might be seen as empty vessels waiting to be filled with ‘professional dogma’ handed down from the experts. Taylor and Garratt (2010a, p. 126) define habitus as “a system of acquired knowledge or categories of perceptions and assessment held (by the coach) at the level of practice”. Consequently it is easy to envisage coaches feeling as if the treatment
they are receiving from the powerful coach educator does not take into account their previous learning and experiences and forces them not to challenge the authority of the educator nor National Governing Body (NGBs) who hold the power of awarding certificates of practice. Cushion (2010) suggests that coaches then go through the motions of agreeing that the evidence presented to them is acceptable. They fear that and once they have gained their certificate they then adopt Goffman’s (1959) impression management technique and pretend to accept the information handed down on formal training courses and upon successful completion of such coaching courses they “often revert to their own preferred methods which were largely implicit and learned from experience” (Cushion, 2010, p. 171). This view was endorsed by evidence from Callary et al., (2014) from a worldwide study and Mesquita et al. (2014) in a study relating to Portuguese football coaches.

Short formal coaching courses have been criticised on many counts, some appear to be too short, or lacking integration, or neglect of social science information at the expense of what are commonly seen as “sports science” – biomechanics, exercise physiology. With little attention being given to pedagogy, coaches tend to question the value of such courses. Often coaching materials on such courses have been presented as a somewhat mechanistic process with little awareness or acceptance of individual creativity. Indeed accepting the wisdom of coaching elders is seen as necessary and the reproduction of such ideas necessary for advancement and success. Lyle (2010) talked of the perceived “wisdom of expert practitioners” (p. 279) and the standardisation of delivery becoming the norm in many UK coaching courses. In many ways this does not differ from much of the criticisms that have been made of school based teaching/learning courses. Not all coaching courses are necessarily seen in such a negative light and Nelson et al. (2014) cite evidence from some courses in soccer (Hammond & Perry, 2005), golf (McCullick, Belcher & Shempp, 2005) and rugby (Cassidy, Potrac & McKenzie, 2006) where programmes have received positive evaluations. Clearly there will be many courses where the learning experience of the participants is beneficial though unfortunately there are too many that are seen not to be at the level which is properly beneficial to their learning.

When discussing the notion of coach learning, Schempp and McCullick (2010) adopted a model of expertise in coaching. They state that there are three main factors that contribute to expertise: experience, knowledge and skill. Firstly they believe that
expert coaches benefit from learning from their experiences. “Like novices expert coaches embrace the lessons that they learn from experience, but unlike novices they realise that there are other sources for increasing skill, knowledge and performance” (Schempp & McCullick, 2010, p. 222). Secondly, coaching experience is critical, though not solely responsible, for a coach developing into an expert. Having an extensive knowledge base plays an important part too. Knowledge can be gleaned from a variety of sources, and indeed Shulman (1987) discussed teacher knowledge and believed that there were several forms of knowledge:

- knowledge of their subject,
- learners,
- learning environment,
- purposes,
- curriculum pedagogy,
- pedagogical content knowledge.

In many ways such attributes could be seen in the expert coach. Having superior knowledge to the novice, expert coaches were often able to be more flexible, and use the coaching environment in a way that the neophyte coach would not know how to do. Thirdly, the skill set that experts employ, understandably, often separates the novice from the expert. Schempp and McCullick (2010 p. 229) point out that the one thing that might separate a beginner coach from an expert coach is that “Expert coaches are measured by one standard: a consistent and superior performance in athletic competition”. However, being an expert coach does not imply that all learning is finished as the expert coach can, like any other coach “become a more expert coach” Schempp and McCullick (2010 p. 230). Trudel and Gilbert (2006) citing the work of Lyle (2002), comment on the relevance of the elite coaching context, which they say “is characterised by the highest levels of athlete and coach commitment, intensive preparation and involvement, public performance objectives, highly structured and formalized competition, coaches who typically work full time as a coach and very restrictive athletic selection criteria” (p. 522).

Werthner and Trudel (2006) emphasise that there should not be a polarisation between formal and informal learning although they agree with Moon’s (2004) view of the benefits of networking which enables coach development from the coach’s idiosyncratic perspective and enhances the notion of a coach as an efficient learner,
when given the opportunity to be so. Chesterfield et al. (2010) presented a study that attempted to analyse how English soccer coaches perceived and rated the content of an advanced coaching course. They noted a similarity with evidence drawn from physical educators who often had negative perceptions of their initial training courses. This is in contrast to the limited amount of evidence available from coaching studies (cf., Cushion et al., 2003). Other studies also produced similar findings (e.g., Schempp & Graber, 1992) suggesting that much of the details in the coach education literature “are in keeping with the Nelson et al. (2006) assertion that much formal coach education provision could be described as indoctrination” (p. 307).

Christensen (2014) states that there has been a growing emphasis in the sports coaching literature that focuses on “learning processes and the development of expertise in elite sports coaches” (p.205) and cites evidence from Jones et al. (2003), Christensen (2009), Cote and Gilbert (2009) and Young et al. (2009) to support this. In order to better describe coach learning, Werthner and Trudel (2006, 2009) distinguished between three learning situations, similar to the approach Moon (2004) has used:

- Mediated learning, where situations are characterised by the imperative presence of instructors, textbooks etc (e.g. NGB coaching courses and formal education)
- Unmediated learning, where situations are characterised by the absence of instructors, where the learner takes personal responsibility for choosing what to learn (such as informal coach education, learning from peers)
- Internal learning situations where the learner is not exposed to new ideas, but rather reinterprets “existing ideas in his/her cognitive structure” (Werthner & Trudel, 2009, p. 437).

However, it is not clear as to how coaches make sense of these diverse learning situations, which lead Christensen (2014) to cite the model proposed by Alheit and Dausien (1999). This detailed biographic learning, suggested that a coach’s biography both structures and is structured by a person’s learning processes. Christensen, (2014) using a qualitative approach to study such learning in eight Danish elite coaches distinguished between ‘situation’ (the constructivist perspective) and ‘process’ (the constructionist perspective) because “situations need to be understood as part of a wider social process and may not be sufficient to capture coach learning” (p. 206). A
number of studies on sports coaching, such as Nash and Collins (2006); Cushion and Kitchen (2011); Jones, Potrac, Cushion and Ronglan (2011) have suggested that the development of coaching expertise is socially constructed and thus interwoven in the structures of specific sports contexts in which the coach is learning and practising coaching. Many such studies tend to follow an explicitly sociological explanation and Christensen cites the work he undertook with Danish talented football (soccer) players (Christensen, 2009) when he used Bourdieu’s ideas on socially instituted power which he felt helped in an understanding of coaching relations with the players. Cassidy, Jones and Potrac (2009) also were concerned about the way coaching was portrayed as a “personal, power ridden everyday pursuit” (p. 223) while Chesterfield et al. (2010) described how tutors on an English FA UEFA ‘A’ License football coaching course used such power and largely rejected the imposition of methods that they found contrary to their own experiences when coaching players. Offering only a one size-fits-all, or what was described by one participant as ‘off the shelf’ instruction, was deemed unacceptable by the trainees so “engaged in ... ‘synthetic coaching’ in order to successfully obtain their certification” (Chesterfield et al., 2010, p. 308). Conversely, work by Nash and Sproule (2009) pointed to the necessity of being aware of the individual’s personal way of learning which Christensen calls “the person behind the professional” (p. 207).

Rynne, Mallett and Tinning (2010), reporting on a study of 24 elite coaches at one of the Australian Institutes of Sport, point out that many of the studies that discuss coach learning most tended to centre around formal educational institutions such as schools or universities. Encouragingly, they also note that there has been a shift from research ‘on’ learning to learning ‘in’ work. Various writers have attested to the perceived limitations and largely ineffectual nature of coach education courses (e.g. Billet & Somerville 2004; Cushion et al., 2003; Trudel & Gilbert, 2006). While other work domains may have suggested that programmes to assist development in the workplace are growing Rynne et al., (2010) state that this is an area that has not been researched extensively while sports coaching is an area “that has largely been overlooked” (p. 316). Traditional forms of learning, witnessed in coach education courses, have been shown to be largely ineffectual and not held in high regard by coaches (Cushion et al., 2003; Trudel & Gilbert, 2006). Many authors support the view that learning in the workplace takes place in a social context and the
collaborative feature of such learning is significant though not often researched. Rynne et al. (2010) agree that it is important to focus on the individual as a member of a wider socio-cultural community with Lave and Wenger (1991) labelling such learning ‘situated learning’. They describe such learning that takes place in particular sets of circumstances in time and space as well as allowing the individual to interact with a larger social community. Other authors have examined such learning in researching physical education (e.g., Kirk and MacDonald, 1998) and in coaching environments (e.g., Culver and Trudel, 2006). Sometimes referred to as communities of practice (CoPs) such learning allowed “scope to theorize the relationship between individual learning practices (related to agency) and collective processes (relating to structure)” (Rynne, Mallett & Tinning, 2010, p. 318). Billet (2004) argues for the greater acknowledgement of relational independence between individual and social agencies when examining the concept of learning throughout working life. He refers to the concept of agency as meaning intentionality, subjectivity and identity and suggests that it is socially shaped over time in enabling an individual to develop their “cognitive experience” (p. 53). Further, Jones et al. (2002) endorse this view of learning though point out that it is essential to examine the joint role of agency and structure in influencing the role as neither alone is capable of promoting learning.

Responding to a request from a National Sporting Organisation (NSO) to have their senior coaches in situ learning be formally accredited, Mallett et al. (2009) attempted to assess the way coaches’ learning was enhanced and how this might be formally recognized. In support of their approach they cited the work of Trudel and Gilbert (2006) who found that in the period 1998-2007 there were only 16 recognised studies and none of these looked at how a sports organisation could change its coach education/training programmes to make it a lifelong learning process that will facilitate learning in formal, non-formal and informal situations. This suggests that in comparison with evidence from other professions, which constantly pointed to the importance of a distinctive level of entrance to the profession was mandatory usually involving weighty formal educational achievements, this has not been the case within coaching. Once qualified, the ‘accepted’ professions normally subjected members to ongoing monitoring which has only recently become part of sports coaches’ formal and ongoing education. Cross and Lyle (1999) were concerned about what they termed ‘languaging’, meaning the need to have a consensus on terminology in order to inform
research. They suggest that such words as ‘education, learning and development’ are not interchangeable and argue that it is essential that these terms are defined in order to better understand how coaches become accepted as professionals. Most NGB courses are offered to coaches who are largely amateur or basically competent, rather than aimed at the expert coach, who would be dealing with elite performance, where a different model of training/education would be essential. Mostly coaches do not operate in well-structured environments, which “explains the absence of in-house, non-formal provision; fewer incidental learning opportunities; less community interaction; and a more general absence of scrutiny of continuing expertise development” (Lyle & Cushion, 2010, p. 362). Citing the work of McKenna (2010), Lyle and Cushion (2010) discuss his concept of ‘utility’ in which he discusses the conflict between system-wide provision and the desire for individualised learning, between standardisation and individual relevance. He warns that the assumed benefits of informal learning should not be overstated and this “is an appropriate reminder of how little we know about the effectiveness of coach education and development in general.” (Lyle & Cushion, 2010, p. 362).

Arguing for the need for elite coaches to continue their learning, Rynne and Mallett (2014) clearly state that “high performance coaching (especially in Australia) aimed at the preparation and training of high performance coaches lacks any significant formalised structure” (p. 14). They suggest that coaches should engage in less formal learning to inform their practice “and then continue to learn so that they might reshape their practice as the contextual demands change” (p. 15). Without engaging in such quality learning for example, coaches risk repeating past mistakes and becoming set in their ways. Werthner and Trudel (2006) cite Moon’s (1999) notion which suggests that learning should be viewed as a process of changing conceptions as opposed to the dominant view of learning as the accumulation of knowledge. This view of learning was also been supported by other writers in this area (cf. Mallet et al., 2009; Lyle et al., 2009).

The importance of viewing knowledge as a social construct stems from the belief that professional knowledge is constructed from the world in which we live; that it is forged “in the dialectic tension between individuals and the worlds around them” (Schemmp, 1993, p. 3). Thus, to gain a real understanding of a coach’s knowledge it is necessary to have an appreciation of the culture of the coach’s workplace, the various
demands on his role within that culture as well as becoming aware of how such influences can both enhance and debilitate the coach. Taking a life-story or narrative approach has been used by other authors such as Denison (1996), Gilbourne and Richardson (2006), Potrac and Jones (1999), Strean (1996), Holt and Strean (2001) and Smith and Sparkes (2008, 2009). This approach has also been used in studies researching both performance coaching and the teaching of physical education (e.g., Schempp, 1993; Templin et al., 1994) though its use in coaching so far has been limited.

Despite recognising the importance of coach preparation and development, and a resulting increase in the number of coach education programmes being implemented worldwide, it could be argued that our understanding of coach learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge lacks a clear conceptual base (Nelson, Cushion & Potrac, 2006). In order to gain a better understanding of sports coaching as a profession it is crucial that an awareness of how coaches learn their craft be developed. Often the terminology to describe coach education is imprecise and lacks clarity and “few models of coach preparations and development exist” (Nelson et al., 2006, p. 248). Learning as a behaviour has a long history and extensive research base in psychology and it would be inappropriate to attempt any detailed analysis of such here. However, a few points need to be stated regarding how coaches might learn and the varying ways this might happen. Learning is an ongoing, life-long process and though the simple mantra that ‘you never stop learning’ appears trite it is also of value. In terms of coach education and the continuing development of coaching knowledge, perhaps it is useful to start with the approach of Coombs and Ahmed (1974) who use the tripartite example of formal, non-formal and informal learning in their work. Attempting to distinguish between learning and education is, according to Jarvis (2004), conceptually restrictive and he makes the point that although many different learning processes occur during the human lifespan, not all of them can be considered educational. Thus using of the term “coach learning” would seem to better suit the idea of how coaches become more knowledgeable in their chosen field of expertise.

Rynne et al. (2010) also emphasise the notion of ‘situated learning’ which Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998) discuss and refer to the way learning takes place in a particular set of circumstances and is social in so far that it involves interaction between individual and others. Billett, (2004), when discussing workplace
learning, also emphasises the interaction of learner and others. He sees formal learning as a process in formally structured educational settings and suggests that learning should be seen as “a consequence of everyday thinking and acting...” (Rynne, et al., 2010, p. 318). Jones et al. (2002) also saw learning (in references to coaches) as dynamic social activity in which the coach plays a dynamic, active part.

b) Non-formal Learning

Little evidence has been presented regarding the area of non-formal learning in coaches though Coombs and Ahmed (1974) define nonformal learning as “any organised, systematic educational activity carried on outside the framework of the formal system to provide select types of learning to particular subgroups in populations” (p. 8) a view that is supported by Nelson, Cushion and Poptrac (2006). Examples of this in a coaching milieu would be such things as coaching conferences, seminars, and workshops. Though sharing many aspects of formal learning, nonformal learning is generally seen as presenting a particular subgroup of a population (such as high performance coaches) with alternative sources to those available on more formalised learning pathways. Unfortunately in the literature little distinction is made between formal and non-formal courses as they tend to be grouped together as “coaching courses” and it is thus difficult to attest to their value.

c) Informal learning

Coombs and Ahmed (1974) define informal learning as “lifelong experiences by which every person acquires and accumulates knowledge, skills, attitudes and insights from daily experiences and exposure to the environment” (p. 8). This is the very type of learning that is at the heart of the professional socialisation process and is often seen as crucial to development. A great deal of learning takes place in an informal manner and for coaches this could be learning from their experiences when they competed, and/or interaction with other coaches and peers. Nelson, Cushion and Poptrac (2006) suggest that another term for informal learning could be self-directed learning which they suggest might mean learning from the internet, reading coaching manuals and reports, reading textbooks on coaching, watching videos on elite performance, viewing recordings of coaching sessions and accessing relevant journal articles. Smith (1999), Cushion et al. (2001a) and Salmela (1995) all attest to the
importance of coach experience and interactions with other coaches as evidence of informal self-directed learning. Other authors such as Brookfield (1990) pointed to the importance of informal learning networks, and Lave and Wenger (1991) and Cushion and Denstone (2011) refer to communities of practice (CoPs) aspects of learning which reinforce the importance of informal learning for coach development. This is dealt with in more detail later in this Chapter.

**Reflective Practice (RP) and Sports Coaching**

In a major text on reflective practice (RP) in sport and exercise sciences, Knowles et al., (2014a) state that the last 15 years have seen a growing interest in RP though believe that there is no precise definition of what constitutes reflective practice. As an approach to experiential learning to help practitioners learn their craft, develop expertise and become effective, reflective practitioners, RP is often suggested as being a major tool. Huntley et al. (2014) states that over 170 published articles in the domain of sport and exercise have used the word ‘reflection’ as a keyword though only 68 of these have actually engaged with processes representative of RP. Confusion over definitions, practices, processes and outcomes has influenced practitioners’ experiences. Cropley and Hanton (2012) believe that a lack of understanding of the concept of RP has induced anxiety in practitioners who are asked to produce evidence regarding RP. This has given rise to concern about the validity of such evidence. Knowles et al. (2014), in accepting such criticism, suggest that research has to balance scientific paradigms and the weight of evidence with personal reflective accounts of practice. Rhodius and Huntley (2014) reinforce such a view by suggesting that there is an obvious need for more evidence-based studies to demonstrate the effectiveness and utility of RP.

Increasingly applied sport psychologists (ASPs) in the UK have become accountable for the evaluation and development of their professional practice (Cropley, Hanton, Miles & Niven, 2010a; Martindale & Collins, 2005). Such bodies as the British Association for Sport and Exercise Sciences (BASES) and the British Psychological Society (BPS) Division of Sport and Exercise Psychology have recently endeavoured to ensure that “both neophytes and professionals develop knowledge through engagements in processes of experiential learning” (Cropley & Hanton, 2012, p. 307). The former logical-positivistic based knowledge is now assumed not to be
sufficient to provide practitioners with enough tools for effective practice. Similarly, a number of writers have suggested that there is a need to draw on a more knowledge in action approach which is also labelled as practice-based (Cropley et al., 2010b), tacit (Anderson, Knowles & Gilbourne, 2004) and craft knowledge (Knowles, Gilbourne, Borrie & Nevill, 2001). Learning from experience is not necessarily a given and it is essential that “experience has to be examined, analysed and considered in order to shift it to knowledge” (Cropley & Hanton, 2012, p. 309) and one process that has increasingly been shown to be effective in this matter is reflective practice. They also suggest that such a practice might be especially helpful for neophyte applied sport psychologists though believe that experienced practitioners can also benefit from such a method.

A variety of authors in the sport and exercise domain have made progress in attempting to present empirically validated studies in reflective practice (Cropley, Miles, Hanton & Niven, 2011; Knowles, et al., 2001). Arguing that using neophyte practitioners as a sample in studies on the quality of reflective practice, Picknell et al. (2014) suggest that there are limitations inherent in such studies as new professionals are unlikely to be “contaminated by the pressures of real-world practice and thus more likely to be open minded regarding the inclusion of reflective practice as part of their decision making process” (pp. 31-32). They call for the establishment of developmental programmes aimed at enhancing experiential learning opportunities especially as there has been much discontent with the quality and beneficial aspects of previous training programmes experienced by young coaches (Cassidy et al., 2004; Rynne et al., 2010).

Knowles and Gilbourne (2010) believe that there is a growing body of literature that provides insights into the processes and outcomes of reflective practice, in sport and in other professional communities. The practice seems to be increasingly used in applied sport psychology and has been adopted by other accreditation bodies in the UK. According to Knowles et al. (cited by Huntley et al., 2014) “both BASES and BPS have utilised the tenets of reflective practice long established within nursing, health education and psychology disciplines (e.g. clinical, health, educational, counselling psychology). These allied disciplines share similar characteristics to that of sport coaching whereby practice environments are multifaceted requiring sport practitioners to develop both professional and craft based knowledge, the latter
grounded in the day today practical, context-specific experience” (p. 3). The BASES supervised experience programme (2004-2009) required supervisees to “engage in critical reading of key journal sources and to use this material to stimulate their own engagement in and evidence of this process” (Knowles & Gilbourne, 2010, p. 505). Those wishing to engage in a proposed transfer to the BPS Chartership programme would have to show “substantial evidence of reflective practice” (Knowles & Gilbourne 2010, p. 505) in their folio to be submitted for accreditation. Those students aspiring to undertake the Stage 2 route for professional recognition as an applied Sport and Exercise Psychologist with the BPS need to fulfil the current (2016) regulations and ensure that reflective practice is a necessary part of their training. Thus, engaging in reflective practice is becoming a major factor in the training of sport psychology professionals and is likely to be seen as a key element in their development.

Gilbert and Trudel (2005) discuss reflective practice in coaches in the context of being precise about what type of coach is under debate – neophyte or experienced. At the youth or elite level the effective coach might be judged on the provision of learning opportunities for performers while at the elite level it will almost certainly be judged by winning percentages and achievements. In their 2001 study Gilbert and Trudel developed a multi stage model of experiential learning based on reflection. Their emphasis on describing ‘role frames’ or approaches to coaching was a central component of their model. They believed that such role frames acted as “filters through which problems are constructed and addressed“ (Gilbert & Trudel, 2005, p. 2) and suggested that the process of reflective conversation could be integral to this. They stated that an understanding of the following four conditions that influence reflection was central to the making the coach become more aware of the experiential learning processes that might impact on his/her development:

- access to knowledgeable peers (i.e., convenient access to an experienced coach);
- stage of learning of the coach (i.e., the time the coach had been practising);
- issue characteristics (e.g., the type and variety of issues that the coach was confronted with); and
- environment in which the coach engaged (e.g., amateur, professional)

In relation to sports coaching Ghaye (2009) believes that “there are many views about the practice of reflection as a tool to enhance an individual’s skills though
it is safe to say that it is a complex process and makes an important contribution to better coaching” (p. 6). As there are many different types of reflection the most important issue is to recognise that reflection should allow the individual (coach, teacher, learner) to move forward in some way. Creative reflection means learning from past experiences and then trying something novel – it is both backwards and forwards looking. Critical reflection includes questioning routines, the conventional wisdom of the day and being able to question one’s practice. According to Ghaye (2009) this may entail adopting a “tough, militant and political face” (p.7) in order to challenge one’s practice and the context in which it takes place using reflection.

Believing that RP has the power to transform both what we are and what we do, Ghaye (2009, p. 9) suggests that when dealing with issues of reflection pertaining to coaching there are four guiding principles underlying reflective practice:

• Reflective practice is about you, your role and your work (coaching, teaching, managing)
• Reflective practice is about learning from your experience of coaching and leading
• Reflective practice is about valuing what you do and why you do it; and
• The reflective conversation is at the heart of the process of reflecting-on-practice.

Clearly RP can become a useful tool for coaches who work with athletes at all levels. Central to the process of coach development are the coaching awards offered by individual National Governing Bodies (NGBs). In general these tend to be short courses often over long periods of time, such as the SFA ‘A’ License which takes over two years for completion with little opportunity for ongoing support. Consequently, as Nelson and Cushion (2006) point out, these ad hoc arrangements mean that few models of coaching exist and most courses are “theoretical patchwork model created to meet the needs of a sport governing body to certify its coaches” (p.174). As a result it is hardly surprising that various authors (such as Cushion, et al., 2003, 2006; Gould, Gianni, Krane & Hodge 1990) believe that a great deal of coaching knowledge comes not from actual coaching courses but from reflections on personal experiences and encounters. Arguing for the development of a sound theoretical approach to coach learning Nelson and Cushion (2006) suggest that the approach of reflective practice could be one way of aiding coach learning. Schon (1983, 1987) is recognised as one of
the prime leaders in this approach though his view has been challenged by other writers such as Eraut (1994), Bleakley (1999) as well as Clegg and Saeidi (1999). Reflection is not just a link between professional knowledge and experience but, according to Buyesse, Sparkman and Wesley (2003) it should be considered as a way of knowledge generation and dissemination in a practice field. Gilbert and Trudel’s (2001, 2005) work in developing a model of experiential learning suggested that reflection should be reviewed in three ways:

• reflection-in-action (during the action present)
• reflection-on-action (within the action present but not in midst of activity)
• retrospective reflection-on-action (outside the action present)

Nelson and Cushion (2006) believe that the Gilbert and Trudel’s studies (2001; 2005; 2006) “have presented a compelling argument that Schon’s (1983; 1987) theory of reflective practice provides an effective framework for analysing and explaining how (these) coaches framed their knowledge and learned from practical coaching experiences” (Gilbert & Trudel, 2006, p. 175).

Referring to RP in coaching as a ‘pedagogy of scarcity’, Dixon, Lee and Ghaye (2013, p. 588) described it as “about coaches and those responsible for developing and delivering coach education programmes having a somewhat anemic and skeletal conception of reflection and its practices” (p. 588). They saw this as having two main consequences – placelessness and borrowing practices. Placelessness was explained as a type of reflection often associated with reflection-on-action, such as a competition debrief, which often concentrated on problem solving rather than forward looking analysis. They cite Russell (1995, p. 200) in providing evidence of how some coaches invented experiences simply to fulfill a reflective practice task that they, the coaches, perceived to be unproductive and did little to help their development. Such an approach was likely to lead to a deficit-based view of coaching pedagogy whereby an emphasis on the attempt at solving previous problems and undesirable aspects of performance can somehow enable a player to perform better. This pedagogy of scarcity is that which ignores the variety of different forms of reflection. Dixon, Lee and Ghaye (2013) asserted that reflection should have a potent role in helping to bridge the gap between education and knowledge that is generated by reflective practice. Their second point concerned the idea of ‘borrowing’ whereby the interpretation of reflection in coaching is overly reliant on the work of Schon (1983,
1987) and Dewey (1902), which they believe derives “mainly from education and healthcare” and as such may not be directly applicable to coach education. These attempts to ‘force-fit’ such into sports coaching pedagogy fail to generate or create a system that might be directly applicable to sports coaching practices. It may explain why students on sports coaching courses find difficulty in identifying with reflective practices approaches. Fredrickson (2011) saw the perceived approach to coaching as mainly problem solving, which limits the coach’s thought-through-action repertoire which runs the risk of making coaching less effective and enjoyable. Cassidy and Rossi (2006) have pointed out that many coaches found their certification courses to be inadequate and did not satisfy the needs of either recreational nor elite coaches. They often construed coaching interventions as punishments for mistakes, caused the formation of a negative climate for learning. Proposing a counterbalance to this pedagogy of scarceness Dixon et al. (2013) proposed a counterpoint – a pedagogy of abundance which would be less myopic and enable coaches and coach educators to concentrate on developing strengths. This would balance deficit management with a focus on reflection-in-action where practices would utilise some of the more obvious modern communications and technologies available today. “Such a shift towards practices of reflection which provide a more sustained focus on performance successes and strengths” (Dixon et al., 2013, p. 594). Embracing the advantages of modern communication systems, such as social media, could also have manifest importance to the modern day coach and his/her capacity to develop and learn.

An alternative approach to the understanding of reflective practice is given by the work of Jacobs, Claringbould and Knoppers (2016, p. 411) when they state “We drew on Foucault’s conceptualization of self constitution and confessional practice or modes of subjectivation and Knaus’s approach to teaching for our analytical framework”. Coaches often rely on their own experience and those of other coaches rather than formal coach education courses (Cushion et al., 2003; Chesterfield, Potrac & Jones 2010). Ongoing professional development for the coach should embrace a variety of media. Ideas of what constitutes a ‘good coach’ vary though it is apparent that formal coach education courses do not provide the whole answer. Taylor and Garratt (2010a) suggest that the idea that there is a commonly agreed notion of what constitutes a good coach is contested. Prioritising the acquisition of specific coaching knowledge via coach education courses should, they believe, give way to having
coaches reflect on their own coaching practices as suggestion that was supported by Cushion et al. (2006); Denison (2007); Peel, Cropley, Hanton and Fleming (2013). In this way, coaches should then be able to “construct their own solutions for a problem, by exploring how problems can be defined, why and by whom. Analysing and constructing solutions can be developed through constant critical reflection” (Jacobs et al., 2016, p. 413). Denison (2010) believes that reflection is not a linear process that can be learnt by following a series of steps but requires engaging in the processes of transformation. This process of “learning about and engaging in a process of transformation... requires thorough critical reflection” (Jacobs et al., 2016, p. 414) and has received little attention in the coaching literature. Utilising an approach from the work of Foucault (1964, 1970) they suggested that individuals (in this case sports coaches) constitute and transform themselves into four aspects:

- ethical substance (the actual part of oneself that the individual chooses as material for transformation)
- mode of subjection (an individual’s relation to specific rules and moral obligation he or she feels to put these into practice)
- ethical work (the deliberate strategies coaches use in their attempts to transform themselves to realise the desired behaviour or practice)
- and telos (what a coach wants to accomplish, that is, how a coach wants to behave)

“The use of this Foucauldian lens provides insight into the process of perceived change and the use of critical reflection” (Jacobs et al., 2016, p. 415).

**Mentoring in sports coaching**

Carruthers (1993) relates the story from Greek Mythology of how Mentor demonstrated the traditional roles of father, teacher confidante, counsellor and advisor which today often resonate with definitions of a mentor. Mentors are not commonly chosen in sporting situations but are more likely to be imposed by a higher authority especially at a professional club level. Indeed, Cassidy and Rossi (2006) point out that “there is little mention of a professional mentor/mentee relationship within any level of coaching, which would suggest that such relationships are less formal at best and non-existent at worst. When such arrangements do actually come into existence, it seems to be a matter of serendipity rather than any intentional action” (p. 238).
“In recent years the term ‘mentoring’ has come into common use within sports coaching” (Jones, Harris & Miles, 2009 p. 267). Agreeing with Bloom, Durand-Bush and Salmela (1997) that it has been associated with enlightened, good practice in relation to developing a coach’s knowledge and expertise they believe that such a claim has not met with universal approval in other fields. Colley (2003), for example, concluded that “existing research evidence scarcely justifies (mentoring) use on a massive scale” (p. 267) and the movement does not “seem to have developed a sound theoretical base to underpin policy or practice” (p. 267). This seemingly crucial lack of a sustainable theoretical underpinning makes it very difficult to understand how mentor relationships actually develop and “merely provides a limited view of what may happen rather than what can happen” (Colley, 2003, p. 3). Even though there is a real paucity of research evidence pertaining to the mentoring process(es) in sports coaching, various writers, such as Cushion (2006), Jones et al. (2003, 2004) and Jones, Harris and Miles (2009) note that a great deal of coach learning has taken place when younger coaches have actively sought out advice from more experienced coaches or players. Utilising Lortie’s (1975) ‘apprenticeship of observation’ model, Schempp and Graber (1992) suggest that it is an effective mechanism by which beginner coaches learn their roles, though equally a great deal of coach learning may take place informally through observing or just interacting with significant others and peers. Armour and Yelling (2007) found that coaching knowledge drawn from informal education was the most important factor in the development of coaches and physical educators. Jones et al. (2003, 2004) believed this process reflected an element of socialisation within a subculture whereby a personal set of coaching views were derived which, in Lyle’s (1999) view, enabled new coaches to see how things should be done. Bloom et al., (1998) state that besides gaining hands-on knowledge in practical situations novices were found to copy established coaches’ behaviours which help them crystallise their own coaching philosophies. Seeing senior coaches as the one exemplar of good practice has its dangers, as the critics of the Apprenticeship Model have previously pointed out though Jones et al. (2009) suggest that “such formative experiences carry far into a coach’s career and provide a continuing influence over perspectives, beliefs and behaviours both positive and negative” (p. 276). Bloom et al. (1998) found that experienced coaches generally thought that they had only received mentoring in a very informal and haphazard way while Cushion
(2011) pointed to the unstructured and often uncritical nature of mentoring in a GB context. More recently Cushion (2006) and Jones et al., (2003) believed that there would be benefits from a more systematic and formalised mentoring set up and pointed to the possibilities of using such activities as reflection (Schon, 1987) and communities of practice (CoPs) (Lave & Wenger 1991), to foster such an approach. Nash (2003) has shown that attempts have been made in Australia and Canada to instigate a more formalised mechanism for mentoring and such a formalisation would fit in with the call from UK Coaching (2013) in the document ‘Creating a mentoring programme for sport: A comprehensive guide’ for an in-depth examination of what coaches understand by the term ‘mentoring’ and how such a programme might be established.

There still seems to be a great deal of confusion surrounding the concept of mentoring, particularly in terms of sports coaching. Hard and fast guidelines seem difficult to establish though Monaghan and Lunt (1992) argued against the establishment of a prescriptive approach to mentoring as it is a complex social and psychological activity. However, most definitions of mentoring point to the crucial importance of the relationship between mentor and mentee as being crucial and needs to be harmonious yet challenging in order to provide assistance to the professional development of the coach. Margolis and Romero (2001) believe that mentoring has become an instrument of socialisation wherein “mentors control the gates of social reproduction” (p. 82), while Jones et al. (2009) quote Pitney and Ehlers (2004) by stating “... from a protege’s standpoint, a mentor relationship that facilitates the understanding of professional perspectives is an important element in their anticipatory professional socialization” (p. 277).

There are various ways that mentoring in a sporting context that has been described. Young et al. (2005) belief in three fundamental types of mentoring relationships - responsive, interactive and directive – were supported by Jones et al. (2009) when they suggested a ‘tentative model of good practice’ (p. 277). The responsive mentor was seen as looking almost exclusively to his or her protege, though Mead, Campbell and Milan (1999) suggest that there are inherent dangers in this approach especially if carried out too early in a mentoring process. Interactive mentors sought to establish relational parity with their mentees and the relationship was characterised by open conversation on issues of mutual concern with the mentor.
acting as friend, colleague and trusted advisor. Such an approach might better occur with a more experienced mentor and as the relationship becomes well established.

Finally, directive mentors tend to be more domineering in their approach, taking charge of developmental agendas though this approach has been criticised for being too hierarchical (Mead et al., 1999) as well as leading to the possibility of the mentee becoming passive and over dependent on the mentor. In similar fashion the Coaching Association of Canada sought an approach following Marshall’s (2001) model – formal, informal and facilitated – which suggested a continuum from those that are very short term and informal to long term highly structured partnerships. In the UK, the government’s Department for Education and Science (DfES, 2005, p. 2) put together “ten principles based on evidence from research and consultations that are recommended to inform mentoring and coaching programmes in schools to help increase the impact of continuing professional development on student’s learning”. Jones et al. (2009) agreed that these principles “seem to address most of the good practice requirements highlighted in mentoring research from a variety of fields” (p. 279). Mentoring, according to (DfES 2005, p. 2) was seen as:

• A learning conversation: structured professional dialogue, rooted in evidence from the professional learner’s practice.
• A thoughtful relationship: developing trust, attending respectfully and with sensitivity to the powerful emotions in deep professional learning.
• A learning agreement: establishing confidence about the boundaries of the relationship by agreeing and upholding ground rules that address imbalances of power and accountability.
• Combining support from fellow professional learners and specialists: collaborating with colleagues to sustain commitment to learning; seeking out specialist expertise to extend skills and knowledge and to model good practice.
• Growing self-direction: an evolving process in which the learner takes increasing responsibility for their professional development as skills, knowledge and self-awareness increase.
• Setting challenging and personal goals: identifying goals that build on what learners know and can do already, but could not yet achieve alone, while attending both institutionally and individual priorities.
• Understanding why different approaches work: developing understanding of the theory that underpins new practice so that it can be interpreted and adapted for different contexts.

• Acknowledging the benefits to the mentors and coaches, recognizing and making use of the professional learning that mentors and coaches gain from the opportunity to mentor or coach.

• Experimenting and observing: creating a learning environment that supports risk taking and innovation and encourages professional learners to seek out direct evidence from practice.

• Using resources effectively: making and using time and other resources creatively to protect and sustain learning, action and reflection on a day-to-day basis.

In 2013, virtually an entire volume (volume 8) of the International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching was devoted to an analysis of the work of David Clutterbuck (e.g. 2007, 2008) though his work mostly focused on the business application of coaching. However, a number of writers did point out that many aspects could well be related to coaching in a sports context. Bloom (2013a) believed that despite the development of coach education courses in such places as Canada, Australia and UK, their efforts to integrate mentoring into the actual training and development of coaches “there is still a long way to go before mentoring becomes integrated for coaches in the same manner that it does for teachers, doctors, and many other business professionals” (p. 219). Rynne (2014), in research conducted with a variety of elite level Australian high performance sport coaches, identified a number of barriers to mentoring that afflicted Australian sports coaches. Areas that have also previously been established are lack of time between mentor and mentee, lack of a proper number of capable and respected mentors and the “perceived threat of exposing areas of deficit to others in a highly competitive environment of sports coaching” (Rynne, 2013, p. 223) were the main factors he identified. Writing in the same journal David Megginson (2013), a researcher and collaborator of Clutterbuck, takes issue with what he calls Clutterbuck’s ‘nominal fallacy’ by which he means seeing mentoring as a discrete phenomenon, when in fact, in Megginson’s view “there is no uniformity about the characteristics of the processes that are called ‘mentoring’ and no features that differentiate mentoring from what some people call coaching” (p. 179).
This position is often argued in the non-sports coaching literature though it seems perfectly reasonable to examine the way sports coaching has sought to utilise the idea of mentoring to help enhance coach performance and how indeed such coaching might differ from that utilised in other professions. Rolfe (2013) describes how the Australian Olympic team took a number of mentors to the London 2012 Games though often these were used as counsellors/support staff to both coaches and athletes. Some of these ‘mentors’ were in fact former Australian elite performers (Rolfe calls them ‘legendary achievers’) from different sports such as Steve Waugh in cricket and John Eales in rugby. Formally entitled Athletic Liaison Officers (ALOs) their role was primarily to act as supportive guides though not as strict mentors in the accepted sense. Bloom (2013b) believes that there is currently a lack of empirical research on coaches being formally mentored and this is replaced by anecdotal evidence (e.g. Bloom, 2013a; Cushion et al., 2003; Cushion, 2006). Jones (2009) also used anecdotal evidence when citing the views of Ian McGeechan, the former Lions rugby coach, when pointing to the way that young coaches may have developed mainly through their own experience and by observing other coaches.

Though mentoring is difficult to define in clear cut terms one of its main aims is not just a system of information exchange but a “process that actively supports professional development by assisting mentees to become, for example, more reflective about practice, to develop their autonomy and enhance their ability to solve problems” (Griffiths, 2011, p. 302). The available literature regarding mentoring in sports is very limited and that relating specifically to professional football (in the UK), virtually non-existent.

Continuing Professional Development (CPD) of coaches

In discussing how continuing professional development (CPD) of coaches is part of their ongoing professional development, Armour (2010) draws upon the work of Dewey (1902) and Kirk and McDonald (1998) to advocate the use of social constructivist theory to understand the learning process. “Learning is an active and creative process involving an individual’s interaction with their physical environment and with other learners” (Kirk & MacDonald, 1998, p. 377). Cushion (2011), however, believes that “constructivism is not really a theory but a description that encompasses a range of approaches to learning….Constructive approaches are
concerned with how learners build their own mental structures through interaction with their environment” (p. 168). When groups who share a common understanding of professional practice come together to pool knowledge and experience they may be able to attempt to solve or at least investigate common problems and therefore arrive at possible solutions. Cushion et al., (2003), when examining the relevance and importance of CPD for coach development, believe that it is through such experiences that “shared meanings about the occupational culture of coaching starts to take place” (p. 216). The numerous hours that coaches spend with their athletes and interacting with other coaches dwarfs the amount of time that coaches actually spend on their formal learning so it is clearly important that such informal learning experiences be valued. Gilbert and Trudel (2006) verify this view and believe that it is not surprising that more and more acceptance and, indeed, the need for such activities as mentoring, reflection and CPD should be considered as essential parts of the informal learning process in coach development. Gilbert et al., (2006) verify this view and believe that it is not surprising that more and more acceptance and indeed need for such activities as mentoring, reflection and continuing professional development (CPD) be considered as essential parts of the informal learning process in coach development.

Many of the major professions now utilise CPD activities as part of ongoing professional renewal and it is also accepted in sports coaching but the actual evidence to underline its value and relevance has yet to be established. Armour (2011c) reinforces the point that as professionals teachers and coaches, as well as others in the more traditional professions, have a duty to continue to engage in their own professional development throughout their careers, keeping abreast of most of the up to date knowledge available. Pressures of time, increasing bureaucratic demands by authorities and government policies (Armour & Yelling, 2004) make such ongoing involvement always demanding. However, as most sports coaching in the UK relates to part time volunteers it is understandable that participating in developmental courses can be seen as onerous and perhaps expensive though for those coaches who are at, or aspire to work at, elite levels continuous professional development is essential and National Governing Bodies (NGBs) commonly offer a variety of courses to assist in such development (cf. Sports Coach UK for a variety of courses available both online and in practical workshop situations). Often however, these courses have been criticised as being largely ineffective and a waste of time and money (Guskey &
Sparkes, 2002). Armour (2011c) recites a whole gamut of responses that physical education teachers offered regarding the negative perceptions they had of such courses and one teacher reported “that the best bits of these courses are the coffee breaks and lunches when you are talking to other coaches” (Armour, 2011c, p. 231). Such development courses are often seen as too sporadic, often one-offs and “disconnected from prior learning and the context in which learning should be applied” (Armour, 2011c, p. 231). Similar complaints have been made about longer courses often as a part of coach qualifications. Jones and Brewer (2004) provide evidence from Ian McGeechan, former Scotland and Lions rugby coach, citing similar concerns. Armour and Yelling (2004) also provide criticisms of formal education courses though their sample was physical education teachers and direct comparisons may not be entirely valid even if there are clear similarities between the two professions.

It was generally the norm for individual sporting bodies to offer their own CPD courses for coaches though these were largely spasmodic, often incoherent, lightly supervised and rarely welcomed by coaches as meeting their practical needs. However, CPD activities for sport coaches have now become a fundamental part of most National Governing Bodies’ (NGBs) coach development plans. Sports Coach UK launched their ‘Revised Sport Coaching Framework’ (2013, p. 1) which they state “contains four headline objectives that by March 2017 we will have:

- More appropriately qualified and skilled coaches
- A more diverse workforce
- A culture of self-improvement
- A better supported workforce

Contributing to sustained and increased participation and improved performance in sport”.

It was expressly stated that CPD courses would be a central aspect of such plans. Most NGBs in the UK bought into this guide though, surprisingly, the Scottish Football Association (SFA) did not and chose to offer their own CPD courses. Coaches are required to attain a minimum of 15 hours over a three year period per qualification that they hold and a variety of courses are offered. Little empirical evidence has been published by the SFA to demonstrate the efficacy and coach response to these courses. One of the major problems regarding CPD courses is that
NGBs rarely publish evidence of the way these courses are perceived by coaches and, consequently it is difficult to ascertain to what extent such courses make a profound impact on the coaching population. Muijs and Linsey (2008) believe that the evaluation of CPD courses is “rarely undertaken in a systematic and focused manner. Until more acceptable and well researched studies are undertaken to examine the impact of such courses, though well, meaning, it is not possible to state that CPD courses for coaches are making a major contribution to coach learning, which is what they are meant to do” (p. 196).

**Communities of Practice (CoPs)**

Literature from the coaching area CoPs is now seen as an important aspect of coach learning and development. The basic principles underlying CoPs have been exemplified in the early chapter on professional socialisation. With the increased awareness of and support for coaching in the UK and Collins 2014) more attention has been focussed on the actual provision of coach education. Criticisms of coaching courses in sport have been extensive (Callary, Culver, Werthner & Bales, 2014; Mesquita et al., 2014; Cushion et al., 2010, Lyle & Cushion, 2010; Werthner & Trudel, 2009) though Nelson et al. (2006) have made a plea for more importance to be attached to the social nature of coach learning - a shift to place individual involvement in their own development. As a result a number of researchers have pointed to the possible benefits of utilising Lave and Wenger’s (1991) ideas relating to CoPs as one example of how learning through a non-formalised approach may be beneficial to coach development though a number of concerns remain regarding the actual benefits accruing from such an approach.

Though Nelson and Cushion (2006) point to the proliferation of coaching courses throughout the UK which should lead to enhanced coaching development, such formal courses are often seen as merely ‘train and verify’ attempts to help coaches. (Trudel & Gilbert, 2006) thought that such formal courses usually have severe limitations, not attending to the practical needs of the participants, being expensive in terms of time commitments and finance (Stoszkowski & Collins, 2014) and, more importantly, not providing context specific information on course content (Trudel & Gilbert, 2006). Saury and Durand (1998) point to lack of consistency and quality of delivery and believe that such courses have relatively low impact on coach
learning. Other writers, such as Mallett et al. (2009), Chesterfield et al. (2010) and Cushion et al. (2010) believe that this has lead to coaches questioning the relevance and utility of such courses to their professional development (Gilbert & Trudel, 1999). Further, other writers (Jones et al., 2003; Cushion 2006; Gilbert & Trudel, 2005) have stated that whether coaching courses are offered at amateur or elite level the overall opinions of the quality and relevance of such courses are, in the words of Culver and Trudel (2008a, p. 97) ‘mixed’. Consequently, various writers in the field of coach education and development (Jones et al., 2003; Cushion & Nelson 2013 and Cushion et al., 2010), among others have sought to emphasise the social nature of learning and point to the approach of Lave and Wenger (1991), and Wenger (1998a, 1998b) and their topic of communities of practice (CoPs) as one way to enhance coach learning and development from situating the learner and his/her learning as part of a social process. Consequently, there has been a great deal of attention directed toward the establishment of other, informal, approaches to learning by coaches such as allowing individual coaches opportunities for developing their knowledge of practice through direct experience of observation of other coaches.

With coaching being seen as a complex activity (Jones et al., 2003) the training of coaches should not be limited to a list of courses based on the assumption provided by Wenger (1998b) who believed that that learning is an individual process that has a beginning and an end, that is best separated from the rest of activities, and that it is the result of teaching. Culver and Trudel (2008) point out that many coach education courses rarely stick to this dictum, and are usually based on individuals spending “hours provided in a classroom or on a practice field by a designated course conductor with the evaluation being a solitary test where collaborating is considered cheating” (p. 97). Jones et al. (2004), however, have pointed to the general agreement that exists suggesting that learning from experience plays an important part in their development as coaching professionals. Thus coach interaction is an important aspect of such development. According to Culver and Trudel (2008), when the idea of forming CoPs is sought it is crucial to understand that such coach interactions will be influenced by three factors – mutual engagement, joint enterprise and shared repertoire, which are central to Wenger’s understanding of CoPs.

Culver and Trudel (2008, p. 100) expand on what these three areas comprise:
Engagement in practice is individual and tensions and challenges are accepted as common elements of participation.

Joint enterprise implies that the enterprise is co-operative “not because the coaching staff agree on all things but because it is collectively negotiated, allowing it to be uniquely individual, thus never (being) fully determined by outside mandate, by prescription or by any individual participant.”

Shared interactions. This acts as a source of community coherence. The repertoire of a community allows for the negotiation of meaning because it reflects the communities’ history of mutual engagement while remaining ambiguous.

Tannehill (2011) cites the work of Bosco (1986) and Bruner (1956) to support the notion that “learning is more effective when it takes place in an environment that encourages active participation with opportunities for frequent and sustained interaction among the group” (p. 313). Though the relationship between community and learning was first established in a business context, it has been adapted and applied to educational settings where teachers focus on developing their own collaborative culture. “Though professional learning contexts in coaching may be different from those in teaching the potential to gain learning benefits from collaboration is similar” (Tannehill, 2011, p. 313). Writing primarily from a teaching perspective, Tannehill (2011) points to a series of five steps in the development of a (teaching) community of practice though these may not really be applicable to a professional coaching context. However, it appears that the lifespan of any community is limited by the value and utility placed on it by its members, as ultimately any community functions most effectively when it is steered by its own members and coaching should not be any different. It is quite clear that the role of the learner is no longer a passive one and such a philosophy “seems outdated in our current knowledge based society, where people have access to countless amounts of information through the Internet” (Culver & Trudel, 2006, p. 1). The variety of outside learning opportunities, such as workplace learning, nonformal learning and incidental learning have pointed to the way that peers may play a crucial role in an individual’s learning. The development and cultivation of communities that might assist in such learning situations has seen a growth in the studies that have examined this area in physical
education and, increasingly, sports coaching as exemplified in the work of writers such as Cushion (2011), Cushion and Denstone (2011), Galipeau and Trudel (2006).

“The idea of communities of practice is not really new. Groups have always met informally and to some extent learned from each other” (Cassidy & Rossi, 2006, p. 239). Wenger et al. (2002) believe that though all CoPs are not identical they do share common structural elements – domain of knowledge, a community of people and share common practices. Communities thus are ‘the social fabric of learning’ (Cassidy & Rossi, 2006, p. 240) and the emphasis on learning as social participation is at the very root of any community of learning. Jones et al. (2004) describe how one senior football coach in the UK (Steve Harrison) felt that he could learn from everyone and other researchers. (Cassidy & Rossi, 2006) have attested to the belief that formal and informal conversations with other coaches to be as valuable to their professional development. This is perhaps even more important than purely theoretical and cognitive knowledge delivered by coach educators as part of formal education schemes.

CoPs are yet another aspect of how coaches might learn in a non-formal setting though the heavy emphasis of competition, which is at the heart of sporting endeavour, especially in the professional sphere of sport raises some important issues. Cushion and Denstone (2011, p. 98) state that a CoP is not merely a repository for technical knowledge and skills; and cite Lave and Wenger (1991, p. 98) in stating “rather it is an intrinsic condition for the existence of knowledge, not least because it provides the interpretive support necessary for making sense of its heritage”. Trudel and Gilbert (2006) insist that CoPs are not mere networks of practice or informal knowledge networks “as they contain selected groups of people who share a common purpose, desire to learn and know what each other knows” (p. 99). Cushion (2008b) believed that CoPs in coaching may not be as neat and tidy as we would like. Summarising some of their previous studies on CoPs, Culver and Trudel (2008) suggested that the facilitator (whom they termed ‘the learning architect’) plays a vital role in the development of the group though Cushion (2008b) cautioned against the idea that CoPs that are ‘manufactured’ or facilitated may not engage a coach’s sense of belonging and thus inhibit meaningful learning.

When discussing CoPs in sport, Galipeau and Trudel (2006) point out that there is a difference between a ‘coach’s’ CoP and an ‘athlete’s’ CoP, particularly
regarding the roles each community might perform in the sports setting. There is very limited research in the sporting literature regarding evidence of actual CoPs in practice. Exceptions are from the work of Trudel and Gilbert (2004) with ice hockey coaches and the Culver and Trudel (2008) studies of an athletic club and a ski club. Both of these studies were undertaken in Canada and so may not be generalisable to other sporting cultures such as that which may exist in the UK.

One of the problematic areas of CoPs in sports coaching is that the environment is often extremely competitive and coaches are often loathe to share ideas of best practice as other coaches can easily be seen “more as opponents than collaborators” (Culver & Trudel, 2008, p. 5). Whereas CoPs are often described as benign learning and supportive environments where trust is an essential element “even the mildest of coaching contexts are fundamentally based on competition with explicitly designated winners and losers” (Culver & Trudel, 2008, p. 2). Although largely supportive of the idea of the utility of CoPs, Stoszkowski and Collins (2014) are at pains to point out that there is need to ascertain exactly how these help coach learning and “need to be checked against accepted criteria of evaluation” (p. 775). Other writers have pointed to the lack of an appreciation of the social side of coaching (Jones et al., 2002) and have emphasised the importance of an understanding of the social complexities of coaching (Cushion et al., 2006; Potrac & Cassidy, 2006). The constructivist approach to learning emphasises that knowledge is a social construct and that learning alongside other people is crucial for learning to develop and therefore should be seen as a collaborative process. Such developed knowledge is thus not imposed on the learner in a formal way but the point that most coaches learn from other coaches has been reiterated by writers such as Gould et al. (1990); Gilbert and Trudel (2005) and Salmela (1995). The philosophic approach of Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998b) demonstrates that learning happens best ‘in context’, where people meet challenges in their own environment. This view is further supported by Cushion et al. (2003) when stating that the majority of coach learning should be situated in practice in comparison to much coach education which takes place in classrooms or lecture halls.

Problems of differentiating CoPs from related concepts led Grossman, Wineberg and Woolworth (2001, p. 942) to state “The word ‘community’ has lost its meaning. From the prevalence of terms such as ‘communities of learners’, ‘discourse
communities’ and ‘epistemic communities’ to ‘school community’, ‘teacher community’ or ‘communities of practice’ it is clear that community has become an obligatory appendage to every educational innovation”. Similarly, Watson (2014, p. 18) made the same complaint when discussing the analogous area of professional learning communities (PLCs) when stating that “the term PLC has been used so ubiquitously that it risks losing all meaning”. When pointing out the difficulties of developing and sustaining CoPs in sporting cultures, Culver and Trudel (2008, p. 10) state that “The sport culture does not facilitate collegiality between coaches in the same league” and suggest that it is often more relevant to engage in debate and discussion with fellow coaches outside of their league of operation. The issue that has often been assumed in elite sport is that the dominant goal, especially prevalent in professional sports, is that winning is the underlying objective, so it is understandable that coaches would not wish to share their thoughts or fears or views generally with what are considered direct opponents who may be in the same employment market as themselves.

**Developing a professional identity**

Developing a professional identity is crucial for a coach’s learning and development. It is at the very heart of his/her being and encapsulates notions of personal philosophy of practice, ideas of self ideal and professional aspiration. There is little research evidence that testifies to such development and information regarding the professional development of coaches in football is almost non-existent. The most comparable and useful evidence comes from educational studies and this is presented in Chapter 2 (Professional Socialisation).

Closely linked to a professional’ development of a coaching identity is the area of coaching philosophy. “Compared to topics such as coach behaviours, there has been a dearth of research on coaching philosophy” (Armour, 2010, p. 235). Very little research has expressly attended to the notion of what constitutes a “coaching philosophy”, with notable exceptions being the studies of Cassidy (2009), Cushion (2008a), Lyle (2002), Nash et al. (2008) and Schempp et al. (2006). Some writers have implied that a philosophy of coaching should come from behaviours derived from a range of practical and educational experiences. Cassidy et al. (2004, p. 57) believe that “the link between coach’s beliefs and their actions has rarely been examined through
field studies”. Martens (2004) points out that the great American basketball coach John Wooden believes that coaches do not begin their careers with the same philosophy that they finish with. Lyle (1999) views philosophy not merely in terms of beliefs and values and principles, a commonly held view, but adds behaviours that will characterise a coach’s practice as an important contribution to any coaching philosophy. He argues that a coaching philosophy should be seen in terms of ‘principles’ that guide coaching practice though verification of this normally remains at the anecdotal level. While accepting the need for coaches to have a well designed and appropriate philosophy for their work Cassidy et al. (2009) point out that coaching philosophies are often compromised by constraints such as the desire to meet the needs of the employing organisation. Such pressures are common in elite sport especially when working with athletes in those sports, such as football, where the rewards for success may be enormous, compared to other sports, though the threat of failure is just as relevant.

Much of the existing research that specifically focuses on coaching philosophy, and it is rather meagre, tends to focus on anecdotal accounts or personal books from high profile coaches who have retired from the fray. Cassidy (2009) however reviewed the extant literature from a socio-cultural and pedagogical perspective and argues that coaching philosophies should be regarded as “flexible guides to action” (p. 64) based on personal values. Both Cassidy (2009) and Lyle (1999) draw on the work of Bourdieu (1977) to argue that coaching can be viewed as regular improvisation while the work of Cushion (2007) and Taylor and Garratt (2010a) use Bourdieu’s notion of ‘habitus’ to indicate how social practices might inform and support one’s philosophic approach to coaching. Stating that there has been a distinct lack of studies that have examined personal coaching philosophies in peer reviewed literature, Jenkins (2010) points to two exceptions in the work of Schempp, McCullick and Mason (2006), and Nash, Sproule and Horton (2008). Schemmp et al. (2006) found that philosophy (defined as things teachers believed) was one of five themes that emerged from an analysis of a sample of 31 golf coaches. Nash et al. (2008), on the other hand, looked at 21 coaches of different levels in Scotland and concluded that as coaches gained knowledge and became more experienced “they were able to articulate a coherent personal coaching philosophy and contextualise it in their coaching practice” (p. 539). Jones et al. (2004) gave a few examples of how coaches develop a philosophy where
rugby coaches Bob Dwyer and Ian McGeechan explain the importance of their educational background and how this contributed to the development of their coaching philosophy.

“The notion of ‘becoming’ a coach which is central to the learning of ‘how’ to be a coach and the process of ‘becoming’ can be seen to sit at the articulation of practice and identity” (Cassidy & Rossi, 2006, p. 242). Butt et al. (1997) suggest that the idea of ‘becoming’ can be seen as a form of self discovery which Cassidy and Rossi (2006) believe “results from ‘the nexus of membership’ and the social practices inherent within human membership and human agency – the capacity to make choices as a member” (p. 243). Thus, being part of a coaching community, for example, enables the participation as a social practice as well as enabling the negotiation required for that participation. The notion that ‘learning never stops’ is often stated, though Cassidy and Rossi (2006) further suggest that, as testified by the anecdotal account given by Steve Harrison in Jones et al. (2003), “it is not unreasonable to suggest neither does the ‘becoming’ as it is always under negotiation as part of a community” (p. 243).

**Compassion and coaching**

If one’s personal (coaching) philosophy is integral to the way one behaves as a professional then it seems justifiable to examine how the notion of compassion might be part of such a philosophy even though in the hard bitten world of professional sports such a notion might seem rather bizarre. The growth in compassion research over the last ten years owes a great deal to the seminal work by Neff (2003). She defined compassion as “being open to and moved by one’s own suffering, experiencing feelings of caring and kindness, taking an understanding, non-judgemental attitude towards one’s inadequacies and failures and recognizing that one’s experiences is part of the common human experience (p. 24). Having some connections to the humanistic tradition of such therapists as Rogers and Kelly one can see the connection to their notions of empathy though Gilbert and Choden (2013) believe that the definition by Neff is incomplete and argue for the idea that for compassion to be truly complete one needs to be pro-socially motivated. They suggest that one (i.e. the coach) needs to engage in (in reality understand and be aware of) suffering but also work towards the alleviation and prevention of suffering in others.
Over the past few years there has been an interesting development in an area of
behaviour that could well be of direct relevance to how coaches actual interact with
their athletes – compassion or what Gilbert (2009) calls “compassionate mind
training”. Though it is extremely rare to find any articles on compassion in the sport
literature recently a number have been produced. According to Storie (2014) the word
compassion does not once figure in the 72 page report UK Sport Elite Sports Coaching
Programme Prospectus (2014-2017). As a number of writers have examined the
deleterious effects of elite sport on performers (e.g., Gilbourne & Anderson, 2011) it is
clear that the use of such a concept as compassion might be attractive to coaches
working at this level. Unfortunately, there are a number of sports, such as rugby (both
Union and League) and perhaps particularly football, where the very notion of being
compassionate is often seen as anathema to those involved at the elite, professional
level. The often quoted macho or alpha male culture surrounding these sports often
prevents coaches from engaging in what might be seen as sympathetic responses to
sports performers who might be having some difficulties that are impacting on their
life. Mental health in elite sport is now beginning to receive much more attention. In
2015, FIFPro, the worldwide organisation for professional footballers, took a leading
role in this area and published a report regarding the susceptibility footballers,
worldwide, to have mental health issues, which were much more prevalent than in the
general population (Gernon, 2016). Indeed Gernon (2016) relates the anecdote of how
a former Premier League player and England international player, Stan Collymore,
“confessed to his manager, John Gregory, that he was suffering from clinical
depression. Gregory responded by asking what someone on £20,000 per week had to
be depressed about?” (p.154). Such an attitude is not uncommon in elite professional
sport when winning really is, in the oft quoted words of the famous NFL coach, Vince
Lombardi ‘everything’.

Lyle, (2005, p.xii) states that coaching at the elite level is “an integrated
interdependent and serial accumulation of purposeful activities that are designed to
achieve a set of objectives centred on improved competition performance” while in
contrast organisation psychologists Smith, Van Oosten and Boyatzis (2009),
emphasise the more human aspect of the coaching process defining it as “a facilitative
or helping relationship with the purpose of achieving some type of change, learning or
new level of individual or organizational performance”. Thus, coaches should be
striving for performance outcomes and personal growth in their players and while many coaches might mouth pleasantries in such directions often in reality they behave in a contrary direction, possibly because of the perceived and actual pressures to meet performance targets. Indeed Nelson et al. (2013) believe that coaching involves managing one’s own emotions in the face of complex psychological difficulties, such as goal related frustrations or dealing with external criticism. Potrac and Marshall (2011) describe Hochschild’s (1983) notion of ‘emotional labour’ and show, from the perspective of one of the authors (Marshall, himself a coach) how the inability to express one’s true emotions in the workplace might be detrimental to ongoing development and consequent performance. The gap between felt emotions and those actually present is a threat to the coach’s sense of wellbeing. The great demands of coaching and performing at the elite level are often unsustainable and recent examples of both players, such as English international cricketers Jonathan Trott, Marcus Trescothick, high profile footballers such as Clark Carlisle, Gary Speed from the Premier League and Robert Enke, the German international goalkeeper, who eventually committed suicide, and football coaches such as Celtic FC Manager, Neil Lennon and Newcastle manager, Alan Pardew attest to the excessive demands at the elite level. Indeed a report cited in the Glasgow Herald, 3 April 2014 provided evidence gathered by FIFPro from players from six European football nations which reported that 26% of players who were still currently playing football at the elite level suffered from mental illness while this figure rose to 39% once they had retired. Being aware of and understanding this type of suffering should enable steps to be taken to alleviate it without which, according to Gilbert (2009) it is not possible to be compassionate towards others.

Coach-athlete relationships, like many other types of relationships, are often required to withstand conflict and building successful relationships need energy. Perhaps the days are beginning to recede when having personal concern and consideration for others (such as the coach for his/her athlete) is not seen as a weakness though in the more “macho” sports of which football is particularly vulnerable, this is perhaps a slow process. Not all coaches can demonstrate the same levels of compassion and individual players react to coaches in different ways. Some clearly would like the coach to show concern for them as athletes but don’t want the coach to go beyond that, such as into the “personal sphere” while others just want the
coach “to tell me what to do – I don’t want you to explain why I should do it, just tell me and I will do it.”

It is not just with athletes that coaches should be compassionate, it should occur with colleagues too. However, often the very nature of competition for top jobs and interpersonal rivalries makes it difficult for coaches to be truly compassionate towards their colleagues, both in sport and in the workplace generally. Potrac et al. (2013, p. 80) believe that compassionate behaviour is rarely evidenced in elite sport environments by quoting a coach who said “I wanted to do well. I wanted to better myself as a coach. As such I increasingly came to view my colleagues as competitors in a tacitly understood competition. While no one would admit it when working together, each of us was trying to outperform the other in order to preserve our place in a very competitive environment”. Further in the same article the same coach explains how the deleterious effects of the competitive environment on his personality led to the decision to retire from football coaching: “Faults and imperfections everywhere. I felt shame, shallow, selfish, egotistical, uncaring shame. Everything a coach should not be everything I had become (Potrac et al., 2012, p. 83). Rynne, et al. (2010) writing on the topic of workplace learning of high performance coaches in Australia emphasise the highly competitive nature of such environments and its impact on some coaches. They describe how difficult it might be to develop trust with fellow coaches and give an example of when one top coach said “I’ve heard a highly regarded coach say “I’ll give you a piece of advice.....don’t give ‘em all your knowledge’ ....(He was talking about other coaches). ‘You’ve got to keep some of it for yourself so you’ve got an edge”. Such views point to the inevitable difficulty of fostering a compassionate approach to coaching and such a position is likely to be exemplified in many elite environments though clearly there is little hard factual evidence to verify this stance.

There has been an increase in the development of ‘soft skills’ in managers, coaches and leaders in business. Marques (2013) believes that the tide is turning for those in the workplace towards a preference for empathic leaders. Though Chelladurai (1978) emphasises the point that there is no one way to be an effective leader (i.e. coach) through adopting a more democratic style of coaching, the coach becomes a facilitator of learning with an athlete-centred environment. Lyle (2002) suggested that for this to become effective a more flexible, indeed empathic, approach by the coach is
necessary, though Gilbert and Choden (2013) believe that compassion is far more relevant to coaching than mere empathy as this would imply a willingness to take action to relieve suffering in others. Annerstedt and Lindgren (2014, p. 35) also believe that attending to the emotions of players is of vital importance when they state “A coach must be able to feel empathy and understanding and treat every human being with respect in any situation he or she experiences. It is simply about being able to take the other person’s position”.

Being a “compassionate coach” does not simply mean focussing exclusively on what Jack et al. (2013) state as positive attractors as against negative attractors, a criticism at times laid at the positive psychology movement, whereby anything negative seemingly, is ignored in favour of total focus on the positive. Clearly this cannot work in an elite level performance where failure to address techniques, for example, those that need attention, would ultimately be detrimental. However, it is a question of balance and Jack et al’s (2013) view is that focussing on one’s difficulties shows a lack of compassion and dwelling on an athlete’s shortcomings creates defensiveness. The compassionate approach which focuses on positive attractors such as strengths and aspirations, as against such negative attractors as performance targets and areas of technical weakness would seem to be a way forward for coaches though as yet little research, even anecdotally, has examined the validity of such.

Holistic Coaching

Over the recent years there has been a growing awareness in the concept of holistic sports coaching and a number of writers have examined this topic (Cross & Lyle, 1999; Cassidy, Jones & Potrac, 2009; Cassidy, 2010a, 2010b). An entire issue of the journal International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching: Volume 5, Number 4, 2010, was dedicated to the question of ‘Holism in sports coaching: Beyond humanistic psychology’ and though a number of inputs were related to the wider field of coaching, in business for example, most were directed at sports coaching. The lead author, Tania Cassidy, introduced the topic and wrote an overarching commentary which summarised the various approaches by individual authors in the issue. From the outset Cassidy (2010a) believes that “it is not clear what constitutes ‘holistic coaching’ because it is used in a variety of ways including as a synonym to challenge dominant practices” (p. 439). Shaffer (1978) states that humanistic psychology “does not involve
a specific content area so much as an attitude or orientation towards psychology as a whole” (p. 1) and Lombardo (1987) drew on its principles when describing the application of “long before humanism became a topic of conversation in the sports coaching literature” (Cassidy, 2010a, p. 441). Often writers refer to person centred coaching though this is not synonymous with having a humanistic approach, though clearly both are closely related. A number of writers have utilised the principles of Carl Rogers person centred theory in relation to sport coaching (Carless & Douglas, 2008; Lyle, 2002; Cushion, 2010) others have demonstrated how Kelly’s Personal Construct Theory might readily be useful within a coaching context (Clarke, 1994b, 1995; Cushion, 2010). Kidman (2010) believes that the terms ‘holistic’, ‘athlete centred’ and humanistic “are about the individual and his or her culturally based context” (p. 473). Essentially they are about enabling people coaches to encourage growth and development in their athletes by providing a supportive learning environment. Hamel and Gilbert (2010) believe that “there is a considerable amount of literature related to ‘holistic coaching’ in North America but the term itself is rarely used” (p. 485). Mallett and Rynne (2010) point to the importance of examining subjective experience. Humanistic psychology has its roots in existentialism and phenomenology and emphasises the individual’s capacity for self actualisation. It stresses the importance of self awareness and thus coaches should ensure that their athlete charges are supported in a way that promotes such development and empowerment of the individual athletes with whom they engage. Lyle (2010), however, points to the issues that may arise when coaches are working with the elite section of performance when the pressures to achieve may be quite different from those in operation with younger, aspiring athletes, “where a more balanced approach might be used” (p. 451). Finally, Cassidy (2010a) points out that recognising that the interpretations of holism are culturally specific and the integration of other disciplines, such as education and sociology, are important in any proper understanding of the practice of holistic coaching. “If the sports community fails to gain a greater understanding of holism, yet continues to use the phrase ‘holistic coaching’, the phrase has the potential to become meaningless” (p. 442).

Implicit in the area of having a holistic approach to coaching is the question of duty of care. This is often seen in mainly legalistic terms (cf. the work of The Sports Law and Strategy Group, 2010) or mainly with regards to injury prevention though the
concept has broader connotations for the holistic coach. Treating the athlete as a whole person and not just as a competitor demands careful consideration. Lyle (2010) points out that “coaching practice should have a dual focus of performance and (athlete) welfare” (p. 451).

Summary

This chapter began with an overview of the historical development of coaching and included the ways in which the professionalization of coaching (particularly in the UK) has taken place over the recent past. The ways coaches learn to become professional was highlighted in the areas of formal coach education courses as well as the less formal areas of reflective practice, mentoring, communities of practice, and continuing professional development activities.

The aspirations of those in the coaching community to be accepted as established professionals still has some way to go before being fulfilled. In order for this to happen there are a variety of matters that need to be addressed. The evidence presented in this chapter suggests that formal coach education courses do not yet meet the demands of coaches, especially those experienced coaches, operating at elite levels who are chary of having their own experiences dismissed in the attempts by governing bodies, often at the behest of government directives, to ‘academicise’ (as it is often perceived by coaches) courses and reduce the importance of their own personal coaching experiences. The importance of the social nature of learning, in all its variations, is thus not given priority. Consequently, much recent and relevant evidence presented in this chapter would strongly favour the use of alternative aspects of learning. In this way coaches are most likely to develop an overall skill set in which their own coaching identity will be enhanced and their approach to engaging with athletes, of all ages, will become more holistic. As a result, athletes are more likely to become involved in their own learning processes as they grow and develop. The modern coach is thus more likely to be compassionate and aware of their role, in terms of duty of care to their charges, even when operating at the very competitive edge of professional sporting performance.

Such an approach fits in ideally with the tenets of humanistic psychology and underlines the use of Kelly’s Personal Construct Psychology for analysis of coaching development.
Chapter 4 – Research Questions

The fundamental question at the root of this work is to ascertain how professional football (soccer) coaches in Scotland attempt to develop a professional understanding of their role. The whole area of professionalism is still a hotly contested one and though the ‘traditional’ professions of medicine, law and the church have now been imitated by other activities that aspire to be considered a profession, such as education and social work, the area of sports coaching is still seen as being some way short of being accepted as a true profession. Indeed Lyle (1999), who has researched the sports coaching area extensively over many years, considered coaching to be a ‘pseudo profession’. Further, most sports coaching literature ignores the essence of what being a professional means, with the exception of such writers as Armour (2010), Lyle (2007), and Taylor and Garratt (2010a; 2010b; 2013). Very few have attempted to ascertain what areas of belief or philosophy are held by coaches regarding their practice.

Coaching philosophy often refers to actual style of coaching, democratic versus autocratic for example, though Cross and Lyle (1999) believe that an holistic approach to coaching, which emphasises personal development and growth through a coaching experience is possible. Little evidence for such a stance is apparent from the limited literature on the coaching of elite professional footballers where the demands and the regards for successful performance predominate. The literature regarding football coaches in this area is almost nonexistent. Horsley, Cockburn and James (2015), in a study specifically examining the philosophies of participation football (soccer) coaches (as distinct from those coaches operating at an elite level) suggest that it is very difficult to examine the success of holistic coaching philosophies when the performance aims are either to enhance life skills or to improve life-long learning. Participation coaching may have many similarities to elite coaching, as Lyle (2010) suggests, though evidently the emphasis is very different with performance outcomes being seen as much more important than development of players. Elite USA soccer coach Shannon Higgins-Cirovski (2015, p. 6) states that her “coaching philosophy evolved as she became more experienced” (as a coach) and this developmental aspect of coach learning to be a professional requires further investigation.

The ways in which young professional players learn to develop their understanding of the game has received little attention from researchers though it is
clearly important to ascertain what constructs these players make use of, regarding such matters as the ideal qualities of professional performance, and coaching they receive at their clubs. Coaching should have a direct impact on the players’ development and it is important to understand the player’s world (in terms of the ways in which they ‘construct’ their world) if coaching is to be most beneficial.

A limited amount of evidence has been produced regarding differences between neophyte coaches and the more experienced professionals though there is somewhat more evidence regarding such differences among professionals in the ‘classical’ professions (e.g. Medicine, Law). There is virtually no evidence of comparisons between neophyte coaches and their experienced counterparts in football, especially in a Scottish context. In the field of sports coaching the vast majority of work relates to coaches who are not operating at the elite level (such as Nash & Sproule, 2011) with swimming coaches, and those researchers who have attempted to examine elite football coaches, such as Potrac, Jones and Armour (2002) though they only used one coach as their sample.

The topic of ongoing professional learning has, over the past few years, received considerable attention, especially with greater need for accountability being seen now as the norm. The very concept of ‘professional socialisation’ refers to this learning process as Page (2005, p. 105) explains when describing this process as “the acquisition of values, attitudes, skills and knowledges pertaining to a professional subculture”. It is clear that there is considerable disquiet from nascent coaches undergoing their training (cf. former British Lions Rugby coach Ian McGeechan in Jones et al. 2004, pp. 53-63) and Cushion (2010) reinforces this view when noting how coaches, on their training courses, use Goffman’s (1959) idea of impression management to pretend to accept the pearls of wisdom handed down on formal training courses and then, on completion, “often revert to their own preferred methods which were largely implicit and learned from experience” (Cushion, 2010, p. 171).

There are various aspects of ongoing learning that now permeate personal development across the professions such as reflective practice, mentoring, CPD programmes etc. and sports coaching has also been affected by such notions. Gilbert and Trudel (2005), and Cropley and Hanton (2012) examined reflective practice, and Knowles (2005, 2011, 2014a, 2014b) has written extensively in this area. Cushion, (2006), and Jones, Harris and Miles (2009) commented on mentoring in coaches, as
did Ghaye (2009) though no real consensus of best practice has emerged, though it is becoming increasingly used through sports coaching and related professionals such as sport psychologists. Continuing professional development (CPD) is gaining much more currency in the coaching literature though it is perhaps the idea of professional learning communities (Bolam et al., 2005) following work from Lave and Wenger (1991) who spoke of ‘communities of practice’ that might be a fruitful area of research with sports coaches though (2014, p. 22) guards against “a form of increased surveillance” when talking about such communities in schools. The informality of such ‘communities’ would seem to be most relevant to the world of the experienced professional coach where ongoing contacts through meetings, coaching course involvement and support would appear more acceptable than the more formal and often derided CPD courses to which many football coaches in Scotland readily attest. Utilising the ‘Snake Interview’ technique used mainly in educational studies by Pope and Denicolo (2001) would seem an ideal instrument to ascertain what sort of important influences impact on the coaches’ ongoing professional learning.

It would, therefore be valuable to contrast the constructs that football coaches undergoing their initial training courses (badges) developed as they gained the relevant awards and how such constructs might differ from those of experienced professionals. With the changing roles that coaches have had to adopt in sports, especially the highly competitive sport of football, the traditional approaches have had to be reassessed. Recently the theoretical approach of ‘compassionate coaching’ has found some favour in the literature. Neff (2003) and Gilbert and Choden’s (2013) notion of ‘compassionate mind training’ suggests that compassion is far more relevant than mere empathy. Annerstedt and Lindgren (2014, p. 35) attest to the vital importance of dealing with the emotions of players when they state “A coach must be able to feel empathy and understanding and treat every human being with respect”. Rynne, Mallett and Tinning (2010), writing on the topic of workplace learning of high performance coaches in Australia, emphasise the highly competitive nature of such environments and the difficulties that impact on coaches who may wish to take a more person centred approach to athletes as well as fellow (often competitive) colleagues. Thus, by examining the constructs held by coaches at the different levels it would be possible to ascertain to what extent wider social/personal values and broader concepts of coaching might now be emerging.
The research questions across Studies 1, 2 and 3 are as follows:

**Study 1:** What are the constructs that developing players and recently turned professionals exhibit regarding ideal football performance and coaching?

- What are the constructs that developing professionals commonly use to describe the qualities necessary in the ideal player?
- What are the constructs held by players, who are on professional contracts, regarding coaching they have received?

**Study 2:** What are the constructs that neophyte coaches hold regarding appropriate coaching qualities?

- What are the constructs held by those coaches undertaking their “B” and ‘A’ License course?
- Are the constructs held by “B” License coaches qualitatively different from those expressed by those undertaking their “A” License badges?

**Study 3:** Once qualified at the highest level (“A” License level), and having been in professional practice for at least five years, how do these coaches continue to learn to be ‘professionals’?

- What were the constructs that individual, experienced coaches held regarding coaching?
- Were there any commonality of constructs that these coaches held?
- What constructs do these coaches see as more important regarding coaching?
- What influences (events, people, situations) impact on their professional development as coaches?
Chapter 5 – Methods

This chapter outlines the methods used to gather data from all samples across studies. All participants in the studies were males. Kelly’s (1955) Repertory Grid (Repgrid) technique was utilised to gather data from all samples. In addition, a Laddering Technique (Hinkle, 1965) and a Snake Interview (Pope & Denicolo, 2001) were used with the experienced male coaches in Study 3 to examine information pertaining to their lives as coaches once they had achieved the necessary certification to be classified as a football coach.

Participants and Procedures

A summary of the participants in Studies 1, 2 and 3 is outlined in Table 5.1 below.

Table 5.1
Participants: Studies 1, 2 and 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study 1a</th>
<th>Study 1b</th>
<th>Study 2a</th>
<th>Study 2b</th>
<th>Study 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young players</td>
<td>Professional Players</td>
<td>‘B’ License Coaches</td>
<td>‘A’ License Coaches</td>
<td>Senior, Experienced coaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 1 N = 18</td>
<td>Group 1 N = 11</td>
<td>N = 15</td>
<td>N = 12</td>
<td>N = 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2 N = 11</td>
<td>Group 2 N = 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Study 1a there were two samples of players at a senior Scottish Premier League club. The first group consisted of players (Group 1, N=18) who were aged between 14-16 years. All players completed a RepGrid, and the elements in the grid were the players from the group plus one for an ideal player. Constructs/contrasts were elicited through a process of discussion whereby the perceived qualities that were considered to be important in order to be an ‘elite’ player. Twenty such qualities were initially identified and these were reduced to ten by having the group rank order what they thought were the most important. These qualities were then listed randomly to form the constructs/contrasts (characteristics to be assessed) in the actual grid.
Study 1a

Group 1

For the first part of Study 1, the participants (Group 1) attended training sessions throughout week nights as well as spending one entire day per week at the training ground. The participating schools gave permission for these pupils to attend the full day sessions and the day was broken up into football related matters (e.g., sessions on fitness, technical work and psychology) as well as time being given to educational matters. Though players hope to ‘get a contract’ with the club, this could not happen until they were sixteen years of age. The group had two of the full time coaching staff from the club involved in their coaching. One was essentially the manager and had his SFA “A” license coaching award. He had played professional football at various clubs in Scotland. The other was a coach who had been a full time SPL player with a major Scottish team and already had his top coaching award, the SFA “A” License.

Group 2

For the second part of Study 1a players in Group 2 consisted of players (N=11) who were full time professional players at the same club, aged between 16-18 years. The same data collecting procedure that was used with Group 1 was used with Group 2. This group did not receive any specific psychological support from the author.

Study 1b

Group 1

For the first part of the investigation (Study 1b) a cohort of professional male players (N=11) from the Scottish Premier League Club X were participants.

Group 2

For the second part of Study 1b another cohort of professional players from the Scottish Premier League Club Y were used as participants. All were full time players and the protocol followed mirrored that of the first study with the exception that coaches that the players had known formed elements and the constructs/contrast were generated again by involving the players in a discussion to ascertain the qualities they perceived to be important in coaching with one element being the ‘Ideal Coach’.

Study 2a

This investigation consisted of a sample (N=15) of prospective male coaches during their SFA ‘B’ License course at the National Coaching Centre, Largs, Scotland.
This group is referred to as Study 1b, Group 1. Again, using a group discussion method to generate ideas pertaining to perceive coaching qualities/characteristics, a list of characteristics was generated and formed the basis of the construct/contrast section of the grid. Then each element was examined on a 1-5 scale. The 12 elements selected included one element which identified themselves as a coach. Then each element was rated in terms of the agreed constructs/contrasts.

**Study 2b**

The second part of this study consisted of a sample (Study 2b) consisted of candidates (N=12) undertaking their final coaching award (SFA ‘A’ level award) at the National Recreation Centre, Largs, Inverclyde. Again, using a group discussion method to generate ideas pertaining to perceive coaching qualities/characteristics, a list of characteristics was generated and formed the basis of the construct/contrast section of the grid. Then each element was examined on a 1-5 scale. The 12 elements selected included one element which identified themselves as a coach. Then each element was rated in terms of the agreed constructs/contrasts. Initially, each participant completed a Repgrid in a similar manner to that followed by participants in Study 2a, in that the elements chosen were a selection of coaches they had known plus one for an Ideal Coach. The grids were derived in exactly the same way as in previous studies (see Study 2a).

**Study 3**

The final study in the thesis consisted of collecting the following three sets of data from six senior coaches in Scotland, who had at least five years professional engagement once they had received their highest coaching award necessary (the SFA ‘A’ License):

a) Completion of a Repgrid. This was the same approach as was undertaken in Study 2.

b) Laddering (following the example of Hinkle’s (1965) approach) of constructs/contrasts derived from individual grids.

c) Snake Interview (following the approach suggested by the work of Pope & Denicolo, 2001).
Materials Used for Data Collection

Repertory Grid Technique

“The repertory grid technique (grid) is an idiographic means of understanding a person’s psychological space in terms of the patterns between constructs and elements” (Butler, 2009, p. 11). While it originated in the field of counseling/psychotherapy, it has been used in medical diagnosis, personal placement and development, market research, town planning, education as well as sport (performance) settings as well as many others. Though it is claimed by Butt and Burr (2004) that people too often tend to focus on Kelly’s measurement technique (the Repgrid) rather than utilise his theory in order to fully explain their work, it is important to realise that the Repgrid method of data gathering can be a vital tool and well respected tool of investigation.

Fransella, and Neimeyer (2005, p. 13) explain the use of the repertory grid technique as “...the grid technique addresses a central goal of PCT namely, bringing to light the distinctive ways that the individual human beings or groups organise and interpret some aspects of their experience”. One of the unique features of the grid technique is that it allows a very sensitive and structured approach to the participant’s personal world, at the same time it provides structured data which facilitate analysis and interpretation.

All data collected were gathered using the Repertory Grid Technique (Repgrid) and analysed using the software package devised by Gaines and Shaw 2009, (Rep V: Conceptual Representation Software). The Repgrid method is not a questionnaire approach; it is a method, not a test and there are a number of different formats, from monadic elicitation, dyadic elicitation to triadic elicitation. The approach used throughout the thesis is the triadic elicitation format which has been extensively used throughout research using the Repgrid approach.

The form adopted was comprised of elements – items that pertained to the social world of the participants, in this particular case, football players and coaches. In Kellyan terms an element is ‘something important that takes place in the participants’ world, which can come in a whole myriad of environments’. Researchers have used family relations (e.g., Neimeyer, (1985), Olympic curlers (e.g., Clarke, 2004), athletes, (e.g., Savage, 2003), coaches (e.g., Clarke, 2005, 2007), management situations (e.g., Fromm, 2004), education (e.g., Pope & Shaw, 1981; Wright & Chan, 2007),
computers (e.g., Gaines & Shaw, 1997) and business (e.g., Stewart, 1998; Stewart, Stewart & Fonda, 1981); the list is extraordinarily varied, broad and extensive.

The triadic elicitation approach was adopted whereby a random selection of elements were selected as triads and the participants were then asked to derive some construct (often referred to as the emergent pole), whereby two of these three elements shared to an extent that the third did not (cf. examples of this in the work of Jankowicz, 2003). The characteristic thus generated (the actual construct) was described and its logical contrast (referred to as the implicit pole) also stipulated. Following the decision to decide upon a construct - it could be a word or phrase – each of the other elements in the grid was then assessed. Assessment was undertaken on a 1-5 scale (with 1 being at the construct pole and 5 being at the contrast pole, see examples below).

There were two differing styles that were adopted in the data gathering, either a generation of constructs/contrasts through the use of a group discussion style of agreed communal or the use of the standardised triadic elicitation procedure. In the cases where group derivation of constructs/contrasts were used (such as in Study 1 with younger professional players) a group discussion took place of ideas pertaining to elite performance or perceived coaching qualities (as exemplified in Study 2 with older professional young players). These agreed ‘qualities or characteristics’ were then used to rate the individuals in the group (i.e., the players who constituted the group in Study 1) or coaches that the players had experienced (as in Group 2).

When the triadic elicitation procedure was utilised (as in all other studies) the following seven steps detail the procedure:

**Step 1.** The participant is asked to identify individuals whether they are players, (as in the following example) or coaches, depending on the study being investigated. The participant is then asked to identify some meaningful characteristic that two elements share which the third, thus, does not have.

**Step 2.** In Step 2 the participant is then asked to identify which of the three players share the characteristic and these are identified with a cross. The element that does not possess this characteristic is identified with a blank. The actual characteristic (construct) is then listed with its contrast. It is important to understand that the construct can be a word, phrase or statement.
Step 3. Once this step has been completed then the remainder of the elements are rated. There is no limit to the actual number of elements or constructs that can be used, though any numbers between 8 and 15 are commonly utilized. This particular approach is known as the dichotomous approach though is somewhat restrictive in terms of the ability of the researcher to analyse the data fully so the next stage is to insert a rating scale – again there is no one agreed scale for Repgrids and throughout the studies a scale of 1-5 was used – 1 meaning that the element shared this construct while 5 meant that the element was more likely to be assessed by the contrast pole.

Step 4. Instead of identifying elements dichotomously the participant is then asked to use a rating scale of 1-5 so that subtleties can be derived.

Step 5. Once the participant understands this process the next stage is to present a range (normally ten sets of triads were used throughout the study).

Step 6. This stage essentially makes use of a continued randomised set of triads and follows the former procedure with a different construct/contrast being used each time.

Step 7. Once the agreed set elements have been assessed by their concomitant construct/contrasts the actual designated triadic circles are removed before being computed (using the Gaines and Shaw, 2009, Rep V software package) as their only function is to cause the generation of constructs. Examples of derived grid (called “Display” in the software package) are given below.

Laddering Technique

The technique of ‘Laddering’ (Hinkle, 1965) is extensively reviewed in the Chapter on PCT and the instructions to participants are given here. Each individual is presented with their dichotomous constructs/contrasts. In the case of Study 3, the rank order of constructs was obtained by use of the PrinGrid statistic in the software devised by Gaines and Shaw (2009) called Rep V though there is no one agreed system for utilising this technique. Participants are then asked which pole they prefer and why this might be the case. After the answer is given the next question is posed in terms of why the answer was important to them. This is repeated until the participant cannot reveal any further information pertaining to this particular construct/contrast and the next relevant construct/contrast is examined in the same way. All ten
constructs/contrasts are treated in the same way even though some researchers do not use all constructs/contrasts derived from a grid.

**Snake Interview Technique**

A detailed account of the Snake Interview technique, derived by Pope and Denicolo (2001), appears in the Chapter on Kelly’s PCT approach. The instructions for this process are given here.

**Participant instructions.**

The following instruction was read out to each interviewee in Study 3, and they were provided with a hard copy of a “Snake” so that they could record their change in what they perceived as being critical incidents in their professional life:

> “The procedure which you are about to undertake entails you discussing what are the main critical incidents (such as episodes, people or events) that have had an important influence in your development as a professional coach. Simply make a note of any event that you believe has been important in your professional development at each turn of the snake. There is no set limit as to how many turns the snake may have. Both positive and negative incidents can be described”.

Each coach thus was asked to examine his own professional development as he experienced it, and then describe it in the form of the snake (either diagrammatically or verbally). Each senior coach was asked to name the most important events, people, situations that helped them to develop as a professional coach starting from the time they received their top coaching license (The SFA ‘A’ License). Each turn of the body of the snake was meant to represent an important event (critical incident as he experienced it), important person or something significant that influenced their attitudes, learning and general development as a coach. The participants were asked to add brief notes at each turn of the snake should they wish to do so (these were all recorded and transcribed later) to remind them of what caused such development/learning. Both positive and/or negative influences could be utilised to facilitate their Snake report.

All Ladder and Snake interviews were recorded using an Olympus Voice Recorder, DS-40 and subsequently transcribed. Excerpts of verbatim statements from
coaches’ Laddering and Snake interviews are included in the Study 3 results and noted in italics.

**Examples of results from each study**

**Study 1a**

The following examples are provided to outline the data produced by each study. Study 1a consisted of an investigation into the perceptions that two sets of samples of young players held regarding their views of an ideal footballer’s qualities. These were obtained using a standard Repgrid approach (see Figure 5.1 and 5.2). All data were analysed using the software package Rep V (Gaines and Shaw, 2009).

**Figure 5.1 Example of one completed grid: Study 1a, Group 1**
**Figure 5.2** Example of one completed grid: Study 1a, Group 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNIQUE</th>
<th>LACK OF TECHNIQUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATTITUDE</td>
<td>BAD ATTITUDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECISION MAKING</td>
<td>POOR DECISION MAKING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK RATE</td>
<td>LAZY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABILITY</td>
<td>LACK OF ABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCENTRATION</td>
<td>DISTRACTED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FITNESS</td>
<td>UNFIT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIRE</td>
<td>COMPLACENCY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFIDENCE</td>
<td>NERVOUS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETERMINATION</td>
<td>UNDERTERMINED</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Display K.N

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GA</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>GW</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>DC</th>
<th>SF</th>
<th>JN</th>
<th>DW</th>
<th>KN</th>
<th>CK</th>
<th>KH</th>
<th>IDEAL PLAYER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Display K.N
Study 1b

Study 1b consisted of an investigation into the perceptions of two samples of young players at two Scottish Premier League clubs regarding their views on coaching that they had received. Data were gathered using a standard Repgrid approach (cf. Figures 5.3 and 5.4). All data were analysed using the software package, Rep V (Gaines & Shaw, 2009).

Figure 5.3 Example of one completed grid: Study 1b, Group 1
Figure 5.4 Example of one completed grid: Study 1b, Group 2
**Study 2**

Study 2 examined the constructs/contrasts that neophyte coaches hold regarding appropriate coaching qualities. Study 2a involved B License Coaches (Figure 5.5), whereas Study 2b involved A License Coaches (Figure 5.6).

**Figure 5.5 Example of one completed grid: Study 2a ‘B’ License Coaches**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control of Group</th>
<th>Unable to Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1 2 1 2 1 1 2 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 3 5 1 2 2 1 4 3 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Communicator</td>
<td>Poor Communicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 4 2 1 1 1 4 2 3 1</td>
<td>1 2 4 1 1 1 1 4 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Motivator</td>
<td>Poor Motivator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 4 1 1 2 1 2 2 1 2 1</td>
<td>1 1 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Man Management</td>
<td>Poor Man Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 2 1 1 1 2 2 3 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Knowledge of Game</td>
<td>Poor Knowledge of Game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
<td>1 2 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful</td>
<td>Lacks Respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 3 1 1 1 1 2 1 3 1</td>
<td>1 3 2 3 2 3 2 2 5 2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching Experience</td>
<td>Lack of Coaching Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1 2 1 2 1 5 2 2 1</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 2 1 2 2 2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows Flexible Thinking</td>
<td>Closed Mind to New Ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 2 3 2 3 2 2 5 2 1 1</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 2 1 2 2 2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Coaching Style</td>
<td>Negative Coaching Style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 3 3 2 1 2 2 1 5 2 2 1</td>
<td>1 1 2 1 2 1 2 2 2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows Confidence</td>
<td>Does Not Show Confidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Display Coach BX

"COACHING"
Figure 5.6 Example of one completed grid; Study 2b ‘A’ License Coaches

Display Coach Z
"A LICENSE COACHING"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSPIRATIONAL</th>
<th>UNINSPIRING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GOOD COMMUNICATOR</td>
<td>LACKS COMMUNICATION SKILLS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARISMATIC</td>
<td>DULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PATIENT</td>
<td>IMPULSIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELL PREPARED</td>
<td>UNPREPARED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD ROLE MODEL</td>
<td>SETS BAD EXAMPLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROACHABLE</td>
<td>UNAPPROACHABLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAS SELF CONTROL</td>
<td>NO SELF CONTROL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD PLAYER RELATIONSHIPS</td>
<td>POOR PLAYER RELATIONSHIPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOOD GAME KNOWLEDGE</td>
<td>POOR KNOWLEDGE OF GAME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEAL COACH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEST COMMUNICATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST DEMANDING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST DISLIKED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEST MOTIVATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST AGGRESSIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST TACTICALLY AWARE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOST ORGANISED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEST COACH I EVER HAD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MYSELF AS A COACH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Study 3

The group of experienced (those who had worked professionally for at least five years) coaches (N = 6) completed a Repgrid in a similar manner to the other previously listed (see Figure 5.7), then additionally the derived constructs/contrasts were rank ordered using the Rep V software. A Laddering exercise (Hinkle, 1965) was then undertaken. This method invited the participants to explain, in an iterative manner, what was their choice of constructs or contrasts (see Figure 5.8). In this way a deeper understanding of the construct/contrast was given and the relative importance of such was established. Further, a more detailed analysis of important issues (as perceived by the individuals) was assessed via a Snake Interview (Pope & Denicolo, 2001), in which the participants details issues in their professional career that they consider relevant to their professional development (see Figure 5.9).

The Repgrid Procedure

The approach adopted with this group followed exactly that of the individual neophyte groups whereby the participant, in this case the experienced coach, decided upon his own constructs/contrasts through use of the triadic elicitation method. All constructs (and their individual contrasts) derived from the Repgrids demonstrate the ways in which participants understood and described their personal understanding of the elements (other coaches or players).
Figure 5.7 Example of one completed grid: Study 3

Display SENIOR COACH A
"COACHING"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGGRESSIVE</th>
<th>PATIENT</th>
<th>GOOD COMMUNICATOR</th>
<th>INABILITY TO COMMUNICATE</th>
<th>STRATEGIC</th>
<th>DISORGANISED</th>
<th>EDUCATED</th>
<th>NOT EDUCATED</th>
<th>HIGH LEVEL PLAYER</th>
<th>LOWER LEVEL PLAYER</th>
<th>TOO REACTIVE</th>
<th>MEASURED</th>
<th>CALM</th>
<th>ERRATIC</th>
<th>TACTICALLY AWARE</th>
<th>TACTICALLY UNAWARE</th>
<th>CONSISTENT</th>
<th>INCONSISTENT</th>
<th>HANDS ON</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 3 5 4 1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 4 1 3</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 3 4 5 1 4</td>
<td>1 1 3 3 2 5 3 4 1 2 3</td>
<td>2 2 1 1 1</td>
<td>3 2 1 1 3 1 1 4</td>
<td>2 3 1 3 4 1 5 5</td>
<td>1 4 3 3 1 5 1 5</td>
<td>3 2 1 1 2 5 5 1 5</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 2 2 5 5</td>
<td>1 5 3 2</td>
<td>1 2 1 1 2</td>
<td>1 5 4 2</td>
<td>1 3 3 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 1 1 5 4</td>
<td>2 1 3 3 1 1 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.8 Example of a completed Ladder of one senior coach

Constructs/Contrasts

Item 1. Consistent/Inconsistent. Reasons why consistent was important to you?
   A) Important that players know there is a structure, something to hang their hat on.
   B) Consistency does not mean that everything is the same but the players know
      that the coach has knowledge (of formations for example) and they trust him.
   C) Players are often immature and in difficult times they look for a consistent
      approach from the coach.
   D) If this is absent it would compound the problems when going through difficult
      times.

Item 2. Strategic/Disorganised. Reasons why strategic was important to you?
   A) Coaches need to be organised to some degree which allows planning and being
      strategic about goals and objectives that you have for the team.
   B) Players take comfort from order.
   C) If you are disorganised it suggests a haphazard approach.

Item 3. Calm/Erratic. Reasons why calm was important to you?
   A) You really have to be calm and not erratic. Being demonstrative and passionate
      can be part of a calmness. Calmness does not always get you over the line but
      showing passion is an important aspect of it.
   B) Some coaches are very demonstrative on the sideline while others who are not
      like this are often misjudged as not caring.
   C) Different managers/coaches have their own unique way to demonstrate their
      passion for the game.

Item 4. Tactically Aware/Tactically Unaware. Reasons why tactically aware
was important to you?
   A) Your credibility often hangs on being tactically aware.
   B) These days players are becoming more astute tactically and the coach needs to
      be able to give a quick, correct answer.
   C) Players will judge a coach negatively if they think the coach is not savvy in
      the tactical area. If they think you do not have a clue you are bust as a coach.
   D) Players will accept you for being a ‘good guy’ for a short while though longer
      term they will just not accept lack of tactical expertise from the coach.

Item 5. Good Communication/Inability to Communicate. Reasons why good
communication was important to you?
   A) Though communication is vital for a coach there is no one particular way to do
      this. Some coaches ramble and shout while others are more consider though
      both may have been successful in their work.
   B) The manner of your communication may be unimportant though good
      communication with players is critical.
   C) The quality of different communications may be similar but the method of
      actually doing it may differ considerably.

Item 6. Being aggressive/patient. Reasons why being patient was important to you?
A) Perhaps being competitive is a better word. Similar to the calm/erratic construct as aggressive is a rather outdated style.
B) Dealing with amateur players necessitates the coach toning down an aggressive style.
C) Being a ‘soother’ and being calm and patient still allows the coach to demonstrate how much his work means to him.
D) Just being low key all the time is also a danger as players might think that you are not bothered about them, no matter how much money or at what level the coach is operating.

Item 7. Being educated/not educated. Reasons why being educated was important to you?
   A) It is football education rather than an academic one that is vitally important. Some coaches demonstrate their education by the way they communicate but others feel that they have not had a proper academic education but their football education (experience) is very good.
   B) Being ‘steeped’ in the game is crucial and top pros will quickly suss out coaches who do not really have a sound football background

Item 8. Being reactive/measured. Reasons why measured was important to you?
   A) Ranting and raving and being too ready to react to issues can lead to players just ignoring what the coach says
   B) Such barking becomes just noise
   C) Clearly there are times when as a coach you need to react to certain situations and at times you need to demonstrate that you are passionate about the game
   D) Some coaches express their passion by just ranting which is inappropriate these days especially with top players

Item 9. Being hands on/supervisory. Reasons why being hands on was important to you?
   A) As a coach you need to be hands on as a manager you can be supervisory.
   B) Being in the players’ faces all day long players need someone else to come in and be wise and measured offering support.
   C) As a manager you need to be able to pick your points, and come in and make the correct intervention.
   D) As a coach you need to be vibrant and busy with players. This is especially true with senior players.
   E) When dealing with youngsters you need to allow them time to make their mistakes. Too many modern young coaches try to tell the youngsters when to pass, when to dribble etc. It isn’t necessary. Young coaches often think that being hands on means doing everything for the players.
   F) Modern coach education has hindered such development I feel.

A) Item 10. Being a high level player/lower level player. Reasons why being a higher level player was important to you?
   B) No clear demarcation here as being a top level player only buys you a limited time as a coach.
   C) Numerous Premier League Managers in England have little practical experience at the high level though they have definitely other abilities.
D) Getting in the door to a coaching job is more important than playing level but you must then demonstrate your worth as a coach.

E) Working with top level players who question your background necessitates you having had success as a coach in order to have credibility with the players.

F) The higher the level you work at the more you need to be able to demonstrate (being able to bring something out of the bag) success that you have had previously – such as Mourinho.
1. The most important thing for me was taking the “S” Form training of youngsters at Dundee United when I was still completing my badges.
2. I studied extra ‘Highers’ as I was not convinced that I was going to make it as a footballer.
3. Gaining confidence from this and being asked by senior coaching staff to help them gave me a lift.
5. Gaining my UEFA Pro License before being asked to become a manager.
6. Losing my job as manager at Dundee United was my biggest shock.
7. Going abroad, to Hong Kong, six months was rewarding. The money was good and I was then asked to come back to Scotland, at St. Mirren, to be the assistant manager there.
8. In 2006 I came here to Rangers and have been here about six or seven years, working with the younger age players.
9. The eventual change of managers had a slight impact on the work with youth players as some managers did not believe in the youth team or did not use the players in the first team.
10. My overall philosophy and work ethic has not really changed though being complacent was never an issue.
11. Some people call it “Rangeritise” meaning getting carried away with being at a big club like Rangers.
12. Important for me to be adaptable in my role. Being flexible in being able to turn your hand to what the manager wants is something you learn. Just like driving a car and learning how to use it to progress.
13. Circumstances here (at Rangers) are fantastic (in terms of training facilities, work environment and colleagues). Money is not the only issue.
14. Possibility of change when nearing the end of my career.

Figure 5.9 Example of one completed Snake Interview with one senior Coach
Chapter 6 – Results

Study 1

The first study sought to examine the perceptions that aspiring professional players had of the attributes necessary in an ideal player (Study 1a, young players) and, in addition, what perceptions were held by those young players who were on full time contracts at two separate Scottish Premiership clubs (Study 1b, professional players).

Study 1a, Group 1 (N = 18)

Table 6.1 Group Construct Scores (Study 1a, Group 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C8</th>
<th>C9</th>
<th>C10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Player1</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 11</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 16</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 17</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>853</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>724</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>807</td>
<td>727</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>47.38</td>
<td>45.11</td>
<td>40.72</td>
<td>40.22</td>
<td>50.38</td>
<td>42.16</td>
<td>44.38</td>
<td>40.38</td>
<td>41.11</td>
<td>39.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Rank    | 9 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 1
Note. C1=pace/lacks pace; C2=strength/weak; C3=competitive/uncompetitive; C4=passionate about game/no passion for the game; C5=desire to win/no desire to win; C6=leader on the pitch/hides in games; C7=good on concentration/lacks concentration; C8=has stamina/lacks stamina; C9=good technique/poor technique; C10=believes in his ability/no self-belief.

The results (Table 6.1) suggest that, out of the ten constructs (attributes) generated by Group 1, six out of ten were related to psychological aspects of performance and three out of the top five ranked constructs were psychological – self belief, passionate about the game and competitiveness.
Table 6.2 Rank Order Construct Scores for the Ideal Player (Study 1a, Group 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C8</th>
<th>C9</th>
<th>C10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Player 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. C1=pace/lacks pace; C2=strong/weak; C3=competitive/uncompetitive; C4=passionate about game/no passion for the game; C5=desire to win/no desire to win; C6=leader on the pitch/hides in games; C7=good on concentration/lacks concentration; C8=has stamina/lacks stamina; C9=good technique/poor technique; C10=believes in his ability/no self-belief.

Table 6.2 demonstrates that though the actual derived differences between the rank order scores were very slight, the perceived qualities deemed necessary for the Ideal Player were largely psychological in nature, with three out of the top five
constructs being seen as psychological aspects - competitive, leader on the pitch and passionate about the game.

Study 1a, Group 2 (N = 11)

Table 6.3 *Group Construct Scores (Study 1a, Group 2)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C8</th>
<th>C9</th>
<th>C10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Player 1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 7</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 9</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>21.63</td>
<td>26.45</td>
<td>29.27</td>
<td>24.54</td>
<td>23.18</td>
<td>28.45</td>
<td>25.27</td>
<td>23.27</td>
<td>23.81</td>
<td>24.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. C1=technique/lack of technique; C2=attitude/bad attitude; C3=decision making/poor decision making; C4=work rate/lazy; C5=ability/lack of ability; C6=concentration/distracted; C7=fitness/unfit; C8=desire/complacency; C9=confidence/nervous; C10=determination/lacks determination.

Out of the ten constructs generated by Group 2, six were arguably psychological (desire/complacency, confidence/nervous; determination/undetermined; attitude/bad attitude; concentration/distracted; decision making/poor decision making) while the rest related to technical or physical areas (Table 6.3). Three out of the top five ranked constructs are again of a psychological nature (desire, confidence, determination) though three out of the lowest ranked areas are also psychological ones – attitude, concentration, and decision making.
Table 6.4 Rank Order Construct Scores for Ideal Player (Study 1a, Group 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C8</th>
<th>C9</th>
<th>C10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Player 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. C1=technique/lack of technique; C2=attitude/bad attitude; C3=decision making/poor decision making; C4=work rate/lazy; C5=ability/lack of ability; C6=concentration/distracted; C7=fitness/unfit; C8=desire/complacency; C9=confidence/nervous; C10=determination/lacks determination.

Out of the eight top ranked qualities perceived to be important for an Ideal Player six were psychological (Table 6.4). This differs somewhat from the ways in which the group of players, who formed the elements in the Repgrid, was ranked though does indicate that the group as a whole is somewhat short of attributes in terms of how ideal players are perceived.
Table 6.5 shows how both groups ranked their generated constructs. Each group had its own coach which may have had an influence on the results obtained though as coaches with these groups did not undertake any grid analyses no attempt was made to ascertain any reasons for the way players from these groups developed their actual constructs.
Study 1b, Group 1 (N = 11)

Table 6.6 Group Construct Scores (Study 1b, Group 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Players</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C8</th>
<th>C9</th>
<th>C10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Player 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>17.45</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>19.72</td>
<td>17.63</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>20.63</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>15.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=11; C1=organised/disorganised; C2=enthusiastic/unenthusiatic; C3=realistic/unrealistic; C4=ambitious/lack of ambition; C5=professional/unprofessional; C6=no favouritism/has favourites C7=good communicator/poor communicator; C8=understanding/lack of understanding; C9=will to win/lack of desire; C10=experienced/rookie.

Out of the ten coaching qualities derived by this set of professional youngsters most related to the personal qualities of the coach only two – construct 1, organised/disorganised and construct 7, good communicator/poor communicator directly - referred to the coach when he was actually involved in technical aspects of his work (Table 6.6). The other areas were more closely described as being part of his personal qualities.

The most highly ranked constructs that the professional players devised for characteristics of coaches that they had known were construct 10, experience, construct 9, will to win and construct 3, being organised. Most of the derived constructs related to how coaches might use personal qualities in their interaction with
players and only, one ‘knowledge of the game’, was directly seen as a football skill rather than the others which tended to relate to interactional skills of the coach.

Table 6.7. Rank Order Construct Scores for Ideal Coach (Study 1b, Group 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Players</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C8</th>
<th>C9</th>
<th>C10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Player 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=11; C1=organised/disorganised; C2=enthusiastic/unenthusiastic; C3=realistic/unrealistic; C4=ambitious/lack of ambition; C5=professional/unprofessional; C6=no favouritism/has favourites; C7=good communicator/poor communicator; C8=understanding/lack of understanding; C9=will to win/lack of desire; C10=experienced/rookie.

Regarding how this group perceived the qualities they thought that the ideal coach should possess five characteristics (constructs) were equally ranked as being of most importance – construct 1, organized/disorganised; construct 4, ambitious/lack of ambition; construct 8, understanding/lack of understanding; construct 9, will to win/lack of desire and construct 10, experienced/rookie. This reflects the different approaches that they had received from coaches throughout their playing careers and what they would prefer to see in an ideal coach.
\textbf{Study 1b, Group 2 (N = 11)}

Table 6.8 \textit{Group Construct Scores (Study 1b, Group 2)}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C8</th>
<th>C9</th>
<th>C10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Player1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>16.36</td>
<td>30.63</td>
<td>18.54</td>
<td>19.18</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>22.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=11; C1=good at communicating/poor at communicating; C2=good motivator/poor motivator; C3=knowledge of the game/little knowledge of the game; C4=focus on positives and improves weaknesses/does not focus on positives and improving weaknesses; C5=sense of humour/no sense of humour; C6=encourages/no encouragement; C7=gives feedback/does not give feedback; C8=good management skills/poor management skills; C9=honest with players/not honest with players; C10=professional/unprofessional.

Out of the ten characteristics shown in Table 6.8 that this group had derived from their experiences of having been coached throughout their nascent careers, seven could be regarded as specifically technical areas – good communicator, good motivator, gives feedback, knowledge of the game, good management skills, being professional and having experience. The other areas - honesty, ranked first, focusing on the positives, ranked second and sense of humour, ranked fifth - are more readily understood in terms of the interpersonal personal qualities of coaches.
Table 6.9 Rank Order Construct Scores for Ideal Coach (Study 1b, Group 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Player</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C8</th>
<th>C9</th>
<th>C10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Player 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Player 11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=11; C1=good at communicating/poor at communicating; C2=good motivator/poor motivator; C3=knowledge of the game/little knowledge of the game; C4=focus on positives and improves weaknesses/does not focus on positives and improving weaknesses; C5=sense of humour/no sense of humour; C6=encourages/no encouragement; C7=gives feedback/does not give feedback; C8 ‘good management skills/poor management skills; C9=honest with players/not honest with players; C10=experienced/rookie.

This group saw the desired qualities of an ideal coach primarily, and rather surprisingly, in terms of sense of humour, which is rather different from how they perceived the characteristics of coaches that they had experienced (Table 6.8). Also of prime importance was honesty, being experienced as a coach, the ability to communicate being honest with players conducting themselves in a professional manner. These differences would seem to be that the coaching (and coaches) they experienced was somewhat at variance with their ideal notion of ideal coaching.
Table 6.10 Comparison of constructs/contrasts generated for ideal coach in Study 1b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>organised/disorganised</td>
<td>sense of humour/no sense of humour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambitious/lack of ambition</td>
<td>good at communicating/poor at communicating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>understanding/lack of understanding</td>
<td>honest with players/not honest with players</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>will to win/lack of desire</td>
<td>experienced/rookie.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experienced/rookie</td>
<td>focus on positives and improves weaknesses/does not focus on positives and improving weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enthusiastic/unenthusiastic</td>
<td>knowledge of the game/little knowledge of the game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>realistic/unrealistic</td>
<td>good motivator/poor motivator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>professional/unprofessional</td>
<td>gives feedback/does not give feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no favouritism/has favourites</td>
<td>good management skills/poor management skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good communicator/poor communicator</td>
<td>encourages/no encouragement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the participants in Study 1b were full time professional players at two different SPL clubs and the derived constructs emphasise the practical aspects of coaching that were perceived as being of central importance. As noted in Table 6.10, both groups perceived attributes of coaches as being largely related to practical, ‘training ground’ matters and also thought that the human qualities that their coaches brought to their coaching activities were important factors. In addition there is evidence to suggest that when discussing their ideal coach their experiences of coaching throughout their careers was somewhat different from the ideal that they expected.
Study 2

Study 2 consisted of two groups of aspiring coaches who were undertaking their coaching licenses – Group one were “B” level candidates and Group 2 were “A” level (the top level which is necessary to practice at a football club in Scotland).

**Study 2a Group 1 (N = 15)**

**Table 6.11 Group Construct Scores (Study 2, Group 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>C 1</th>
<th>C 2</th>
<th>C 3</th>
<th>C 4</th>
<th>C 5</th>
<th>C 6</th>
<th>C 7</th>
<th>C 8</th>
<th>C 9</th>
<th>C 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>22.73</td>
<td>20.46</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>22.53</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>19.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=15; C1=control of group/unable to control group; C2=good communicator/poor communicator; C3=good motivator/poor motivator; C4=good man management/poor management; C5=good knowledge of game/poor knowledge of game; C6=respectful/lacks respect; C7=coaching experience/lacks coaching experience; C8=shows flexible thinking/closed mind to new ideas; C9=positive coaching style/negative coaching style; C10=shows confidence/lacks confidence.
The characteristics derived by this coaching group of ‘B’ License candidates seem to relate directly to what one would normally expect from a group undergoing their first steps in accreditation process on a course (Table 6.11). The group perceived the most important quality of coaching to be construct 2, ‘good communicator’ closely followed by construct 1, ‘ability to control the group’. The two lowest ranked constructs were construct 8, ‘shows flexible thinking’ and construct 9, ‘having a ‘positive coaching style’.

Table 6.12 Rank Order Construct Scores for Ideal Coach (Study 2, Group 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C 1</th>
<th>C 2</th>
<th>C 3</th>
<th>C 4</th>
<th>C 5</th>
<th>C 6</th>
<th>C 7</th>
<th>C 8</th>
<th>C 9</th>
<th>C 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=15; C1=control of group/unable to control group; C2=good communicator/poor communicator; C3=good motivator/poor motivator; C4=good man management/poor management; C5=good knowledge of game/poor knowledge of game; C6=respectful/lacks respect; C7=coaching experience/lacks coaching
experience; C8=shows flexible thinking/closed mind to new ideas; C9=positive coaching style/negative coaching style; C10=shows confidence/lacks confidence.

In terms of how the group perceived the notion of an Ideal Coach the most important feature was again construct 2, ‘good communicator’, while the next most important constructs were similarly ranked – construct 1, ‘ability to control the group’, construct 5, having ‘good game knowledge’, construct 6, being ‘respectful’ and construct 7, ‘coaching experience’ which all could be attributed to characteristics one would expect in a formal coaching setting (Table 6.12). The lowest ranked construct was construct 8, ‘shows flexible thinking’ which might be seen as an area of expertise that would largely evolve over a period of time and not be something readily developed on a coaching course.
Study 2b Group 2 (N = 11)

Table 6.13 Group Construct Scores (Study 2, Group 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coach</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C8</th>
<th>C9</th>
<th>C10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach 1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 4</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>23.25</td>
<td>24.08</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>28.33</td>
<td>17.60</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>28.18</td>
<td>21.50</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=11; C1=inspirational/uninspiring; C2=good communicator/lacks communications skills; C3=charismatic/dull; C4=patient/impulsive; C5=well prepared/unprepared; C6=good role model/sets bad example; C7=approachable/unapproachable; C8=has self-control/no self-control; C9=good player relationships/poor players relationships; C10=good game knowledge/poor knowledge of game.

Of the ten constructs derived by this group of SFA ‘A’ License coaches, only four directly related to aspects of coaching that could be described as ‘technical’ – being well prepared, good knowledge of the game, good communicator and having control (in coaching situations) (Table 6.13). The remainder related more to aspects of the personality or qualities that coaches had. Overall the group perceived construct 5,
‘being well prepared’ and construct 10, ‘good game knowledge’ as well as being ‘charismatic’ construct 9, as the most important ones for a coach while construct 4, ‘being patient’ was the least ranked one.

Table 6.14 Rank Order Construct Scores for Ideal Coach (Study 2, Group 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3</th>
<th>C4</th>
<th>C5</th>
<th>C6</th>
<th>C7</th>
<th>C8</th>
<th>C9</th>
<th>C10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coach 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coach 12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N=12; C1=inspirational/uninspiring; C2=good communicator/lacks communications skills; C3=charismatic/dull; C4=patient/impulsive; C5=well prepared/unprepared; C6=good role model/sets bad example; C7=approachable/unapproachable; C8=has self-control/no self-control; C9=good player relationships/poor players relationships; C10=good game knowledge/poor knowledge of game.

In terms of how this group perceived the coaching characteristics that the ideal coach should demonstrate, the constructs of ‘good game knowledge’ and ‘being ‘well prepared’ as being equally the most important of the qualities (Table 6.14). Though the arithmetic differences between constructs was indeed slight the two least important
were acting as a ‘good role model’, construct 6 and having ‘self-control’, construct 8 which was the least ranked constructs.

Table 6.15 Hierarchical Comparison of notions of the Ideal Coach by ‘A’ and ‘B’ candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘A’ License Group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>‘B’ License Group</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>well prepared/unprepared</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>good communicator/poor communicator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good game knowledge/poor knowledge of game.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>control of group/unable to control group</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good communicator/lacks communications skills</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>having ‘good game knowledge/poor game knowledge’</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspirational/uninspiring</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>respectful/lacks respect</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good player relationships/poor players relationships</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>coaching experience/lacks coaching experience</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charismatic/dull</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>positive coaching style/negative coaching style</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient/impulsive</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>shows confidence/lacks confidence</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>approachable/unapproachable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>good motivator/poor motivator</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good role model/sets bad example</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>good man management/poor management</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has self-control/no self-control</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>shows flexible thinking/closed mind to new ideas</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, in terms of the research question posed for Study 2, it is evident that though there are different constructs derived by both groups these differences are really just a matter of emphasis, perhaps reflecting the stage both sets of coaches had reached in terms of their experience when undertaking their coaching accreditation course. Both sets of constructs (Table 6.15) displayed a range of important factors that they perceived as being relevant to coaching which generally consisted of personal characteristics, such as being honest with players or showing flexible thinking, as well
as the more obvious technical issues such of communication skills or being able to control the group or having good knowledge of the game.
Study 3

In this section details of the derived Repgrids, Laddered results and Snake interviews are presented for each experienced coach (N = 6).

Coach A

After a playing career as a semi-professional in Scotland, Coach A completed his training as a physical education teacher (B. Ed) at Jordanhill College of Education where, at that time, all male physical education teachers in Scotland were trained then gained a Masters degree from Glasgow University, while he was still playing football. Gradually, once his playing career came to an end, he became more and more involved in the coaching side of football eventually becoming the Head of Coaching at the SFA. He has obtained all the relevant coaching awards and obtained the prestigious UEFA Pro Licence and then was head-hunted to become Academy Director at one of the major SPL teams in Scotland.

Repgrid

All derived Repgrids were analysed using the software package, Rep V, Version 1.0, designed by Gaines and Shaw (2009). The Display statistic demonstrates how the coach actually perceived the presented elements (the same coaching elements were given to each coach participant).
**Figure 6.1** Coach A Grid Display

Display COACH A
"COACHING"

- **AGGRESSIVE 1**: 4 3 5 4 1 3 1 1 4 1 3 3
- **GOOD COMMUNICATOR 2**: 1 1 1 1 1 3 4 5 1 4 1 1
- **STRATEGIC 3**: 2 2 1 1 1 1 5 5 1 4 1 1
- **EDUCATED 4**: 2 3 1 3 4 1 5 5 1 4 3 3
- **HIGH LEVEL PLAYER 5**: 4 1 3 3 2 2 5 3 4 1 2 3
- **TOO REACTIVE 6**: 3 2 2 1 1 3 1 1 4 1 3 5
- **CALM 7**: 1 2 1 1 2 2 5 5 1 5 3 2
- **TACTICALLY AWARE 8**: 2 1 1 1 2 1 5 4 2 5 1 1
- **CONSISTENT 9**: 2 1 1 1 1 1 5 5 1 4 1 1
- **HANDS ON 10**: 3 1 1 5 4 2 1 3 3 1 1 1

- **1 MYSELF AS COACH**
- **2 BEST COACH I HAD**
- **3 MOST ORGANISED**
- **4 MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE**
- **5 MOST SUCCESSFUL**
- **6 MOST TACTICALLY AWARE**
- **7 MOST AGGRESSIVE**
- **8 BEST MOTIVATOR**
- **9 MOST DISLIKED**
- **10 MOST DEMANDING**
- **11 BEST COMMUNICATOR**
- **12 IDEAL COACH**
- **10 SUPERVISORY**
- **7 ERRATIC**
- **5 LOWER LEVEL PLAYER**
- **6 MEASURED**
- **4 NOT EDUCATED**
- **3 DISORGANISED**
- **2 INABILITY TO COMMUNICATE**
- **1 PATIENT
Table 6.16 Coach A Rank Order Scores for Constructs/Contrasts on main component derived from the Pringrid analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Construct</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Consistent/Inconsistent</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Strategic/Disorganised</td>
<td>2.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Calm/Erratic</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tactically aware/Tactically unaware</td>
<td>2.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good communication/Inability to communicate</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aggressive/Patient</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Educated/Not educated</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Too reactive/Measured</td>
<td>-1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hands on/Supervisory</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>High level player/Lower level player</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Coach A, notions of consistency, strategic awareness and having a calm coaching style are of paramount importance. Being tactically aware and having good communication ability also rank highly. However, taking a direct hands-on approach or having a high level playing background were perceived as being of much less importance.
Figure 6.2 Coach A Ladder Results

Item 1. Inconsistent/Consistent. Reasons why consistent was important to you?
A) Important that players know there is a structure, something to hang their hat on.
B) Consistency does not mean that everything is the same but the players know that the coach has knowledge (of formations for example) and they trust him.
C) Players are often immature and in difficult times they look for a consistent approach from the coach.
D) If this is absent it would compound the problems when going through difficult times.

Item 2. Strategic/Disorganised. Reasons why strategic was important to you?
A) Coaches need to be organised to some degree which allows planning and being strategic about goals and objectives that you have for the team.
B) Players take comfort from order.
C) If you are disorganised it suggests a haphazard approach.

Item 3. Calm/Erratic. Reasons why calm was important to you?
A) You really have to be calm and not erratic. Being demonstrative and passionate can be part of a calmness. Calmness does not always get you over the line but showing passion is an important aspect of it.
B) Some coaches are very demonstrative on the sideline while others who are not like this are often misjudged as not caring.
C) Different managers/coaches have their own unique way to demonstrate their passion for the game.

Item 4. Tactically Aware/Tactically Unaware. Reasons why tactically aware was important to you?
A) Your credibility often hangs on being tactically aware.
B) These days players are becoming more astute tactically and the coach needs to be able to give a quick, correct answer.
C) Players will judge a coach negatively if they think the coach is not savvy in the tactical area. If they think you do not have a clue you are bust as a coach.
D) Players will accept you for being a ‘good guy’ for a short while though longer term they will just not accept lack of tactical expertise from the coach.

Item 5. Good Communication/Inability to Communicate. Reasons why good communication was important to you?
A) Though communication is vital for a coach there is no one particular way to do this. Some coaches ramble and shout while others are more consider though both may have been successful in their work.
B) The manner of your communication may be unimportant though good communication with players is critical.
C) The quality of different communications may be similar but the method of actually doing it may differ considerably.
Item 6. Being aggressive/patient. Reasons why being patient was important to you?
A) Perhaps being competitive is a better word. Similar to the calm/erratic construct as aggressive is a rather outdated style.
B) Dealing with amateur players necessitates the coach toning down an aggressive style.
C) Being a ‘soother’ and being calm and patient still allows the coach to demonstrate how much his work means to him.
D) Just being low key all the time is also a danger as players might think that you are not bothered about them, no matter how much money or at what level the coach is operating.

Item 7. Being educated/not educated. Reasons why being educated was important to you?
A) It is football education rather than an academic one that is vitally important. Some coaches demonstrate their education by the way they communicate but others feel that they have not had a proper academic education but their football education (experience) is very good.
B) Being ‘steeped’ in the game is crucial and top pros will quickly suss out coaches who do not really have a sound football background.

Item 8. Being reactive/measured. Reasons why measured was important to you?
A) Ranting and raving and being too ready to react to issues can lead to players just ignoring what the coach says.
B) Such barking becomes just noise.
C) Clearly there are times when as a coach you need to react to certain situations and at times you need to demonstrate that you are passionate about the game.
D) Some coaches express their passion by just ranting which is inappropriate these days especially with top players.

Item 9. Being hands on/supervisory. Reasons why being hands on was important to you?
A) As a coach you need to be hands on as a manager you can be supervisory.
B) Being in the players’ faces all day long players need someone else to come in and be wise and measured offering support.
C) As a manager you need to be able to pick your points, and come in and make the correct intervention.
D) As a coach you need to be vibrant and busy with players. This is especially true with senior players.
E) When dealing with youngsters you need to allow them time to make their mistakes. Too many modern young coaches try to tell the youngsters when to pass, when to dribble etc. It isn’t necessary. Young coaches often think that being hands on means doing everything for the players.
F) Modern coach education has hindered such development I feel.

Item 10. Being a high level player/lower level player. Reasons why being a higher level was important to you?
A) No clear demarcation here as being a top level player only buys you a limited time as a coach.
B) Numerous Premier League Managers in England have little practical experience at the high level though they have definite other abilities.
C) Getting in the door to a coaching job is more important than playing level but you must then demonstrate your worth as a coach.

D) Working with top level players who question your background necessitates your having had success as a coach in order to have credibility with the players.

E) The higher the level you work at the more you need to be able to demonstrate (being able to bring something out of the bag) success that you have had previously – such as Mourinho.

Using a variant of the approach adopted by Fransella (2003), all ten derived constructs were subject to a ‘laddering’ analysis. This enabled an interpretation of all the derived constructs and gave a more, detailed explanation of what the participant actually meant by the derived construct in question. The overall outcome gave a much fuller picture as to what the coach really was meaning when detailing the constructs that he derived in his grid.

Coach A described in some detail why he thought ‘being consistent’ as a coach was important to him, though “‘consistency’ does not mean that everything stays the same it does give the players a structure which leads to them building trust in the coach. Again, “coaches need to be strategic about their organisation in order to allow planning in setting team goals, which enables the players to take comfort and not see the coach as being haphazard in his approach”. Further, the idea of coaches who are calm rather than erratic was proffered by Coach A. He states that “Being able to remain calm, rather than erratic, under pressure is important. Such calmness sometimes can be mistaken for lacking passion or not caring. Different coaches have different styles on the touchline and there is no one way that suits everyone”. The coach’s credibility was important to Coach A. Tactical awareness as presented by Coach A was important to him as it related to his ideas of the coach’s credibility in front of his players. He believes that as players are now becoming more tactically aware “Your credibility often hangs on being tactically aware”. And “If you do not have a clue you are bust as a coach”. Therefore, it is crucial that the coach demonstrates tactical awareness. Trying to justify tactical awareness by posing as a ‘good guy’ will only last a short time “though in the long run players will not accept a coach who does not display a sound tactical approach”.

Another crucial aspect of coaching is the area of good communication. “Though the actual method by which coaches communicate to players may differ considerably being able to communicate with players is vital”. When speaking of
being aggressive in the way a coach might operate, Coach A suggested that “In one’s coaching a better word might be ‘competitive’. He suggested that it this is similar to the ‘calm’ construct and especially when dealing with amateur players (where it pays dividends to take a less aggressive approach”). Being calm and patient allows the coach to demonstrate how much he cares about his work "though being low key all the time might give the impression that you, as a coach, are not bothered about them".

Discussing the notion of coaches being educated, Coach A stressed that “It is important that coaches are educated in a football rather than an academic sense. Being ‘steeped’ in the game is vital when working with professional players who will quickly ‘suss you out’ if you do not have a sound football background”. A measured approach, in contrast to a more erratic approach, was deemed important to this coach. “Being measured in coaching is important. Ranting and raving at players becomes just noise and they will end up just ignoring what you are trying to communicate. Clearly there will be times when you have to react immediately, which can demonstrate your passion for the game, but these days, especially when dealing with top players, is inappropriate”. Active coaching as compared to what this coach calls ‘supervisory’ coaching is explained by Coach A, making the obvious distinction between a coach and a manager (in football terms, even though at times this distinction can be blurred). “There is a difference between 'being hands on' and ‘supervisory’ and generally a coach needs to be hands on while a manager can take a more supervisory approach, especially when dealing with professional players. Being in the faces of players all the time sometimes can have a negative effect and subtle and timely interventions by the manager acting in a supervisory role often is needed by players. There is a definite difference when dealing with different levels of players. With professionals you need to be busy and vibrant while with younger players who are essentially learning their trade the coach can allow more time in allowing players to learn from their mistakes. Being hands on does not necessarily mean constantly telling the players what to do – a common mistake of more inexperienced coaches – and modern coaches courses have not helped in this regard”.

Finally, the construct playing at a high level was important to this coach when he says “Having been a top level player only buys you a limited amount of time as a coach. It is important to use your previous playing experience to get you into a coaching position then it is what you do that is important in convincing players that
you do know what you are doing. These days there are various examples of top level coaches who have not played at any major level (Mourinho, Wenger and Klopp are good examples) though without the safety net of high level playing experience a new coach has to be able to demonstrate that he has had success elsewhere as a coach in order to convince the players of his pedigree.”
Figure 6.3 Coach A Snake Interview Results

1. As an individual Craig B was the first important person in my coach development education. He is almost a paradox as he has got a discipline and passion for the game. He lives for the game, is intelligent and charming and he plays on this charm a lot. He was a very big influence on me. The good things about him you could pick off and use, which I have done throughout my career as a coach. He signed me for Queens Park immediately. His best pal was my principal teacher and there was a real bond between us that continued right through. He did not influence me directly once he became National Team Manager but did help when we met other people at UEFA and FIFA meetings.

2. When I was coaching at the SFA and playing at Stirling Albion as well as teaching at the same time he helped in my biggest single move (joining the SFA as a direct employee).

3. Walter S was another who was a massive influence on me in terms of how he conducted himself (when I became Academy Manager at Rangers). I was more in admiration of him when I arrived at Rangers rather than just modeling myself on him though perhaps subconsciously I did. He had a calmness and measured approach that he did not always demonstrate in his career but he did address that. I had first known him when his was the National Team Manager and he then displayed a calmness that struck me as not getting upset at things. He had an unnerving way in conversation and one look on his face would almost make you think ‘what the fuck are you talking about’ even though he may not be conscious of doing it. His pedigree gives him the right to behave like that. He likes to maintain a wee distance especially to employees.

4. Billie K (another coach at Rangers) tells a wee story about Walter. When we (Jimmy and Kirkie) were celebrating a win over Celtic in the under-age Glasgow Cup Final we both expected Walter to congratulate us. However he just said ‘Is that the best you’ve got? I have not seen many players for the first team here’. I am not sure he needed to do that – I would have walked on broken glass for him – though maybe it was his way of not allowing us to be satisfied too easily and decided to have ‘a wee nip’. This could have been the result of his training with Jim MacLean (at Dundee United). Kirkie believes that such training under MacLean contributed to such an approach. For us (coaches at Rangers Academy) he was a massive influence. He provided me with a real learning curve which suggested that just winning cups and trophies is merely part of the overall picture – producing (developing) players for the first team is crucial. That’s the bottom line even though questions would be asked – by the Board, supporters etc – if we lose three games on the run. Working at the (Rangers) Academy is very pressurised and it educates and builds an expectation for players to take into the first team.

5. Tommy W (now at Philadelphia Union MSL Club) and Billy K are others who have had a major influence on me. Each Monday morning we would discuss details of the previous week-ends performances. This has helped us all keep our jobs for eight years.

6. Regarding formal training (going though your licenses) – and I am not knocking the SFA or other groups – is very, very limiting and a great deal of informal learning takes
place (away from formal courses). Initially when I started coaching I thought that you, as a coach, would be measured by the number of routines you could produce! As I got older I realised that it is the detail of what you produce in a session rather than how many variations you might have. Nowadays I concentrate on smaller number of exercises that I know the younger players want.

7. In terms of CPD activities we would informally pick up things from trips but there is no magic formula. Other countries might have better players, more access to government funding though the present quality of players in Scotland is down (on former years). Maybe the weather is a factor here. It’s a national thing and you can only do so much.

8. I taught for thirteen years and being at the SFA meant that I saw my job as trying to educate people to become players. However throughout my career there has always been uncertainty and insecurity. I have a five year contract here which will become a rolling one after that but as that time approaches I wonder if I have done enough. The present turmoil here (at Rangers) still is a cause of concern for my job though I hope to get to the point where I can relax and enjoy it – especially if I am still in a job at sixty!

The most obvious points to arise from the critical experiences this coach had in his professional development were the importance attached to individual people who had a major impact, in different ways, on his development. “Senior coaches (who had indeed been managers of the Scottish National Team at various times), and coaches at the National Governing Body (the SFA), colleagues at the Rangers Academy were easily the most crucial parts of my professional development”. Other obvious factors such as CPD courses, specific mentors, or formal coach education courses played little part in such development. It could be argued the notion of ‘communities of practice’ while not specified, such as meeting like-minded professionals at conferences or on coaching courses, for example, played some part in the professional development of a coach. This coach specifically refused to endorse formal educational courses as having any major impact of his professional learning/development and focused more on the informal aspects of his learning.
**Coach B**

Senior Coach B played as a professional for a number of high profile clubs in the SPL before forging a career in coaching. He holds a UEFA Pro Licence. Working at top SPL clubs over the years, at different times as a coach, assistant manager and manager, he eventually joined the Academy at a major SPL club where he continues to work with reserve team and elite youngsters.

**Figure 6.4 Coach B Grid Display**

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABLE TO ADAPT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WILLING TO LEARN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INNER DESIRE 3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
.SMALL DETAILS 4|1  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 |
|LIKED 5|1  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
|CARING 6|3  | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |
|NEW SCHOOL 7|2  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
|FLEXIBLE 8|3  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
|RESPECT 9|2  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
|OLD/EXPERIENCED 10|2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |

1 MYSELF AS A COACH
2 BEST COACH I EVER HAD
3 MOST ORGANISED
4 MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE
5 MOST SUCCESSFUL
6 MOST TACTICALLY AWARE
7 MOST AGGRESSIVE
8 BEST MOTIVATOR
9 MOST DISLIKED
10 YOUNG/INEXPERIENCED
11 BEST COMMUNICATOR
12 IDEAL COACH
```
Table 6.17 Coach B Rank Order Scores for Constructs/Contrasts on main component derived from the Pringrid analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Construct/Contrast</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Able to adapt/Not prepared to adapt</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Liked/disliked</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Caring/Uncaring</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Respect/lack of respect</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>New school/Old school</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Willing to learn/Unwilling to learn</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Flexible/Rigid</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Small details/Unorganised</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Old, experienced/Young, inexperienced</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Inner desire/Relaxed</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Being adaptable was the most important factor for Coach B and issues regarding being liked, caring for his charges and having respect were also important in his coaching approach. The constructs of organization, experience and taking a relaxed or intense approach appeared less important to this coach.
Item 1. Able to adapt/Not prepared to adapt: Reasons why being able to adapt was important to you?
A) Need to be able to adapt to conditions such as pitch, overhead conditions.
B) Need to be able to adapt in training and various other situations.
C) Coaches who cannot adapt are arrogant.
D) Especially important when dealing with younger kids rather than experienced pros.

Item 2. Liked/disliked: Reasons why being liked was important to you?
A) Cannot be as simple as black and white.
B) Depends on what role (selector, coach, manager) you are in whether being liked or disliked is important.
C) Good for young kids to be able to feel that they can talk to you if they like you.
D) Firmness and approachability necessary with younger players.
E) Leads to respect from players which is necessary for coaches.

Item 3. Caring/Uncaring: Reasons why caring was important to you?
A) More important for a coach to be caring than a manager, who might verge on the “uncaring” side.
B) Important to take an interest in the players’ family, brothers, sisters etc.
C) Enables you to get to know them as a person in various circumstances.
D) Might be different from the way they are treated at home and helps you see what makes them tick.
E) Enables the players to confide in you almost as a friend.
F) Enables a bond of trust to be established between player and coach.
G) Enables players to get to know the coach and thus the coach gets the best out of them.

Item 4. Respect/lack of respect Reasons why respect was important to you?
A) More important for the younger ones to have respect.
B) Respect from first team players not so important so long as they perform on match days.
C) Respect from younger ones necessary as they should understand that you are trying to educate them up to a level.
D) They have to believe in what you are telling them and how to go about their job on a daily basis.
E) They have to believe in what you are trying to tell them.
F) Fine line between caring and be respected.
G) With first team players lack of respect can lead to ‘losing the dressing room’ and maybe the eventual sack.
H) With youngsters it is perhaps more like friendship.

Item 5. New School/Old School: Reasons why this was important to you?
A) Right in the middle with this one.
B) Brought up ‘Old School’ but nowadays sports science is part of the ‘New School’ approach.
C) Not just sports science that has taken over but the reliance on a type of Dutch football (Walter Smith calls it ‘pensioners football’ with its overemphasis on passing).
D) Scottish fans need to be entertained so teams need to show energy as the weather in Scotland is not conducive to watching in short sleeves.

Item 6. Willing to learn/Unwilling to learn: Reasons why being willing to learn was important to you?
A) Similar to Old School, New School.
B) Need to adapt to new ideas but much of Old School approach was good, such as developing respect of first team players.
C) Much new age thinking not helped players appreciate a lot of things.
D) Like driving a car. Passing your test is really just the beginning of adapting to new conditions.

Item 7. Flexible/Rigid: Reasons why being flexible was important to you?
A) Though needing a rigid structure, flexibility is equally important.
B) Needs to have rules, regulations in terms of preparations for games etc.
C) As human beings, kids also need to know that there is some degree of flexibility too.
D) Similar to adaptability so when players develop into the first team squad they need to know what is expected of them too.
E) Though structured there has to be an emphasis on the importance of relative flexibility an adaptability.

Item 8. Small details/Unorganised: Reasons why small details was important to you?
A) With young kids, taking care of the small things and the big things take care of themselves.
B) Taking care to be well prepared in all aspects prior to a game (like taking more care when having just passed a driving test).
C) Important to a coach when planning ahead.
D) Big things usually take care of themselves but ‘knick-nacks’ need organising (having the right studs, shin pads etc.).
E) For a coach, preparing all such details helps a session flow.
F) Being organised as a coach is half the battle.
G) Helps the players to be organised when they play in matches.

Item 9. Old, experienced/Young, inexperienced: Reasons why experience was important to you?
A) Just like driving a car. By doing it you become more experienced.
B) Experience is invaluable. Tell a good player once, tell a bad player all the time.
C) Being disciplined leads to players being receptive to what you are saying.
D) Not being receptive limits the player’s development. They become ‘erratic’ in their development.
E) Players who develop into top players are the ones who have listened and taken on board what you have been saying to them. Limitations to the extent coaches can help young players develop. Often there is a need for outside help for some players.
Item 10. Inner desire/Relaxed: Reasons why this was important to you?
A) Players need to know that you are relaxed but still have a desire to help them develop into better players.
B) Cannot be intense with players all the time.
C) Coach must be able to have a laugh and a joke and take a wee bit of stick though this may not be possible for a Head of the Academy, where a certain distance from players may be necessary.
D) Coaches should not be seen as being desperate. Being relaxed at times can be very helpful.
E) Knowing how to be relaxed in demanding situations (playing in front of 50,000 fans in the first team, for example) is essential if they are to develop into top class players.

According to Coach B, “A coach needs to be able to adapt – to pitch conditions, overhead conditions as well as training situations. Coaches who refuse to adapt are arrogant and it is especially important when dealing with youth players as against experienced professionals”. Further Coach B suggested that “being liked or disliked by players is not always as simple as black and white. Can depend on the role you have, such as selector, coach or manager. It is important for younger players to feel able to talk to you though you must be firm yet approachable”. The construct pertaining to respect was expanded on by Coach B when he states “It is important for coaches to earn the respect from players”. In terms of demonstrating a caring attitude towards players in his charge Coach B stated that “Coaches are thus often seen as more caring than managers, who sometimes can be seen as uncaring. It is vital that the coach of younger players get a whole picture of the players – family circumstances, how many brothers and sisters, the way they are treated at home etc. This enables the players to confide in you ‘almost like a friend’ which enables a bond between player and coach to be formed. In this way coaches can get the best out of players”.

The derived construct relating to respect was amplified when he said “Gaining respect from players is more important when dealing with youngsters – with seasoned pros it is less important so long as they are performing well on match days. Younger players have to appreciate that you are trying to educate them in how to go about their job on a daily basis”. Demonstrating his connection between the constructs of respect and caring Coach B stated “There is a fine line between caring and being respected and is almost like friendship. With older professionals lack of respect can
lead to you losing the dressing room, which can lead to being sacked”. Coach B believed that the notion (construct) of ‘old school – new school’ approach to coaching was demanding for him to come to terms with. He states ‘It is difficult to decide between being ‘old school or new school’. “The recent development of sport science is important but in Scotland some coaches shy away from embracing such developments (as in Walter Smith’s notion of Dutch football being ‘pensioners’ football’). Scottish fans are more concerned about teams showing energy and playing in short sleeves is not an option in Scotland because of the weather”. Ongoing learning was another construct generated from Coach B’s grid. He states, “Willing to learn is similar to ‘old school/new school’ in that coaches must be able to adapt to new ideas though there is still a lot to be said about the old school approach. It is like driving a car. Passing your test (coaching badges) is really just the beginning in adapting to new conditions”.

The importance of flexibility in coaching was clearly stated when Coach B states “Though coaches need to have a structure in their approach flexibility is equally important. Knowing how to adapt to new rules, regulations, preparation for games etc. is important”. Being organized and attending to small details was suggested by the coach as being of importance, as part of normal coaching behaviour. He states “When younger players progress into the first team squad they have to know they need to adapt and understand what is then expected of them. When dealing with young players it is important that he plans well and emphasises to the players the relevance of looking after small details in their preparation. Being organised as a coach is half the battle and it helps coaching sessions to flow. It also helps the players to understand they too must be organised when they play matches”. Experience is also vital for the coach. “It enables players to become disciplined and those that develop into top players are the ones who have listened to what the coach has been saying”.

Finally, being relaxed as a coach in his/her approach to players is an important issue. “Players need to know that though you are relaxed you still have a desire to help them become better players. A coach cannot be intense all the time, sharing a laugh and a joke can be helpful in this regard, though that may not always be possible in the coaching role you have (such as being Head of the Academy)”. He believed that “Coaches should never be seen as desperate. Knowing how and when to relax
such as playing in front of 50,000 fans) can be instructive in developing youngsters into top class players”.

Figure 6.6 Coach B: Snake Interview Results

1. The most important thing for me was taking the “S” Form training of youngsters at Dundee United when I was still completing my badges.
2. I studied extra ‘Highers’ as I was not convinced that I was going to make it as a footballer.
3. Gaining confidence from this and being asked by senior coaching staff to help them gave me a lift.
5. Gaining my UEFA Pro License before being asked to become a manager.
6. Losing my job as manager at Dundee United was my biggest shock.
7. Going abroad, to Hong Kong, six months was rewarding. The money was good and I was then asked to come back to Scotland, at St. Mirren, to be the assistant manager there.
8. In 2006 I came here to Rangers and have been here about six or seven years, working with the younger age players.
9. The eventual change of managers had a slight impact on the work with youth players as some managers did not believe in the youth team or did not use the players in the first team.
10. My overall philosophy and work ethic has not really changed though being complacent was never an issue.
11. Some people call it “Rangeritise” meaning getting carried away with being at a big club like Rangers.
12. Important for me to be adaptable in my role. Being flexible in being able to turn your hand to what the manager wants is something you learn. Just like driving a car and learning how to use the use to progress.
13. Circumstances here (at Rangers) are fantastic (in terms of training facilities, work environment and colleagues). Money is not the only issue.
14. Possibility of change when nearing the end of my career.

The most important aspect of this coach’s development was related to his coaching experiences – good and bad – over the years. “The first and most important aspect of professional development was working with young (‘S’ form) players while I was still playing at Dundee United. It gave me confidence in gaining all my coaching licenses. Being sacked and then going abroad to coach was crucial in my development and getting a job at Rangers. My work ethic has not really changed over the years though the impact of different managers here at Rangers, and the way some did not really promote younger players was crucial to me. No possibility of complacency here even though the facilities and circumstances at the training ground are fantastic”.

Virtually no mention of the normal professional development areas of formal
mentoring, reflection, CPD etc was made by this coach and it seemed that his actual coaching experiences were the most crucial aspects of his coaching development.
Coach C

Coach C is different from the rest of the sample of coaches in Study 3 in that he openly expressed a view that he enjoyed working as an assistant Academy Manager and felt that this would be his future career path, rather than wanting to be a first coach or manager and felt that his forte and major interest was in developing young players. He holds the UEFA “A” Licence, Youth Licence and, rather unusually, the Youth Director’s award. After a playing career at a number of second tier Scottish professional clubs, he was Senior Youth Development Officer at the SFA before joining a major SPL club where he was initially Academy Operations manager before becoming, in January 2015, Academy Director there. He is a graduate of Glasgow University.

**Figure 6.7** Coach C Grid Display

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Display COACH C</th>
<th>&quot;COACHING&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATIENCE</td>
<td>3 4 4 2 2 2 5 3 1 4 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREATIVITY/FLEXIBILITY</td>
<td>2 2 4 2 2 4 2 5 4 3 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTHUSIASM/HONESTY</td>
<td>2 1 2 2 1 3 1 5 2 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPARATION</td>
<td>3 2 1 2 4 1 3 4 5 3 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRIDE/OWNERSHIP</td>
<td>2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1 3 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERSTANDING</td>
<td>2 2 4 2 2 2 5 2 1 2 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENCE/RESPECT</td>
<td>4 3 5 1 2 2 2 2 1 2 1 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIRE TO LEARN</td>
<td>2 2 3 3 3 1 4 2 5 4 2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WORK ETHIC</td>
<td>2 1 2 2 2 1 2 2 5 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPRESSES IDEAS</td>
<td>2 1 3 1 2 1 2 3 2 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOT HEADED</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIXED PICTURE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACK OF DESIRE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACK OF PLANNING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LACK OF PASSION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT CONSIDERATE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SET IN WAYS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE DRIVE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POOR COMMUNICATOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ideal Coach**

JS
BK
AMC2
BL
CB
AMC
WS
DT
IM
Self as Coach
### Table 6.18 Coach C Rank Order Scores of Constructs/Contrasts on main component derived from the Pringrid analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Construct/Contrasts</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enthusiastic, honest /Lack of desire</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Desire to learn/Set in ways</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Work ethic/Little drive</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Preparation/Lack of planning</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Creativity, flexibility/Fixed picture</td>
<td>1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Expresses ideas/Poor communicator</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pride, ownership/Lack of passion</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Patience/Hot headed</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Understanding/Not considerate</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Experience, respect/Learning</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first five constructs – enthusiasm, desire to learn having a sound work ethic, being prepared and being creative/flexible – are perceived as being of similar importance to this coach, while those of patience, understanding and experience appeared to have lesser importance.
Figure 6.8 Coach C Ladder Results

Item 1. Enthusiastic, honest /Lack of desire. Reasons why being enthusiastic, honest was important to you?
A) Being honest and straightforward without dressing things up or manipulating situations means that you get response from players.
B) Coach must also be enthusiastic whatever the sport.
C) This does not mean being a “baller or shouter”. Comes across in different ways.
D) If you want [players to show enthusiasm and passion you have to demonstrate such passion and energy yourself.
E) If you are not honest with players they are always second guessing to what extent they are improving.
F) Without such energy and enthusiasm from the coach they are less likely to be motivated to improve.

Item 2. Desire to learn/ Set in ways. Reasons why desire to win was important to you?
A) Applies in other sports too and in academic situations.
B) Need for more openness to learning and new ideas.
C) Footballers tend to be set in their ways culturally.
D) Need to be open-minded to other sports and other practices from other countries too.
E) Without such an approach little chance of Scottish football developing good practice and will remain stuff with an output which is out dated.

Item 3. Work ethic/ Little drive. Reasons why work ethic was important to you?
A) Having the ethic to sacrifice a great deal to become as effective as you can be is vital.
B) Demands an awful lot of hours.
C) Not just coaching techniques and skills to players.
D) The people management of young players demands 24/7 attention to help their continual desire to learn.
E) One cannot be an effective coach without such a work ethic.

Item 4. Preparation/ Lack of planning. Reasons why preparation was important to you?
A) Similar concept to work ethic.
B) Being experienced might enable coach to spend less time preparing.
C) Modern activities such as GPS monitoring, video analysis, notational analysis demand sound preparation.
D) Regardless of one’s knowledge the coach needs to work and prepare properly all the time to help players develop.

Item 5. Creativity, flexibility/ Fixed picture. Reasons why creativity, flexibility was important to you?
A) Being creative and flexible means not being set in your ways.
B) Leads to a desire to learn.
C) Opposite to being stuck in one’s ways.
D) Similar to constructs we spoke of earlier.

Item 6. Expresses ideas/ Poor communicator. Reasons why expressing ideas was important to you?
A) Being able to communicate effectively essential part of a coach’s skill set.
B) Playing experience not enough.
C) When dealing with players nowadays being able to communicate in various fashions – use of IT, emailing, making presentations to groups is essential.
D) Social media is now an important way of communicating with players.
E) Using videos pre match is now an established practice.
F) Modern day coach needs a variety of such communication skills.

Item 7. Pride, ownership/Lack of passion. Reasons why pride, ownership was important to you?
A) Pride and ownership is very similar to the earlier construct ‘enthusiasm and honesty’.
B) Not having pride, ownership, enthusiasm, energy show thorough as a player.
C) Would lead to players not getting the outcome the coach wanted.
D) Not having such as a coach would make you less effective as a coach.
E) Ultimately could cost the coach his job.

Item 8. Patience/Hot headed. Reasons why patience was important to you?
A) Having passion is vital for players.
B) Being disciplined as a coach also entails showing patience with players.
C) Leads to less acts of confrontation with players.
D) Useful examples from former managers who developed the skill of patience, particularly with high profile elite players.
E) Important for younger coaches to learn from senior ones in how to treat players with a patience both on and off the field to help produce better performance.

Item 9. Understanding/Not considerate. Reasons why understanding was important to you?
A) Understanding modern players’ lifestyle so important these days.
B) Need to understand how players learn.
C) Understanding a player’s background becoming more and more important.
D) Not being aware of such issues does not work any more.
E) Even an understanding of legalities is crucial for coaches these days especially when dealing with parents, who are more likely to sue coaches or clubs.
F) Helps get the best out of player and ensures a better run professional organization.

Item 10. Experience, respect/Learning. Reasons why experience, respect was important to you?
A) A coach’s experience often results in being respected.
B) Watching an experienced coach helpful when dealing with various situations.
C) Simple observation more important than a thousand words.

Coach C believed that enthusiasm was the most important aspect of his coaching. “Being honest and straightforward with players is important if the coach wants to get a response from players”. He must show enthusiasm and passion if he wants the players to show the same. “If you are not honest with players they will not know the extent to which they are improving and they will become less motivated.”
Ongoing learning featured highly in Coach C’s hierarchy of important constructs. He states that “As in other sports and academic institutions openness to leaning and new ideas is important when coaching as players can often be set in their ways. Without such an approach Scottish football will become outdated”. In general, coaches, according to Coach C, need to have a strong work ethic. “Having a solid work ethic, which might mean sacrificing a great deal to become an effective coach is vital. Coaching young players is very time consuming with 24/7 demands on the coach. Without such an approach a coach will not be effective”. Good coaching demands sound preparation, according to Coach C. “Sound preparation is very important, though experience can help with this. Utilising modern developments such as use of GPS systems, video analysis etc. used properly can assist players develop”.

Creativity on the coach’s part was listed by Coach C as an important construct. “Being creative in one’s coaching leads to a desire to learn rather than being stuck in one’s ways”. Communication was an essential part of proper coaching behaviour, according to Coach C “Being able to communicate effectively is essential part of a coach’s skill set. Playing experience is now not enough as young players can benefit from good use of modern ideas, such as IT, social media and through such use the coach can demonstrate his wide variety of communication skills”. Coach C distinguished between the ideas of ‘pride/ownership’ with ‘lack of passion’ when dealing with his idea of enthusiasm and honesty. He states that “The notion of ‘pride and ownership’ is very similar to that of enthusiasm and honesty”. Without this players will not achieve the outcome expected by the coach. This could effectively mean that you might be perceived as a less effective coach, which could mean you losing your job”. Having passion is important for a coach “Though this must be harnessed to patience with players. This will lead to less confrontation. Important for the younger coach to learn this skill from senior more experienced coach in the way that they have handled experienced professionals. This applies when dealing with young players both on and off the field. The ability of the coach to understand players’ modern lifestyles is important these days”.

A coach’s ability to be understanding was cited as being important for Coach C. “This means having an understanding how players learn, how the players’ background impacts on them as well as being aware of such issues as legalities, especially when dealing with parents. This helps to get the best put of players and
ensures a better run professional organization”. Finally, Coach C believed that experience was important for a coach when he states “A coach’s experience often results in gaining respect from players that is why it is important for younger coaches to watch more experienced, senior ones deal with different situations – ‘Simple observation is worth a thousand words’.

**Figure 6.9** Coach C Snake Interview Results

1. I did my ‘B’ License as a player before I started coaching.
2. Being here (at Rangers) for over 16 years has made me able to handle difficult scenarios (such as those the club is going through the moment).
3. With the club going into administration and the ways in which this has impacted on the way we have to deal with players, parents etc. is a massive learning experience.
4. As a player working with Ian M at Hamilton Accies had a major impact on me, even though I had worked with other major coaches such as Murdo M and Billy L at Dunbarton.
5. His energy, desire, preparation and organisation had an impact on making me want to become a coach.
6. Even though I studied accountancy at Glasgow University, after being coached by Ian M I decided to become a part-time coach with the SFA.
7. Doing the SFA coaching courses was good and working at the SFA for six years was very helpful in my development.
8. Moving to Rangers and being out of coach education (which I did at the SFA) for over ten years meant that when I finally took my coaching badges there was immense pressure on me, mostly self imposed not from the club, to succeed.
9. Coaching on a daily basis at Rangers meant that I was more experienced than most of the candidates on the coaching courses.
10. Gaining the ‘A’ License was personally important though these courses can help with the ‘football bits’ they cannot give you the sort of ancillary bits, such as dealing with parents, agents, schools etc. that have to be learnt experientially.
11. Working with budgets, administrators, changes to a club’s philosophy, working with a foreign (French) manager with its cultural implications cannot be learnt from books or courses.
12. Being involved with senior coaching staff in an informal way at elite European games was extremely valuable. Chatting with such people over a meal was an important learning experience that you cannot get from a coaching course.
13. Learning has to be continuous and being exposed to new learning ideas is crucial.
14. Going beyond the club, such as visiting Sporting Lisbon, Panathanaikos, the Swedish FA is important in my ongoing development.
15. Internal CPD is helpful but travelling abroad with Rangers’ coaching staff at various elite clubs enabled us to share our professional experiences and to include these in the curriculum at Rangers for the youngsters.
16. Many of the CPD courses run by the SFA are for boys clubs or lower level professional clubs and thus not applicable to us at Rangers.
17. Coaches only have to do 15 hours over a three year period to maintain their
coaching accreditation and this can even be done on a single trip! Initial coach resistance has lessened even though some coaches will always be stuck in their ways and not embrace change and can be quite rigid and pretty fixed in their thinking.

18. Recent changes to the sporting (football club) environment such as the way money now predominates, the role of Chief Executives and Board of Directors has meant that coaches have to adapt or would not last a few minutes in their jobs.

19. The coaching role has changed enormously and though the coaching courses deal mainly with technical issues, which is a given, other areas are now seen as being more important, such as creating an environment and club culture.

20. Having a personality and being able to relate to people effectively is crucial that comes after you’ve got your (coaching) qualification.

The words from Coach C’s Snake interview describe graphically his views on his development as a professional coach- “Spending 16 years at Rangers was a massive learning experience even though I had spent time as a player and had even started my initial coaching badges at that time”. He goes on to highlight the importance of individuals in his career who were instrumental in his development as a coach. “Most important in my development were a number of individuals coaches (such as Ian Munro, Murdo MacLeod and Billy Lamont) who had a major impact on my becoming a coach”. Working as a coach at the National Governing Body for football in Scotland (SFA) was a further step in Coach C’s learning and he states “Working at the SFA for ten years in coach development helped this development further and”, he goes on to state, “Gaining my top coaching awards was personally crucial even though there was no pressure from the club (Rangers) to complete these”. Comparing difference learning experiences, Coach C believes that “Though internal CPD programmes have helped of far more importance was meeting fellow professionals when travelling throughout Europe. That was massively significant”. According to him “Formal coaching courses just don’t give you that. Most of the official (SFA) CPD courses are really aimed at lower level, community involved coaches and are not really useful as only 15 hours per coaching license is needed over a three year period coaches often don’t buy into them. Travelling to see a game in Europe almost constitutes one CPD period!” Recent changes in sporting (football) environments have forced coaches to examine their new coaching roles. Formal coaching courses mainly deal with technical issues and there are wider aspects that are becoming more pertinent, such as creating a positive environment and club culture”. Emphasising this point Coach C finally states that, “This is where the
coach’s personality and ability to relate to people is crucial – something that has to be learnt after passing the various coaching badges".
Coach D

Coach D played semi-professional football after not ‘making it’ as a young professional. At the same time he gained a BEd in Physical Education from Jordanhill College, Glasgow and taught physical education for a number of years. His coaching pathway eventually lead him to gaining a position at the SFA where he continues to work, specialising in the development of younger age players.

Figure 6.10 Coach D Grid Display
Table 6.19 Coach D Rank order scores of constructs/contrasts on main component derived from the Pringrid analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Constructs/Contrasts</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Manipulates people negatively/Manipulates positively</td>
<td>-2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Less aggressive in approach/More aggressive in approach</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>More approachable/Less approachable</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>More knowledgeable, experienced at grass roots/Less knowledgeable, experienced at grass roots</td>
<td>1.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Presence/Less presence</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Very good organiser/Poor organisation</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Good communicator/Poor communicator</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ability to motivate/less ability to motivate</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Success at highest level/Has not had success at highest level</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>More tactical knowledge/Less tactical knowledge</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Coach D the more salient and relevant constructs chosen were related to ideas of positively ‘manipulating’ players, taking a less aggressive approach and being approachable. Having requisite knowledge of the game and also having a presence on the training field were also important. Motivational ability, having had success at a high level and being tactically aware were of lesser importance to this coach.
Figure 6.11 Coach D Ladder Results

Item 1. Manipulates people negatively/Manipulates positively. Reasons why manipulation is important to you?
A) The best phrase in football is ‘well done’.
B) A lot is to do with context (type of player, age of group etc.).
C) Positive manipulation (enhancing players) leads to players being more motivated and will work harder.
D) Not just what you say but how you say it is important, as this often enables players to relate to you as a coach.
E) Positive coaching can have a huge impact on how successful players become.

Item 2. Less aggressive in approach/More aggressive in approach. Reasons why aggression is important to you?
A) Though both approaches have their place the majority of players seem to favour a less aggressive approach.
B) A lot is to do with context (type of player, age of group etc.).
C) Players need to feel part of something and training does not just ‘happen to them’.
D) It allows players to take part in decision making rather than being told what to do.
E) Positive manipulation is my default position.

Item 3. More approachable/Less approachable. Reasons why being approachable is important to you?
A) Being more approachable is a two way process.
B) Players need to see the coach as someone they can take a question to.
C) When they don’t understand something they need to feel able to ask the coach to explain.
D) Not being able to approach the coach could lead to players going onto the pitch not understanding what they are meant to be doing. This is bad coaching.
E) It is about relationship building and communication, without which there is a disconnect to what the coach is trying to do.

Item 4. More knowledgeable, experienced at grass roots/Less knowledgeable, experienced at grass roots. Reasons why knowledge and experience are important to you?
A) Depends on what kind of coach we are talking about.
B) Such as grass roots football versus performance level.
C) Holistic knowledge of players might be helpful to coaches but not for their day-to-day work.
D) Really depends on the cohort with which the coach is involved.

Item 5. Presence/Less presence. Reasons why presence is important to you?
A) Ability to have presence really important.
B) Coach as a leader is important though he can ‘give away’ that leadership if he is very confident in his own abilities.
C) Not having presence or personality when dealing with adults in a highly competitive environment means you as coach would lose the group.
D) Different types of presence leads to building trust, credibility and power.
E) Enables the coach to relax when with the group.
F) ‘Show us your medals’ syndrome relates to a coach’s presence.
Item 6. Very good organiser/Poor organization. Reasons why organisation is important to you?
A) At every level a coach who is organised has credibility and trust.
B) Every coaching session is an education, a chance for learning and an opportunity to develop, so coaches cannot waste a minute.
C) Smooth operation of a session means more learning opportunities.
D) ‘Accelerated learning’ concept.
E) Coaching is teaching.

Item 7. Good communicator/Poor communicator. Reasons why communication is important to you?
A) Good communication is fundamental to a coach.
B) If you cannot communicate with your players you should not be there.
C) Coaches need to relate and pass on information.
D) Key part of being a good coach.
E) Could be a demonstration, verbal, vision doing a demo.
F) Useful to use various types of communication as a form of ‘accelerated learning’ when time is at a premium with international players.

Item 8. Ability to motivate/less ability to motivate. Reasons why motivation is important to you?
A) Players need to be highly motivated to spend 10,000 hours of their lives to do something with no guarantee at the end.
B) Players need to be internally motivated.
C) Very motivated means being very enthusiastic, not just when you are told to practice.
D) Making players accountable for their own performances which is about intrinsic motivation.
E) The players who are currently succeeding in our squads are the ones who are highly motivated, have a filled mindset and have good learning skills.

Item 9. Success at highest level/Has not had success at highest level. Reasons why success is important to you?
A) Not all good examples of coaches have had success at the highest level.
B) Hard to decide which of these are more important.
C) To get a (coaching) job at the highest level you generally need the credibility of having played at the highest level and been successful.
D) Unusual for top jobs to go to people who have not played at the highest level, though there are various well known examples.

Item 10. More tactical knowledge/Less tactical knowledge. Reasons why tactical knowledge is important to you?
A) Tactical knowledge means you need to know how the game is structured.
B) Football is an invasive game where decisions need to be made all the time.
C) Coaches need players who can ‘play on the edge of chaos’.
D) Players need to adapt in an hundredth of a second.
E) A kind of ‘what if’ scenario.
F) The more tactical knowledge a coach has the more he can influence the learning environment for the players so when they go on the pitch their learning is much better.
The over-riding impression one gets from the detail of the Ladder presented by Coach D is the importance the coach ascribes to having a sensitive approach with players, especially younger ones. “Positively enhancing players leads to players being more motivated and (they) will work harder”. And this “Can have a huge impact on how successful players become”. The coaching style adopted by the coach, in terms of aggressivity, relates to “Factors such as age, sex, level etc. of players (being coached)”. Players need to be dealt with on an individual basis “So that they feel part of something and ‘things just don’t happen to them and it allows players to take part in decision making”. Approachability by the coach was also stated as an important factor in coaching behavior and believes that it is a two way process. “When they don’t understand something they need to feel able to ask the coach to explain” or this could “lead to players going onto the pitch not understanding what they are meant to be doing”.

As a coach who had worked extensively with younger players it is understandable why Coach D believed that the knowledge a coach possesses was another important factor, especially when working at ‘grass root’s’ level. It “Depends on the kind of coach we are talking about, such as grass roots football versus performance level. The coach always has to show presence with the players and show positive leadership in his encounters. This is especially important in a competitive environment in which the coach’s personality can help him develop trust, credibility and power within the group. Credibility is also enhanced by being very well organised. Each coaching session is really an education session with chances to learn. In this way ‘coaching is teaching’”. Of fundamental importance, according to Coach D, coaching is being a good communicator. If the coach cannot do this successfully “he should not be there” according to Coach D. He also stated that “Communication these days is not just verbal instruction, it could be a sound demonstration, good use of IT”. In addition Coach D believed that the ability to motivate players is highly important especially in attempting to get the players to become self motivated, as is crucial in developing continuing performance by the players, especially with the amount of time needed to become a top level player. “Having had success as a player is not absolutely necessary for the modern coach, but might be necessary, in the first instance, in actually obtaining a coaching job”. Finally, Coach D stated that “Coaches need to have the tactical awareness to help players ’play on the edge of
chaos’ where making very quick decisions may be crucial for a winning performance. The more tactical knowledge a coach has the more he can help the learning environment for the players”.

The issue of a coach ‘having presence’ was highlighted by Coach D as being important. “Different types of presence leads to building trust, credibility and power” though “not having presence or personality when dealing with adults in a highly competitive environment means you as a coach could lose the group”. He likened it to the “Show us your medal syndrome”, which can occur when dealing with professional footballers. Being well organized as a coach develops “credibility and trust at every level”. Coach D explained the connection between coaching and teaching when he stated “Every coaching session is an education” as well as adding “a chance for learning and an opportunity to develop”. He even states that “Coaching is teaching”. With regards to the communication skills of a coach, Coach D believes that “Good communication is fundamental to a coach. It is the key part of being a good coach” and emphasises the point by stating “If you cannot communicate with your players you should not be there”. He believed that players need to be highly motivated. “To spend 10,000 hours of their lives to do something with no guarantee at the end”, he goes further when saying “Players need to be internally motivated” and players should be “accountable for their own performances which is about intrinsic motivation”. Coach D was unsure if success at the highest level was of major importance in a coach’s career though “To get a top job at the highest level you generally need the credibility of having played at the highest level and been successful”. He emphasised this point when stating that it is “Unusual for top jobs to go to people who have not played at the highest level”.

Finally, Coach D emphasised the importance of tactical knowledge for the coach. “Tactical knowledge means you need to know how the game is structured” which can enable players “To play on the edge of chaos”. The more tactical knowledge the coach possesses “The more he can influence the learning environment for the players so when they go on the pitch their learning is so much better”.
1. The first major influence in my life would have to be my dad, because he played for Rangers. He chose them instead of running at the Commonwealth Games (he was Scottish sprint champion at the time).
2. My dad was enthusiastic and he was central to my thinking about football.
3. He took young teams to various places, America, Germany which help my professional socialisation as a coach.
4. The next guy who was a major influence was called Innes Mac, my PE teacher at school. He took me to Nairn County where he was manager. He was a legend in the Highlands. He was a real hard man but had presence and was exceptionally good as coach.
5. Playing for him in the Highland League was brave of me as I was not the tallest of players and after trials at Manchester United and Motherwell I realised that I was not good enough to make it as a professional player.
6. It was then a toss-up between becoming a ‘brickie’ or going to Jordanhill (the Scottish School of Physical Education) to train as a PE Teacher.
7. Meeting Andy R and Craig B at coaching courses at Jordanhill was crucial in my early development as a coach.
8. Craig Brown signed me as a player at Clyde and I got excellent coaching from him there for about eighteen months.
9. I did my “A” License with Andy as my tutor and Craig were on the staff when I was about thirty one (years of age).
10. There was quite a lot of nonsense talked in the press about the ‘Largs’ Mafia’ though I learnt a great deal from the two years it took to do my “A” License.
11. Another guy who was extremely important to my development was Jim K, who was my Senior Lecturer at Murray College (of Further Education) where I got my first job. He was a great communicator, very approachable, really well organised and had great people skills. I worked with him for about fourteen years and I have definitely modeled some of these behaviours.
12. The next major influence was a guy called Alec M, who was the Editor of the Glasgow Herald for the North of Scotland and manager of Caley (Thistle). His great skill was about handling people, especially players in delicate situations in competitive matches.
13. Later in my Forties Jim F was a major influence on me. Though he can be loud and brash, and I don’t coach the way he does, his people skills and sound organisation were excellent. He evaluates everything he does and always reflects upon games. Though there is a danger of ‘paralysis through analysis’ reflection can be important if used appropriately.
14. Reflection is important for youngsters especially as some players stop learning once they become professionals in a first team at a club.
15. Travelling all over the world – America, Europe, Australia - meeting top class coaches has enabled me to pick up various ideas that I try and use. Just having coffee with such coaches is important to my learning. Even meeting coaches from different sports gives a helpful perspective.
16. Once you have got your top badge learning from other people becomes more important. The informal ways of learning then become more important to the formal ones.
17. In terms of CPD experiences UEFA states that coaches need to do 15 hours of CPD over a three year period though the SFA have developed an extensive CPD programme for all coaches.

18. Each coaching badge needs the same hours which can be difficult if you hold a variety of badges such as the Children’s Badge and the “A” License.

The overwhelming importance of individuals – coaches, teachers, fellow colleagues and father - to the professional development of this coach is quite evident. At different stages of his career he derived enormous support. Fellow colleagues at the SFA had a major impact on his development – “Jim F, the Head of Coaching at the SFA, was a major influence on me” and it was working with him that reflection became an important learning tool. Additionally, travelling throughout the world, not just to football conferences or attending foreign clubs, was instrumental in his continuing professional development. In this way meeting top class coaches from different sports was beneficial in gaining a wider coaching perspective. Though CPD experiences are mentioned (with only 15 hours needed over a three year period per badge held) these seemed to play a lesser part in the coach’s development and he believed that informal learning was far more relevant and important than formal courses.
Coach E

Coach E played as a semi-professional with a number of clubs in Scotland before becoming very involved in coaching. He became a Staff Coach at the SFA and lectured in Primary Education at Notre Dame, College of Education, Glasgow before taking up a position at Jordanhill College of Education, Glasgow, of which he was a former student and where he specialised in Primary Education and sports studies. He gained an Open University degree and eventually a PhD from Glasgow University. Coaching at both professional and elite amateur level (he also coached the Scottish Women’s football team for a number of years) he had both a theoretical and practical interest in coaching as a discipline.

Figure 6.13 Coach E Grid Display
Table 6.20 Coach E Rank Order Scores of Constructs/Contrasts on main component derived from the Pringrid analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Construct/Contrasts</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Man management, understanding people/Bully</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Care for individuals/Plays favourites</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Team before self/Self before team</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Appropriateness/No pain, no gain regime</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Self confidence/Selfish, lacking self belief</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Preparedness/Disorganised</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Simplicity, clarity/Confuse, complicated</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=8</td>
<td>Thoroughness/Sloppy, lazy</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>=8</td>
<td>Communication/Disinterest, lazy</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Detail/Blah, blah, blah</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most important aspect of coaching for Coach E was man-management ability. Having care for individuals and attending to the importance of the team over individual concerns was also held to be essential though aspects of coaching related to the more practical issues of thoroughness of approach, communication skills and emphasis on detail received less regard.
Figure 6.14 Coach E Ladder Results

Item 1. Man management, understanding people/Bully. Reasons why man management is important to you?
A) Players will accept bullying if they trust the coach’s man management skills.
B) Man management and bullying can go together if the players believe in the coach (Fergie was a good man manager but also a bully).
C) Man management very much linked to coach’s credibility.
D) If man management is not good the coach will lose credibility with players.
E) Man management can be extremely important when players are not being successful. If they believe in your approach.
F) Being successful can be measured in different ways and not just by the actual result. Good man management can facilitate this.

Item 2. Care for individuals/Plays favourites. Reasons why caring for individuals is important to you?
A) Care for individuals enables players to feel good about themselves within the team environment.
B) The coach is more likely to get more out of players if they see that the coach cares for them as an individual.
C) It is almost possible to ‘con’ players this way.
D) Selecting players because you liked them is never going to be a good thing for the coach – it never, ever works.
E) The coach would lose credibility with the players if he played favourites.

Item 3. Team before self/Self before team. Reasons why team before self is important to you?
A) Important to put the team before yourself.
B) Anything you do reflects on the team so then they play badly it is a reflection of you as coach.
C) The coach has to get the best out of his players and this means that he has to assess how much results are because of him and his approach.
D) A coach should never lower his standards or see himself misrepresented by the team’s results.
E) The coach must get the best out of the team at the level they are operating.

Item 4. Appropriateness/No pain, no gain regime. Reasons why appropriateness is important to you?
A) Coaches who take the ‘no pain no gain approach’ are plainly wrong in their approach.
B) Making the players work extremely hard on their fitness, for example, may be more appropriate at certain times.
C) Putting in the hours (in training) is not as important as putting in the most appropriate hours.
D) It is related to the art of coaching, knowing, for example, how to construct training sessions which balance such areas as technique, fitness, functional work etc.
E) Linked to your core values as a coach, your coaching philosophy.

Item 5. Self confidence/Selfish, lacking self belief. Reasons why self confidence is important to you?
A) Having self confidence linked to credibility (who has the new coach played for idea?)
B) Demonstrating self confidence helps give the right impression to players, especially when first appointed to a team.
C) Working at the higher, elite, levels can test one’s self confidence, no matter who the coach is.
D) Very important part of one’s coaching philosophy.
E) Self confidence can underpin all other aspects of coaching, such as man management.

Item 6. Preparedness/Disorganised. Reasons why preparation is important to you?
A) Every coach has at times experienced not being fully prepared but it is an essential prerequisite of good coaching.
B) Players will sense if ‘you have not done your homework’ properly.
C) You are sending out the wrong message to players just as if you were sloppy as a teacher.
D) The good coach should be flexible and say this is not working and change matters.
E) Brings out the ‘art’ side of one’s coaching approach.

Item 7. Simplicity, clarity/Confuse, complicated. Reasons why simplicity, clarity is important to you?
A) Taking a simple and clear approach is essential at any level where the coach operates.
B) Overcomplicating matters confuses players.
C) Players need to get a picture of what you want them to do.
D) Constant practices that are complicated can have a knock-on effect to other aspects such as the coach’s man management skills.

Item 8. Thoroughness/Sloppy, lazy. Reasons why thoroughness is important to you?
A) Thoroughness closely linked to preparation.
B) Very opposite of sloppy/laziness.
C) Clearly linked to one’s self concept.
D) Helps develop and establish one’s credibility with various groups.

Item 9. Communication/Disinterest, lazy. Reasons why communication is important to you?
E) If players think that the coach is disinterested or lazy the coach will have a problem.
F) Communication not necessarily at the opposite extreme to being disinterested.
G) Good communication means that you have a proper concern for the players.
H) Good communication is about having the fluency to get your message over effectively to the players.
I) Some coaches just assume players understand what they are saying and if they don’t then tough!

Item 10. Detail/Blah, blah, blah. Reasons why detail is important to you?
A) Having great detail is not the only aspect of communication.
B) Sometimes coaches need a bit of ‘blah, blah, blah’ (which is talking just for the sake of talking).
C) Presenting the correct detail is like giving players a precise of what you want them to do rather than just talking for the sake of talking.
D) That’s just noise rather than getting the right points over, which is important.

It is understandable that a person who has been involved in education, at differing levels, throughout his career appreciates the importance that Coach E attaches to dealing with individuals. “Man management is very much linked to a coach’s credibility... if man management is not good the coach will lose credibility with players. It can be extremely important when teams are not being successful if they believe in your approach”. With regards to the notion of caring for individuals Coach E believes that “The coach is likely to get more out of the players if they see that the coach cares for them as an individual”. Rejecting the question of selecting players because the coach likes them he states that “Is never going to be a good thing for the coach – it never ever works. The coach will lose credibility with the players if he plays favourites. Playing favourites simply does not work as it will cause the coach to lose credibility in the team’s eyes”. Putting the team before self was important for Coach E. Believing that “Anything you do reflects on the team so when they play badly it is a reflection of you as a coach”. In terms of maintaining high standards Coach D states “A coach should never lower his standards nor see himself misrepresented by the team’s results”. It is the coach’s job to “Get the best out of his team at the level they are operating”.

Distinguishing between the construct of ‘appropriateness’ and its contrast ‘No pain, no gain regime’, Coach E explains that asking the players work extremely hard is not the same as the adage ‘no pain, no gain’. He believes that it is a matter of appropriateness. “Putting in the hours in training is not as important as putting in the most appropriate hours. It is related to the art of the coaching, knowing, for example, how to construct training sessions which balance such areas as technique, fitness, functional work etc”. Emphasising this point he believes that appropriateness is “Linked to your core values as a coach, your coaching philosophy”.

Coach E discussed the construct of self confidence in contrast to being selfish and lacking self belief. He believed that self confidence was linked to a coach’s perceived credibility and “Demonstrating self confidence helps give the right impression to players especially when first appointed to a team”. Moreover, “Working at higher levels can test a coach’s self confidence, no matter who the coach is”. He
believes that is a very important part of a coach’s philosophy and “Can underpin all other aspects of coaching, such as man-management”. Preparation was another area that Coach E focused on. He believed that “It is a prerequisite of good coaching”. If a coach’s preparation is poor “Players will sense if you 'have not done your homework properly” and “You are sending out the wrong message to the players just as if you were sloppy as a teacher”. He states that good preparation results in being able to take a flexible approach and “It brings out the 'art’ side of coaching”. Taking a straightforward, simple and clear approach was another factor highlighted by Coach E. “Overcomplicating matters confuses players”. He goes further and states that players like to get a picture of what is needed in sessions and “Constant practices that are complicated can have a knock-on effect to other aspects of such as a coach’s management skills”. Coach E stated that he saw the construct of thoroughness being closely linked with that of preparation. It was “The very opposite of sloppy/laziness”. He saw it as “Clearly linked with to one’s self concept” and “helps develop and establish one’s credibility”.

Coach E, as has been mentioned by various coaches also discussed the relevance of communication as a construct and contrasted this with being disinterested or lazy. “Good communication means that you have proper concern for the players”. He expands upon this by stating that it is about “Having fluency to get your message over effectively to the players”. He cautions that “Some coaches just assume players understand what they are saying and if they don’t then tough!” Finally, the question of detail is examined by Coach E. He contrasts this construct with the term ‘blah, blah, blah’ which he describes as ”talking just for the sake of talking”. He prefers “Presenting the correct detail (which) is like giving players a precise of what you want them to do rather than talking just for the sake of talking”.
Figure 6.15 Coach E Snake Interview Results

1. Taking my initial coaching badges while still a student at the Scottish School of Physical Education.
2. Didn’t really enjoy coaching at first, I did not know what I was doing and it was stressful.
3. Became conscious of coaching when meeting coaches at Queens Park.
4. Third year at college/first year of teaching began to gain confidence and began to enjoy teaching and confidence more.
5. Impact of poor coaches getting the coaching badges was profound and had to do with the way the SSPE was perceived by the pro players.
6. Once I graduated from SSPE continued to play for various professional clubs where I continued to be influenced by both good and poorer examples of coaches.
7. Biggest influence on me was Eddie T as well as Roy S at SSPE who was interested in how you coached as well as what you coached. Sad day when Eddie T left Queens Park to manage Aberdeen.
8. Playing for Queens became difficult after Eddie T left and the coach, even though a ‘friend’ of mine was not very effective and after leaving and playing part time for various clubs I began to get more involved in coaching at school.
9. Got a job at Notre Dame College of Education where Peter R, a former coach I had when playing for the Scottish Amateur team, was Head of the PE Department. I learnt a great deal from him.
10. Coached at Notre Dame for about four years before moving to Muirend, a very progressive amateur club in Glasgow.
11. Began lecturing at SSPE and coached the team for four years before moving to coach at Hamilton. Starting my PhD meant that I eventually had to give up coaching at Hamilton.
12. Becoming a Staff Coach with the SFA and also National Coach for the Scotland Women’s team helped me broaden my coaching experience.
13. Moved to Geneva to teach and continued coaching with local semi professional side.
14. Wanted to gain credibility within Switzerland though I had expected to start at the bottom (badge) level so stopped being involved at that point.

From initially not really enjoying a coaching role Senior Coach E demonstrates, along with many other coaches in this study, the immense importance attached to individuals on his coaching journey. From observing good coaching practice from his early professional football career he later continued to learn from fellow coaches, colleagues at different educational institutions as well as from experiences gained on becoming a Staff coach at the SFA and eventually Manager of the Scottish Women’s National team. Leaving to take up a position at the International School of Geneva really meant he could not really gain acceptance from the Swiss coaching authorities and his own self respect meant that he decided to discontinue coaching thereafter.
Coach F

Coach F has an extensive career of playing football for a number of senior clubs in Scotland as well as coaching at a number of levels. He holds the UEFA Pro License and he has been involved a great deal in coaching women’s football in Scotland (where he was Assistant National Team Coach for a number of years) and at the elite women’s club level in England. Recently he has returned to coach at senior men’s level in Scotland as well as acting as a consultant to educational establishments throughout Scotland.

Figure 6.16 Coach F Grid Display
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"COACHING"

MAN MANAGEMENT 1 2 1 1 1 3 5 1 1 3 1 1
PRESENCE 2 1 2 1 2 2 4 1 4 3 3 1
KNOWLEDGE 2 1 1 1 2 1 3 1 4 3 1 1
N0 1 WINNERS 1 2 1 1 2 3 4 1 5 1 1 1
HIGH STANDARDS 1 1 1 1 1 2 3 1 4 2 1 1
RESPECT 1 1 1 1 1 2 3 1 5 1 1 1
TOP LEVEL 2 2 1 1 2 2 4 1 4 3 2 1
HUNGER DRIVE 1 1 1 1 1 2 3 1 4 1 1 1
ATTITUDE AND MANNER 1 1 1 2 2 3 5 1 5 3 1 1
ATTENTION TO DETAIL 1 2 1 1 1 3 1 3 1 1 1

POOR PERSONAL SKILLS
DIFFERENT LEVEL OF PRESENCE
LIMITED KNOWLEDGE
N0 2 WINNER
LOWER STANDARDS LEVEL
NO RESPECT
OUTSIDE TOP LEVEL
LACKS THAT HUNGER/DRIVE
POOR ATTITUDE AND MANNER
LOWER LEVEL OF ATTENTION TO DETAIL

IDEAL COACH
BEST COMMUNICATOR
MOST DEMANDING
MOST DISLIKED
BEST MOTIVATOR
MOST AGGRESSIVE
MOST TACTICALLY AWARE
MOST SUCCESSFUL
MOST KNOWLEDGEABLE
MOST ORGANISED
BEST COACH I HAVE HAD
MYSELF AS A COACH
### Table 6.21 Coach F Rank Order Scores of Constructs/Contrasts on main component derived from the Pringrid analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Construct/Contrast</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Attitude and manner/Poor attitude and manner</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No 1 winner/No 2 winner</td>
<td>2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Respect/No respect</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Top level/Outside top level</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High Standards/Lower standards level</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Hunger drive/Lacks that hunger drive</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Presence/Different level of presence</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Knowledge/Limited knowledge</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Man management/poor personal skills</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Attention to detail/Lower level of attention to detail</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senior Coach F described the areas of attitude/manner and having a winning mentality as the prime ones in his coaching, closely followed by the notion of having respect. Maintaining high standards, having a hunger for the game (of football) and displaying presence were also important. Of perceived lesser importance was man management skills and paying strict attention to detail which were not ranked as being of prime importance in coaching.
Figure 6.17 Coach F: Ladder Results

Item 1. Attitude and manner/Poor attitude and manner. Reasons why attitude and manner are important to you?
A) Attitude and manner are virtually the same thing. They are not new but these days of political correctness it is necessary to adjust and reconsider things which you might not have in the past.
B) Your whole manner can dictate whether you are a good coach or not.
C) Not shying away from confrontation is important.
D) Applies to all situations and levels of environments.
E) Don’t need to be seen as a ‘Mr Nice Guy’ – being a reasonable, loyal and honest as a person is the important thing.
F) Relates to morals and ethics when developing young players.

Item 2. No 1 winner/No 2 winner. Reasons why being a winner is important to you?
A) Defining winning is not easy. Not just about winning the game.
B) Being a second winner might be based on your (playing) performance in a game.
C) Young players can be quite vulnerable.
D) Awareness of life, streetwise important.
E) Modern players are often too pampered.
F) Coach’s approach should be sympathetic to players who may be second winners.

Item 3. Respect/No respect. Reasons why respect is important to you?
A) Age categorised. More an issue with the older youths.
B) Overlaps into an environment of discipline and respect.
C) Players should be given every opportunity to develop respect for the people who help them develop. It’s a two way street.
D) Don’t have to like people, such as the coach, to respect them.

Item 4. Top level/Outside top level. Reasons why top level is important to you?
A) Top level means at the Champions League or world level, the pinnacle.
B) Learning from the pressure and experience of the top level.
C) Quality of adjusting and adapting. The things you expect from players.
D) More difficult the further you go down the game.
E) Nowadays more money is a big issue.

Item 5. High standards/Lower standards level. Reasons why having high standards is important to you?
A) Never compromise your standards.
B) It’s a life thing; if you accept less you get less.
C) I would not be a coach if I accepted low standards, for whatever reason.
D) Nothing to do with liking players.
E) Creating the right environment and accept that you are not right all the time leads to an openness and acceptance.
F) Any compromise on standards will lead to eventual regret.

Item 6. Hunger, drive/Lacks that hunger drive. Reasons why hunger, drive is important to you?
A) To do with character.
B) Being hungry for the game and demonstrating it through work ethic at the club.
C) What you put in you get out.
D) Motivation and hunger to succeed is not just a personal matter but for the players too.
E) Modern youngsters often display lack of hunger and laziness, indicative of character in today’s society.

Item 7. Presence/Different level of presence. Reasons why presence is important to you?
A) Presence is an aura and hard to define, but you know it when you see it.
B) It comes from God and develops as we grow.
C) Coaches can use it as a tool in their work with players.
D) This ‘human factor’ develops from home and relates to image, respect and professionalism in approach (by both coach and players).

Item 8. Knowledge/Limited knowledge. Reasons why knowledge is important to you?
A) When you have knowledge players see that you know what you are talking about.
B) Necessary to communicate this knowledge to the players.
C) Helps you support and mentor players in their learning.
D) Successful coaches/managers who do not have the right knowledge must have been lucky!
E) Knowledge helps coaches correct and analyse a player’s performance.
F) Modern day professional managers have teams of assistants to help them in their work.

Item 9. Management/poor personal skills. Reasons why management is important to you?
A) Having good personal skills makes you a good man manager. End of!
B) It’s interaction, relationship building, allowing and creating the right environment that coach does not dominate.
C) Positive manipulation of players all part of being a good manager.
D) Observing a player’s body language can help a coach decide which action to take in helping the player improve.
E) Dealing with players as human beings (a la the Dutch phraseology) is vital.

Item 10. Attention to detail/Lower level of attention to detail. Reasons why attention to detail is important to you?
A) Attention to detail is vital as the small things make the difference. Lower levels of attention to detail is a no go.
B) Applies to all matters when preparing for games – surfaces, type of ball, report times etc.
C) Having a code of conduct is important, especially when travelling with younger squads.
D) Attention to detail often goes unnoticed by people new to the game.
E) Effective preparation for matches needs proper and detailed attention to detail.

A caring attitude by this Coach F is readily apparent in what he says. “*Attitude and manner are virtually the same things. Your whole manner can dictate whether you*
are a good coach or not. A coach does not have to be”. He expands on this by saying “The coach don’t need to be seen as Mr Nice Guy – being reasonable, loyal and honest as a person is the important thing. (It) relates to morals and ethics when developing young players”. In terms of winning, Coach F stated that it was not just about the result “… but it might be based on your (playing) performance in a game”. Explaining that young players can be quite vulnerable it was important for them to have “An awareness of life, (be) streetwise”. Believing that nowadays “Modern players are often too pampered” so it was important that the “Coach’s approach should be sympathetic to players who may be second winners” which emphasizes the view that not all players can be successful and deserve to be coached accordingly. Being respected as a coach was vital for Coach F though he felt that this was more of an issue with older youths and went outwith the boundaries of football. “Players should be given every opportunity to develop respect for the people who helped them develop”. Coach F went further when stating that players “Don’t have to like people, such as the coach, to respect them”.

For this coach coaching at the top level meant “At the Champions League or world level, the pinnacle”. In order for players to learn their trade properly “Learning from the pressure of top level football” was crucial as it helped players cope and adapt to such demands. However, Coach F felt that it became “more difficult the further you go down the game” as “Nowadays more money is a big issue”. Emphasising the importance of maintaining high standards in his work Coach F believed that a coach should “Never compromise your standards”. He was of the opinion that “I would not be a coach if I accepted low standards, for whatever reason”. This had nothing to do with liking players as “Creating the right environment, accept that you are not right all the time leads to openness and acceptance”.

Coach F described motivation in terms of hunger/drive. He did not see this as being related solely to the coach and phrased it as “Motivation to succeed is not just a personal matter but for the players too”. He believed that it was “To do with character” and added “Being hungry for the game and demonstrating it through work ethic at the club”. He also added that he thought that “Modern youngsters often display lack of hunger and laziness” before adding that this was “indicative of character in today’s society”. When he elaborated on his next construct ‘presence’ he stated that “…it is an aura, hard to define”. He thought that “Coaches use it as a tool
in their work with players” though was of the firm opinion that “This human factor develops from home and relates to image, respect and professionalism in approach by both players and coaches”. Having knowledge of the game was also a construct generated by Coach F. He felt that it was “Necessary to communicate this knowledge to players … which helps you support and mentor players in their learning”. He added that “Knowledge (of the game) helps coaches correct and analyse a player’s performance” though added sagely, “Modern day professional managers have teams of assistants to help them in their work”. Having good man-management skills was another construct that Coach F supplied. Forcefully he made this point by stating “Having good personal skills makes you a good man manager. End of!” Not seeking to dominate situation with players but “….relationship building, allowing and creating the right environment” was necessary for the coach. He finished his explanation of this construct by stating that “Dealing with players as human beings (as Dutch coaches often say) is crucial”.

Finally, Coach F was a believer in paying attention to detail as an important part of his coaching philosophy. “Attention to detail is vital as the small things make the difference. Lower levels of details is a no go”. He saw this as applying to “all matters when preparing for games – surfaces, type of ball, report times etc.” This attention to detail went as far as “Having a code of conduct…….especially when travelling with younger squads”. He felt that this attention to detail “often goes unnoticed by people new to the game”.
The biggest thing for me was my playing career. My coaching career was not planned as such it just evolved.

I started my “C” and “B” Licenses while I was still playing and in 1990 I eventually got my “A” License.

The most important influence on my coaching career has been meeting different managers and coaches (think they call it ‘networking’ now!).

Because UEFA has demanded an improvement in coach education – everyone has gone qualification mad – I did my “UEFA Pro License”. Having paper qualifications does not make you a good coach. On top of that you need to do CPD these days.

This is intellectual-speak to me though I would always go and see other people working.

Learning (as a coach) never stops. It’s the same in industry. The whole education world has changed. We did things twenty years ago that would get you arrested now! Life experiences are great for learning.

I am not a great reader, though I do read, mostly football stuff. My small bit of knowledge allows me to apply common sense to problem solving. Life experiences are important in my learning.

Travelling to many different countries only added to my understanding of the game. I can get teams to play for me, though I cannot really explain that, though I still meet people who have been touched by my work.

John L was an important person in my early coaching career, even though many people found him very difficult. I found him to be a ‘hard bandit’ though he was fair too.

A major negative in my career was Anna S, Swedish coach of the Scottish National Women’s team. It was frightening and frustrating working with her. I took sick leave for a year at the SFA though had to leave as my relationship with Anna was terrible and I could never win that battle.

Moving to coach the Arsenal Ladies team was a great experience. It opened my eyes the way female players were treated in England. “If you signed for Arsenal, you were an Arsenal player” with all that involved. Mr W and Vick A., the general Manager of the Women’s Programme were great for me.

I was welcomed at Arsenal and really appreciated my time there, even though I had to live away from my family for a while.

Jim F at Clydebank was probably a ‘mentor’ for me in my early coaching career in an informal way. Learning to store little incidents helped in later years.

Travelling with squads was another good learning experience. Learning is continuous and I am still doing it. The game is now taking decisions away from players making players more coach dependent.

Players these days have not played enough football and have become ‘tricksters’. They have to learn where and when it is appropriate to use their tricks. We spent many more hours playing but society has changed.

Taking the SFA Licenses was a good learning experience for me, though stressful initially, in terms of fear of failure.

Working as a Community coach attached to the SFA for over ten years was powerful in my development.

When Vera P came in to coach the Women’s national Team I got along very well with her. She was very open and a very good coach. As she was Dutch and did
not really understand the football culture in Scotland I took over the responsibility of organising the National Programme for the Women’s game throughout the whole of Scotland. This meant travelling all over Scotland though it was most enjoyable. I still meet people from those days and chat about the game.

33. The politics of the Women’s game at the SFA upset me. Anna S is still there. She has just been awarded a new contract. I still feel deeply aggrieved with what happened with her and Sheila B, the administrator. Anna did not respect Scotland and Sheila was part of the group that gave me a hard time.

34. Going to coach in Kosovo was a real eye opener and a fantastic learning experience.

35. I came back to Scotland and continued to develop my private coaching work as well as working with community groups and local schools as well as some professional clubs like Dunbarton and Ayr United, with the young players. Trying to get parents appreciate that youngsters have to take responsibility for their actions is difficult but important.

36. Some ‘mentoring’ work has been productive especially when helping younger coaches. The experience has helped me develop as a coach too.

Though having a wide and extensive coaching career this coach believed that his early playing days were of vital importance in him developing as a coach. Though he gained his coaching badges (certification) early on in his career he again expressed the view that “It was the individual managers who were of more importance and not just the paper, (academic) courses that he had to undertake”. Watching fellow coaches operating was more valuable. He was quite disparaging about CPD initiatives and insisted that travelling to (and working in) various countries was more important in adding to his understanding of the game. Certain individual coaches and managers had a major impact on his development though there were also some negative influences, particularly when coaching the Scottish Women’s National team that he had to overcome. As he considered learning to be an ongoing process other experiences, such as travelling with squads, helped enormously with his coach development. Again, working as a Community Coach for the SFA for ten years was enormously important which helped him when assisting the initial Scottish Women’s National Coach, who was Dutch, to get an understanding of the Scottish football culture. Taking responsibility for organising the original National Programme for the Women’s game in Scotland was a great learning experience but when the next Women’s Team coach arrived (she was Swedish) politics got in the way and moving to coach Arsenal Ladies was a good move for Senior Coach F, who learnt a lot there. After experiencing a different culture in Kosovo he finally returned to Scotland to
work with young players and mentor a number of young coaches, which he continues to enjoy.

**Table 6.22** Constructs/contrasts generated by all Coaches in Study 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High level</th>
<th>adaptability</th>
<th>enthusiasm</th>
<th>Positive manipulation</th>
<th>Player management</th>
<th>Attitude/ manner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>performer</td>
<td>Being liked</td>
<td>Desire to learn</td>
<td>aggressivity</td>
<td>Care for players</td>
<td>No I winn er</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency</td>
<td>caring</td>
<td>Work ethic</td>
<td>approachability</td>
<td>Team before self</td>
<td>respect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calm</td>
<td>respectful</td>
<td>preparation</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>top level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactically</td>
<td>New school</td>
<td>flexibility</td>
<td>presence</td>
<td>Self confidence</td>
<td>High standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aware</td>
<td>Willing to learn</td>
<td>Communication ability</td>
<td>Organizational abilities</td>
<td>preparation</td>
<td>Hunger, drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>communication</td>
<td>flexible</td>
<td>Pride, ownership</td>
<td>communication</td>
<td>simplicity</td>
<td>presence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggressive</td>
<td>Small details</td>
<td>patience</td>
<td>Ability to motivate</td>
<td>thoroughness</td>
<td>knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge-able</td>
<td>experienced</td>
<td>Understanding, considerate</td>
<td>Success at high level</td>
<td>Communica -tion</td>
<td>Player managemen t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measured</td>
<td>Inner desire</td>
<td>experience</td>
<td>Tactically aware</td>
<td>detail</td>
<td>Attention to detail</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The constructs/contrasts generated by the elite senior coaches, though individually different in terms of how they actually perceived the qualities that they thought important to football coaches, show a degree of similarity. Their unique constructs, cover a wide range of behaviours and rarely were at any micro coaching or pedagogical level. Clearly the basic attributes normally assumed to be part of a coach’s tool kit – knowledge of the game, organizational competence, communication skills, tactical skills – were in evidence though other, perhaps more holistic concerns for players were stated. For example, team before self, caring for players (both from Senior coach E), willing to learn (Senior Coach B), understanding/considerate (Senior Coach C), approachability (Senior Coach D), man management (Senior Coaches E and F), patience (Senior Coach C) and respectful (Senior Coach B). These latter qualities/characteristics rarely are seen as part of any formal football coaching award programmes and would appear to be derived from the environment in which the coaches operate together with the way that the coaches learn throughout their coaching careers.
Summary on data gathered from coaches in Study 3

Kelly’s belief of the use of Repgrids in gaining an insight into the world (in this case the professional world of football coaching), as a valid and justifiable way to gaining an understanding of the coaches professional world as they experienced it, seems justified. Amplified by the Ladders and supported by the Snake interviews the data collected presented six different versions of an individual’s professional life though with many common and related themes. The constructs/contrasts described in the individual Repgrids clearly demonstrated how each Senior coach saw his world, in his own words, though often not too dissimilar from the other coaches in the sample. It reinforces much of the evidence pointing to the social nature of the coaches’ learning that has been extensively reported in the literature.

Through use of the Ladder interviews the actual constructs/contrasts in the Repgrids was explained more fully by the coaches in such a way that a much more comprehensive understanding of the deeper meaning of the coaches’ views was obtained. The coaches were encouraged to describe, in a continual iterative way, what each construct/contrast actually meant to them and in this way a simple word or phrase from the Repgrid was explained in a more comprehensive way which enabled a fuller picture of the coach’s world to be portrayed and thus understood.

Following on from this the Snake interviews permitted the coaches to elaborate on their developmental experiences by discussing any critical incidents throughout their professional life which may have involved people, players or significant others that impacted on their development and so informed the development of their construct system. Such systems are not static in nature and, indeed, Kelly would strongly point to the dynamic nature of personal growth and awareness, which is central to his belief that individuals should never be seen as victims of their personal histories but can be enhanced and developed by their interactions with others. Thus, the Snake interviews demonstrate how each of the Senior coaches did perceive their own professional development and portray their idiosyncratic view of constructs that are salient to them and how their professional experiences over time may have made significant contributions to the way that they see and experienced their coaching.
Chapter 7 - Discussion

This thesis set out to examine the knowledge pertaining to how Scottish professional football coaches ‘learn their trade’ in becoming socialised into fully functioning professionals. The relevant literature relating to the whole process of professional development (i.e. learning to be coaches) was examined and the way that coaches learnt was detailed. Kelly’s (1955) personal construct approach was the theoretical base used to examine how these coaches established their individual approach to their work. Fundamentally, it adopted a position that by using such a theoretical approach a much broader and richer understanding of what coaches value as being of direct importance to them in their professional practice could be established. In order to fully comprehend how coaches actually came to such an understanding a number of relevant studies were used.

First, four groups of younger (15-17 year old) players, at a major Scottish Premier League club, were used to ascertain the areas (constructs) that they thought were important as recipients of coaching. The first group consisted of two sets of aspiring professional players and the second group consisted of two separate cohorts of players from two professional clubs who were on professional contracts. All of these players had received coaching from different coaches at the clubs where they were players. It was crucially important to establish the sort of perceptions (constructs) that players held regarding what they considered important qualities that constituted ideal player performance and also how coaches attempted, through their approach, to develop such expertise.

The second study utilized two distinctive samples of coaches who were undertaking their formal coaching awards (badges) – the SFA (UEFA) ‘B’ and ‘A’ awards – as part of their ongoing development as coaches. Finally, in the third study, a selection of experienced coaches, who had been formally qualified and in post for over five years, was examined in a more detailed way to ascertain the constructs that they thought were relevant and central to their coaching identity.

The results presented in Study 3 suggested that the ways in which individual elite coaches established their coaching philosophy (approach) was indeed idiosyncratic and varied according to their individual environments in which they practiced. The implications suggested that a number of very relevant issues emerged
from the study regarding coach preparation and education particularly as part of continuing professional socialization and development.

**Theoretical Implications**

Central to Kelly’s Personal Construct Psychology (PCP) is the philosophy of ‘constructive alternativism’, by which he means that individuals have an infinite number of possible explanations or constructions of events in their lives. In this way it was possible to ascertain the thoughts, actions and feelings of the participants in their sporting roles. In elaborating his approach, the corollaries, or amplifications to his central tenet – a person’s processes are psychologically channelized by the way that they interpret events – Kelly enabled a better and more precise understanding of the various ways that football players and coaches in the present study developed. Some of the stated corollaries are perhaps self evident (see details in Chapter 1), such as constructs being dichotomous, and the construction corollary by which individuals actually derive their own views on events though all make their own contribution to the overall picture - in this case the ways in which players and coaches develop their perceptions of football. The elements used in the study (either players or coaches used in the Repgrid analyses) directly applied to the range corollary which the participants were familiar with – either players or coaches. Thus, a different set of constructs/contrasts would undoubtedly have been derived with a different element set so the results only apply in this particular sport setting.

Clearly, the individuality corollary describes how each individual perceives events in their own idiosyncratic way though these will have been developed through their experience over time. However, perhaps the two most relevant corollaries were those of commonality – where a person’s constructs are similar to those employed by others – and the sociality corollary by which Kelly suggests that it is through interaction with others and the various roles so played that an individual comes to have a construct system similar to others, though at the same time remaining unique to the individual. This strongly points to the importance of group interactions having an effect on the development of a person’s perceptions. Apelgren (2010) states that in PCP theory the focus is on the individual’s experience of phenomena and writers such as Butt (2006) and Fransella (2005) and especially Warren (2004) point to the connections PCP has to theories of social constructivism and the importance of the
social situation in explaining the development of behaviour. This is underscored with the results of the present samples. The social nature of sporting performance, especially with team sports, have received much attention in the sports literature in general (cf. Potrac & Jones, 1999; 2007; Lyle & Cushion, 2010; Rynne et al., 2010), and team sports in particular (cf. Cushion, 2010; Jones, 2006; Jones et al., 2003; Jones & Wallace, 2005) and the sociability corollary was central to the perceptions utilized by the participants across all groups, as the data collected from the first two studies was undertaken in a group setting and the details of the elite senior coaches also reflected the importance of the social nature of their learning.

Each of the different Kellyan-inspired approaches to data collection utilized in this study – Repgrids, Laddering and Snake Interviews - had their own merits. The Repgrids, which were used for all participants across the research, were essential in establishing how individual (and where relevant, group) constructs were established. It is suggested that the production of such details would be very difficult to establish by use of other types of data collection such as normative questionnaires. Using Repgrids within a group situation is quite straightforward, in terms of time needed and ease of administration and has the added bonus that results, though idiosyncratic can be used normatively too, should this be deemed necessary, through the use of various software programmes, such as the one used in this research (Gaines & Shaw, 2009). When the football players are considered, their regular daily group activities, together with the coaching they receive on a regular basis, quite clearly will influence and enhance their understanding of ideas (i.e. perceptions) relating to football and coaching. In such fashion the sociality and commonality corollaries would help explain how the football environments could play a major part in the development of their constructs.

The Laddering analyses, though used here in a slightly different way from other studies, such as Fransella (2003), Bannister and Mair (1968), have demonstrated that it is possible to get a much deeper understanding of an individual’s construct system by simply following Hinkle’s (1965) style of iterative questioning to tease out the deeper meaning of constructs that may not be readily understandable to others.

The use of the Snake Interviews (following the protocol established by Pope & Denicolo, 2001) revealed detailed information as to the ways the senior coaches learnt from the various influences that were part of their professional life in a way that would
not be possible by conventional quantitative methods. Details are explained in the following section.

Both Laddering and Snake interviews demonstrated that individual coaching environments in the world of professional football in Scotland, in which the senior, elite coaches operated, played a crucial part in the development of their coaching identities. Coaching professional players on a daily basis, meeting with colleagues and engaging in communities of practice could be understood from both the sociality and commonality corollaries, which Kelly described as being a central part in the development of construct formation, in this case regarding the range (corollary) pertinent to football coaching. Further, the experience corollary outlined by Kelly is also demonstrated from the derived data where the senior elite coaches revealed the importance of coaches constantly ‘checking out and revising constructions’ (Kelly, 1955) as a result of engaging with others during their various and wide ranging football activities in which these coaches will have engaged in throughout their careers.

With regards to the findings from the study pertaining to the development of coach learning (professionalisation) a number of salient points should be stated which demonstrate how the study has advanced the literature in this field. The process by which football coaches learn to develop their approach to coaching (becoming professionals) has received limited discussion in the literature, with the main writers explicitly discussing professional socialization of sports coaches being Taylor and Garratt (2008, 2010a, 2010b, 2013). Their body of work, though mostly taking a sociological approach, is focused explicitly on the socialization process though other writers in areas relating to coach development (cf. Jones & Brewer, 2004; Misener & Danylchuk, 2009; Nelson, Groom & Potrac, 2016) have presented more detailed examples, from a more psychological perspective, as to how actual learning takes place for coaches.

There is no overall agreement in the literature relating to the value of formal training courses in coach development and perhaps one crucial aspect of this PhD research is the fact that the evidence from the senior coaches reinforced the often expressed view that such formal courses tend not to be regarded with any great faith in the actual relevance to practice (cf. Cushion & Nelson, 2013; Jones, Armour & Potrac, 2004). Evidence from the senior coaches in Study 3 tended to support this notion of
such courses being perceived as “being too academic” (Senior Coach F) or simply being a necessary hurdle to be overcome before engaging in the actual process of delivering coaching sessions. Senior Coach A reinforces this when stating “It is football education rather than an academic one that is vitally important”, where the practical experience of coaching was deemed more important in the eyes of players. This finding points to the vital importance of coaching courses taking account of the playing (and other previous experiences) of coaches who attend award courses. This has been emphasised by other writers (cf. Cushion, 2011; Jones et al., 2011).

The whole question of valuing the crucial importance of the social environment in learning situations has been extensively reported in the literature (cf. Lave & Wenger, 1991, 1998b; Wenger, 1998a, 1998b; Bowes & Jones, 2006; Cassidy, 2010a; Cassidy, Jones & Potrac, 2009; Cushion, 2011; Jones & Brewer, 2004; Lyle, 2007). Mentoring is one example of how personal interaction can be beneficial to coaches during their learning to become professionals. This has been supported as an important aspect of learning in both sports literature and the broader literature on professional socialization (Margolis & Romero, 2001; Bloom, 2013b; Cushion, 2006; Gray, 2013) though the evidence of this study revealed that few coaches actually saw this as an important aspect of their learning as there was no formal set up to develop such an approach in Scottish football coaching. Informal connections through casual meetings or attendance at conferences, as exemplified by the wider literature on communities of practice, was clearly of much more relevance to the coaches in the study.

Reflection is another area that has been discussed by various writers in the coaching literature (cf. Anderson, Knowles & Gilbourne, 2004; Cropley et al., 2011; Mann, Gordon & MacLeod, 2009; Marshall et al., 2014; Morton, 2008) though again this was not deemed to be a major concern for the coaches in the Study 3. However, it was clear from the Snake interviews of senior coaches that this did occur in a very informal way, though played no part in the formal training process of coaches when undertaking their professional training (coaching awards). Senior coach D expressly states in his Snake interview that his own line manager and Director of Coaching at the SFA used this technique extensively in his work though there was no suggestion that it should feature on any coaching courses undertaken by the SFA.

In terms of the importance of continuing professional development (CPD) as a learning experience for coaches, as has been reported in the literature (cf. Cushion,
Armour & Jones, 2003), little evidence from the present study would justify this as being seen as an important and useful tool for Scottish football coaches. Though other professions have used this area to enhance professional development (cf. Armour & Yelling, 2004; Day & Sachs, 2004; Kelchtermans, 1993a; Opfer & Pedder, 2011) this is an area which has received limited attention in the sports coaching literature and was fundamentally seen as something that coaches paid lip service to rather than embraced as a tool for professional development.

When broader questions relating to holistic coaching are considered it is evident a number of senior coaches in this study saw that it was important part of their role to engage with players as individuals to be supported in a very competitive environment. Holistic coaching as a concept has become more prominent in the coaching literature (cf. Friesen & Orlick, 2010; Cassidy, 2010a, 2013) and it is suggested that the example of the importance of coaching as caring (Jones, 2009) will become even more important in future.

**Practical Implications**

**Study 1**

One major practical implication of the finding of Study 1a was the fact that evidence of the views of young players regarding what they thought constituted the qualities of ideal performance needed in players, so far largely ignored in the literature, was established and it is vitally important the football coaches have some understanding of what these meant for the youngsters. It is necessary for coaches to be able to understand what characteristics young players actually do subscribe to, so that their coaching might take cognisance of such views or at least develop them. Coaches often make assumptions regarding young players and it could be that these are not actually congruent with what these young players actually do perceive as being important. Coaches are seeking to produce ideal performance in their charges and a shared understanding of such is necessary for both players and coaches, so that notions of the constituents of ideal performance can be developed. In addition, the perceptions that those young players, who are on full time contracts, hold regarding coaching qualities, especially those pertaining to what they consider to be the expected qualities of the ideal coach, is of great importance. Players and coaches engage in a daily routine of instruction/learning and some notional agreement as to the wholesomeness
of this interaction needs to be found. The individual, personal qualities of the coach together with his/her ability to develop players through an educational process often mirrors that which takes place in educational settings.

Regarding how young players perceive the qualities needed for elite performance has received virtually no attention in the literature. Such evidence that does exist regarding young footballers tends to cover a wide sweep of ages from primary school to late secondary school and normally focuses on how the coach should actually coach players in this age range. This is especially apparent in the literature from North America, which is exemplified by such reports as that presented by the online site ‘The ideal youth soccer coach’ (www.footy 4kids.co.uk: coaching), and this report does not really examine perceptions from the players’ point of view. With regards to Study 1a, the findings indicated that the two groups of participants, who trained at the same Scottish Premier League club, perceived the qualities that they expected that to the notional ideal player should possess were a combination of psychological and physical factors, though the emphasis differed between the groups, which might have reflected the fact that one group received mental preparation training while the other did not.

A second practical implication from Study 1 came from the two samples (Study 1b) where the research examined the question of constructs derived by full time, young professional players towards coaching with an emphasis on their perceptions of what they regarded as the qualities they deemed important in an ideal coach. With regards to young professional players’ perceptions of ideal coaching behaviour, there is also extremely little evidence available in the literature. Very few studies have addressed the question of how athletes, and in particular, football players, perceive the qualities they would deem appropriate and necessary in the coaches. In general, the produced evidence attends to matters regarding how coaches actually behave in their role when undertaking their practice (Jones et al., 2003), such as technical expertise or how coaches might make sessions more applicable or how young players might be developed tactically and technically (Cushion et al., 2006) though virtually nothing exists regarding what players actually expect from coaches, or what they would see as good coaching practice. Most articles are normally commercially induced activities that are generally inspired by a ‘how to become’ approach without specific research evidence.
The evidence from the results of the present study suggested that both these
two groups of players saw coaching from a point of view of having experienced
professional coaching over a number of years. The qualities they thought that
identified ideal coaching practice surprisingly did not emphasise the
technical/mechanical aspects of coaching, so often highlighted in the pedagogical
reports on coaching (Armour, 2006; Cassidy et al., 2004; Cushion, Armour & Jones
2006) and instead centred more to the personal qualities of the individual coach
(understanding, will to win, ambitious or sense of humour, honesty with players and
experience of the sport). Such qualities are at least beginning to be addressed in the
literature on holistic coaching by such writers as Nelson et al., (2006); Lyle (2002) and
Knowles et al., (2005) as well as the broader aspects of learning in areas such as
reflection (cf. Cropley & Hanton, 2012; Cropley et al., 2013; Knowles et al., 2014a),
mentoring (cf. Bloom, 2013a, 2013b; Dughill & Gilbourne, 2014) and involving
coaches in communities of practice (c.f. Cushion & Denstone, 2011; Dughill &
Gilbourne, 2014). Clearly being aware of such ideas that players held regarding
coaching needs to be recognized by coaches in order to structure their approach to
their coaching work to take account of this.

Study 2

Overall, Study 2 attempted to ascertain what constructs were held by
candidates following their formal coach education courses for both the UEFA ‘A’ and
‘B’ licenses and subsequently how each group perceived their view of what would
constitute the qualities of the ideal coach. These candidates are going to be the coaches
of the future and the instruction they receive on formal coaching courses is of
tremendous importance and as such attention should be paid by the instructing body
(in this case the SFA). These findings reflect the perceptions that aspiring coaches
held regarding what they perceive as being of importance for their role. There was
quite significant agreement between the groups regarding the emphasis given
concerning the constructs deemed important to ideal coaching. Again, the major
constructs derived by both sets of coaches tended to be more technical, such as being
well prepared, having good game knowledge and good communication skills as well
as being able to control the group in question as might be expected when the
participants completed their grids during their actual coaching award course which
they were undertaking. The other, more personalized constructs, such as good player relationships, being charismatic, being respectful and being approachable were not perceived as being as relevant as the technical areas, and might be seen as receiving less attention from the tutors on the coaching courses.

A major practical implication of the findings of Study 2 came from the sample of coaches undertaking the ‘B’ licenses whereby the candidates perceived the importance of such characteristics as having good communication skills, ability to control the group, having good game knowledge and the need for coaching experience to be of major concern. Even though many of such candidates may not proceed to have full time careers in professional football coaching anyone who proceeds to undertake the top licence (the ‘A’ badge) necessarily must undertake the ‘B’ course, so the findings from this sample are noteworthy.

Those candidates following the ‘B’ License course, clearly are at a point where they still have a further, formal course to be undertaken (the ‘A’ License) at a later date and to be formally accredited in order to be permitted to coach at the professional level. It could be argued that tutors on these courses should therefore have some understanding of the type of ideas (constructs) that these neophyte coaches do in fact hold in order to enhance and develop their learning capacities. Cushion et al. (2003) have stated that coach education courses often fail to utilize or acknowledge the coaches’ previous experience and observational abilities when these are often the primary sources of knowledge of coaches.

A second major practical implication of Study 2 came from the sample of ‘A’ license candidates (Study 2b) whereby besides accepting the need for being well prepared and having good knowledge of the game as well as sound communication skills, being inspiring and engaging in good player relationships were deemed crucial to their understanding of coaching at the top level. Too often it would appear that merely lip service is paid to areas that in other professions, such as education, medicine and applied sport psychology, are seen not just normal but essential and mandatory to confirm continual professional accreditation. Once qualified at the necessary level (holding a UEFA ‘A’ license) coaches can now begin the first steps in their professional careers at established professional league clubs.

Various writers have discussed the way that coach education courses do not attend to the proper needs of the students undertaking such courses, by expounding a
body of knowledge that must be accepted by the trainees and then regurgitated in examinations, practical or theoretical, in order to gain accreditation (cf. Callary et al., 2014; Trudel & Gilbert, 2006). Having an awareness of, and attending to, the background knowledge of such trainees, especially in terms of the basic constructs that they have derived from their previous sporting experience does not appear to have been an important consideration for the aspiring coaches who were examined in this study.

Once qualified at the necessary level (holding a UEFA ‘A’ license) coaches can now begin the first steps in their professional careers at established professional league clubs. The evidence from this study has itemized how a number of areas are commonly seen of being of paramount importance for a coach’s ongoing professional development and learning. Too often it would appear that merely lip service is paid to areas that in other professions, such as education, medicine and applied sport psychology, that are seen not just normal but essential and mandatory to confirm continual professional accreditation.

Study 3

The central theme of Study 3 was to examine how coaches aspire to be considered professionals and as such the ramifications of the findings of the study will primarily focus on those of the senior coaches. Learning has been described as being best understood in terms of formal and informal (cf. Coombs & Ahmed, 1974; Rynne, Mallet & Tinning, 2010; Moon, 2004). Formal formal learning, such as taught courses of study are central to coach education though the more informal aspects of learning, described by Lave and Wenger, 1991 as mediated learning has a major role to play in coach development. Informal learning generally is comprised of all those other forms of interaction such as casual meeting with colleagues (CoPs), mentoring, CPD activities or attending conferences, thus emphasizing the social aspects of learning. Coombs and Ahmed (1974) describe this as unmediated learning.

One major practical implication of the findings of this group of experienced football coaches is that formal learning courses offered little reward even though they are essential in the accreditation process of all coaches nowadays. The literature largely supports this view (Callary et al., 2014; Cushion et al., 2010; Mallet et al.,
2009; Mesquita et al., 2014; Trudel & Gilbert, 2006) where formal coach education courses generally have not been seen in a good light largely because they are deemed classroom based or the previous experience of the individual neophyte coach has not been taken into consideration (Werthner & Trudel, 2006; Rynne et al., 2010). Only one of the six senior coaches who were participants in the study, Coach C, stated a positive indication regarding how he benefitted from a formal coach education course when he stated “Doing the SFA coaching courses was good”. However, Coach A went as far as stating ”Regarding formal training (going through your licenses) – I am not knocking the SFA or other groups – is very, very limiting and a great deal of informal learning takes place (away from formal courses)”. Further, Coach F, a very experienced coach who also holds the UEFA Pro License, which is essentially the top management qualification, goes even further and states that “Having paper qualifications does not make you a good coach”.

There is overwhelming support expressed for informal coach learning as well as being a plethora of statements by all the senior coaches and it is probably better to examine how these unmediated learning scenarios assisted in developing their overall coaching philosophy and identity as a coach.

A second practical implication of the results of Study 3 relates to reflective practice (RP), or, more importantly, the lack of its mention by the six experienced coaches in this study. It has become almost commonplace to mention reflective practice when talking about professional development these days (c.f. Cassidy et al., 2009; Cropley & Hanton, 2012; Huntley et al., 2014; Knowles et al., 2014a, 2014b; Knowles & Gilbourne, 2010), though such a term did not directly appear in any of the Snake interviews often it was implicit though clearly not practiced in any formal way. The coaches were thoughtful about their practice as was exemplified by the detail presented in the grids and Ladders though any notion of formal mentoring in the workplace was almost non-existent even though the coaches explained how much they had developed their professional expertise through direct, yet informal, contact with senior coaches. This, however, appears to have been casual serendipitous rather than formally suggested by the governing body (in this case the SFA).

A third practical implication of the study regarding the results from Study 3 relates to the importance of mentoring for the experienced coaches, again this was largely absent from their training/learning though did appear tangentially and
informally throughout all the six accounts, where personal interactions with respected individuals was very evident. A great deal of coaching literature attests to the importance of mentoring (cf. Gray, 2013 (citing the extensive work on mentoring by Clutterbuck); Cushion 2006; Jones, et al., 2003, 2004; Jones et al., 2009; Rynne, 2008; Young et al., 2005). Jones, Harris and Miles (2009, p. 267) state that “In recent years the term ‘mentoring’ has come into common use within sports coaching” though this would appear not to be the case with professional football coaching in Scotland. The actual term ‘mentoring’ does not have universal acceptability though in some coaching associations such as Canada, USA and Australia it is a more accepted form of learning than it has been in the UK and Bloom (2013a, p. 219) believes that “There is still a long way to go before mentoring becomes integrated for coaches in the same manner that it does for teachers doctors and many other business professionals”.

A further practical implication from Study 3 relates to the question of continuing professional development (CPD) was another area that was largely omitted from the coaches Snake Interviews. Various writers have attested to the importance and relevance of CPD activities to professional development (cf. Armour, 2010, 2011c; Cushion, et al., 2003). Sports Coach UK has started to offer a variety of CPD courses, both online and directly-taught though Armour (2011c, p. 231) has suggested that the best part of many CPD courses “Are the coffee breaks and lunches when you are talking to other coaches”. This is similar to the quotations made by a number of the senior coaches in the present study. It is only within the past few years that the SFA has begun to offer formal CPD courses and it is easy to understand how such activities may not be held in great regard by coaches. Coach C stated that “Many of the CPD activities run by the SFA are for boys clubs or lower level professional clubs and might not apply to us at Rangers”. He goes on to say that “Coaches only have to do 15 hours over a three year period to maintain their coaching accreditation and this can even be done in one single trip” (referring to a CPD visit to watch a football game in Spain. Initial coach resistance has lessened even though some coaches will always be stuck in their ways and not embrace change and can be quite rigid and pretty fixed in their thinking”. Coach F describes having to undertake CPD activities as “This is intellectual speak to me though I always go and watch other people working”.

One final, and perhaps vital, implication from Study 3 is the importance of interaction with other coaches in an informal way which was a theme throughout the
Snake interviews and even though coaches did not use the actual term ‘communities of practice’ (CoPs, after the work of Lave and Wenger, 1991 and Wenger, 1998a, 1998b). Many researchers have examined CoPs in a sporting context (Cushion et al., 2003; Cushion & Denstone, 2011; Mesquita et al., 2014; Lyle & Cushion, 2010; Nelson et al., 2016) and it is clearly evident that all the coaches felt this aspect of their learning was of paramount importance to them in terms of their professional development. The expressed dissatisfaction of formal coach education has led to an emphasis being placed on the importance of social interaction as a crucial aspect of coach development. The notion of joint enterprise and shared interactions (Culver & Trudel, 2008) is commonplace in sporting environments and evidence from the Snake interviews by senior coaches. Speaking of one particular colleague Coach A said that he “Would have walked on broken glass for him” so much did he benefit from his insightful help in developing his own approach. Coach D also pointed to the immense value of travelling to meet other coaches when he states “Travelling the world – America, Europe, Australia – meeting top class coaches has enabled me to pick up various ideas that I try to use. Just having coffee with such coaches is important to my learning. Even meeting coaches from different sports gives a helpful perspective”. He goes on to state “Once you’ve got your top badge learning from other people becomes more important. The informal ways of learning then become more important than the formal ones”.

Stoszkowski and Collins (2014), though mainly supporting the idea of CoPs, point out that there is a need to ascertain how such communities actually help coach learning though the collaborative process, would seem to be of direct importance to the senior coaches. Grossman et al. (2001) believed that the term ‘community’ has become so ubiquitous as to lose all meaning (p. 18). Culver and Trudel (2008) suggest that sports cultures do not necessarily facilitate collegiality, especially between coaches in the same league where the highly competitive environments might be a bar to the development of a recognized CoP.

The Laddering procedure was extremely valuable in being able to ascertain aspects of the coaches views that can directly be seen to be making a major contribution to their professional identity and all that entails. It permits a view of their philosophic approach to coaching and, indeed, indicates areas of concern for the individuals with whom they engage. There has been a move to understand sports
coaching in a more holistic fashion (cf. Cross & Lyle, 1999; Cassidy, Jones & Potrac, 2009; Cassidy, 2010a, 2013) and emphasis on a more rounded, caring professional has developed over the past few years. This has been fuelled by concerns expressed by government and other sporting bodies regarding issues about notions of care towards individuals who are essentially clients in professional engagement terms, be they vulnerable athletes on the playing field or pupils in schools. Wigmore (2017), in an article in the ‘I’ newspaper, points out that (the British) government is right to be concerned at the failure of sporting governing bodies not modernizing their approach to their sports. However, former notions of coaching being about ordering players about and making decisions purely from the coach’s perspective have now become less evident in sport though in the professional arena of football sometimes coaches still behave in a dictatorial and oppressive manner. The evidence from the coaches in this study, even though each one had been involved in football coaching for many years, reveals a different story. Having a genuine concern for the importance of treating all players in a more person centred way, particularly younger ones, is evident in the constructs that the coaches have outlined in their grids. The detailed analysis revealed by the Ladders testifies to the value of such an approach and gives a much more insightful view of what the coaches saw as important and relevant to their work.

Summary of the findings from the three studies

The rationale for using three distinctive studies was to ascertain how young players perceived the coaching they received, in terms of characteristics they associated with high level performance, how such coaching was developed with aspiring coaches through formal coach education courses and then, finally, how experienced coaches benefited from the more informal aspects of learning over their years of involvement with professional football. In Study 1 the importance of some form of congruence between young professionals’ ideas of performance, plus perceptions of the coaching that young had received was outlined and Study 2 demonstrated constructs that were derived by the two groups of candidates who were undertaking their coaching awards in order to become professionally recognized. Finally, the idiosyncratic learning styles of the experienced coaches in Study 3 provided the link between the first two studies in so far as it was clear that it was not just the formal coach education courses that provided the expert knowledge needed to
enhance player development but also the importance that they attached to more informal learning – such as being part of ongoing communities of learning which enhanced their experience of coaching through a range of contacts and meetings with fellow professionals – which enabled them to provide a richer set of coaching abilities to develop and support the players with whom they engaged.

Strengths and Limitations

Strengths

The ideographic (Personal Construct) approach adopted in this thesis enabled a much more informed understanding of the ways in which football players and coaches, at differing levels, constructed their individual understanding of their sport. Taking a quantitative approach would not reveal the subtle variations in construct systems that were evidenced here nor provide such an insightful understanding of the way players and coaches view their football world. Extremely few studies in the coaching literature have actually examined coaching beliefs from such a qualitative position, and in the literature pertaining to the coaching in football the only ones that have been evident are from Clarke (1994b, 1995) and Feixas et al. (1989) and the evidence from this study is an important addition to the scarce literature available. Obtaining evidence, even from a small sample base, regarding coach development was extremely important and relevant as an addition to the coaching literature.

Another strength was the fact that the results from Study 1 were able to supply evidence from both aspiring professional and neophyte coaches regarding what constitute the perceived aspects of performance that had not been ascertained in previous studies in football. In addition, it demonstrated the various ways that young players viewed the coaching they received. Few studies have actually tried to quantify what young players see as important aspects of performing so coaches need to be aware of this in terms of how they structure their own practices in assisting young players in their understanding of the game. A mismatch between player expectations of what they see as important to their development as players and the actual coaching they received at their clubs will be disadvantageous to player development as well as causing problems of instruction for the coach. Evidence regarding how neophyte coaches construct their views on the qualities needed in ideal coaches has received
scant attention in the literature and the evidence produced from the coaches in this study may be seen as a basic platform to be developed further.

Coach education courses continue to be perceived in a negative way and one of the strengths of this research is to further reinforce this view so that changes could possibly be made to improve such formalized courses as well as emphasising the importance of other, less formal aspects of coach education. In general, coach education courses attend to the basic mechanisms of coaching, such as organization, good communication, technical development, for example, though little attention seems to be given to the more philosophic aspects of compassion or duty of care towards players which is central to the development of holism in coaching.

Using both the Ladder and Snake interviews clearly enabled coaches to provide a more detailed look at what they saw as important aspects in their perceptions and understanding of their professional identity as coaches and, of equal importance, the learning situations that were instrumental in their development.

Limitations

Though the research undertaken expressly delimited the sample to male players and coaches it could be argued that females should also be investigated in a similar manner. Unfortunately at present in Scotland, and throughout the world in general with a few exceptions, the USA being one such, extremely few professional female players exist and the same applies to professional female coaches. Nowadays female football, and thus female football coaches, have a much higher profile though at the time of the production of the present research few professional football coaches exist throughout the UK, so any sample is also going to be restricted.

Examining players and coaches at one time point prevented any understanding of ongoing developmental trends that may have been evident. However, the football coaching profession in Scotland has not been quick to embrace these areas and there is often a negative reaction to dealing in areas which can be perceived as ‘academic’ and removed from the practical reality of everyday ongoing coaches with professional players.

Accessing coaches can be problematical even when having good personal contacts, due to issues of leaving positions, retirement, moving overseas, etc. and such difficulties make research in this area very demanding and present problems. Only
dealing with small number of coaches could be seen as a limitation though the very use of a qualitative approach, especially when undertaking the various Repgrid methods – the grid itself, the Ladder interview and the Snake interview - can be extremely time consuming, which can be a disadvantage when trying to assemble a larger sample.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

There is a dearth of research using Personal Construct Theory in sport. Some authors such as Gucciardi and Gordon (2008a, 2009) have extended its use when discussing mental preparation strategies and have, in similar fashion to Butler and Hardy (1992), used it in the derivation of performance profiling of athletes and Savage (2003) was another who utilized the PCP approach with his sports study. However, in terms of direct use with footballers and coaches only Clarke (1994b, 1995) and Feixas et al., (1989) have directly utilized samples from football through a PCP approach. Taking a broader playing and coaching sample would be an important development to ascertain if the results of the current research could be used as a base for comparison in the UK, where each country has its own unique, if similar, governing body. Though NGBs in football have to ensure that their coaching award courses are recognised by UEFA (the European governing body for football), each does not necessarily prepare and develop coaches in the exact same way. For example, the notion of the existence of a professional community of football coaches, which may exist to some extent, has received very little attention in the literature and, perhaps, might only exist at the anecdotal level. Another area of concern which has remained outside the general orbit of research regarding football coaches is that of female football coaches. At some future point it would seem quite natural to examine how the new breed of female football coaches actually viewed coaching compared in their learning to male counterparts as there does not appear to be any evidence that relates directly to any group of female professional football coaches in Britain.

A whole range of changes in relation to coach development regarding such areas as CPD, mentoring, reflection and developing of CoPs has become more accepted as a necessary and important part of ongoing development and learning in the established professions over the past few years and examining precisely which
mechanisms might underpin such areas in their contribution to the ongoing development of professional football coaches would be a worthwhile investigation. There is the critical issue of how NGBs (in this case the SFA) develop and emphasise the importance and relevance of all aspects of learning for coaches (such as CPD courses, mentoring skills, reflective practice). This needs to be addressed as there does not seem to be any formal statement regarding how these areas might contribute to formal coach education and development in Scotland. The use of a longitudinal approach to the investigation of the intricacies of coach development might prove very helpful in the understanding of how coaches do develop their practice. Utilising a Kellyan approach to sports coaching analysis beyond football would seem to be a logical and important step in contributing to the wider literature on coach preparation and development.

Conclusions

This PhD thesis has contributed to the literature on the professional learning of football coaches and young players in Scotland in the following ways:

1) It has been demonstrated that by utilizing a Kellyan approach a more detailed insight into the perceptions held by young players has been established, which would not have been feasible through the use of any quantitative approach.

2) The ways in which aspiring football coaches actually perceived the qualities necessary to perform as a coach were established.

3) The use of Kellyan techniques (such as Repgrids, Ladder analyses and Snake interviews) to assess individual perceptions of experienced professional coaches in the various ways that learning contributed to their professional development.

The findings point to the dearth of evidence available to support the case for having professional football coaching (in Scotland) being accepted as a recognised profession in terms of what is normally seen as a true profession. The National Governing Body (in this case the SFA) needs to be made aware of this situation in order to support any subsequent attempts to establish football coaching at a true professional level.
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