

Cardiff School of Sport
DISSERTATION ASSESSMENT PROFORMA:
 Empirical

Student name:	<input type="text" value="Thomas Lloyd Williams"/>	Student ID:	<input type="text" value="ST10001659"/>
Programme:	<input type="text" value="SC"/>		
Dissertation title:	<u>UNDERSTANDING THE USEFULNESS OF COACH EDUCATION AND THE IMPACT CONTINUED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES HAVE ON LEARNER COACHES</u>		
Supervisor:	<input type="text" value="Toby Nichols"/>		
Comments	Section		
	Title and Abstract Title to include: A concise indication of the research question/problem. Abstract to include: A concise summary of the empirical study undertaken.		
	Introduction and literature review To include: outline of context (theoretical/conceptual/applied) for the question; analysis of; logical flow to, and clear presentation of the research problem/question; findings of previous related research including gaps in the literature and relevant contributions an indication of any research expectations, (i.e., hypotheses if applicable).		
	Methods and Research Design To include: details of the research design and justification for the methods applied; participant details; comprehensive replicable protocol.		
	Results and Analysis ² To include: description and justification of data treatment/ data analysis procedures; appropriate presentation of analysed data within text and in tables or figures; description of critical findings.		
	Discussion and Conclusions ¹ To include: collation of information and ideas and evaluation of those ideas relative to the extant literature/concept/theory and research question/problem; adoption of a personal position on the study by linking and combining		

¹ There is scope within qualitative dissertations for the RESULTS and DISCUSSION sections to be presented as a combined section followed by an appropriate CONCLUSION. The mark distribution and criteria across these two sections should be aggregated in those circumstances.

	<p>different elements of the data reported; discussion of the real-life impact of your research findings for coaches and/or practitioners (i.e. practical implications); discussion of the limitations and a critical reflection of the approach/process adopted; and indication of potential improvements and future developments building on the study; and a conclusion which summarises the relationship between the research question and the major findings.</p>
	<p>Presentation</p> <p>To include: academic writing style; depth, scope and accuracy of referencing in the text and final reference list; clarity in organisation, formatting and visual presentation</p>

CARDIFF SCHOOL OF SPORT

CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE

(HONOURS)

COACHING SCIENCE

UNDERSTANDING THE USEFULNESS OF
COACH EDUCATION AND THE IMPACT
CONTINUED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
STRATEGIES HAVE ON LEARNER COACHES

THOMAS LLOYD WILLIAMS

ST10001659

THOMAS LLOYD WILLIAMS

ST10001659

CARDIFF SCHOOL OF SPORT

CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

UNDERSTANDING THE USEFULNESS OF
COACH EDUCATION AND THE IMPACT
CONTINUED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT
STRATEGIES HAVE ON LEARNER COACHES

Cardiff Metropolitan University

Prifysgol Fetropolitan Caerdydd

Certificate of student

By submitting this document, I certify that the whole of this work is the result of my individual effort, that all quotations from books and journals have been acknowledged, and that the word count given below is a true and accurate record of the words contained (omitting contents pages, acknowledgements, indices, tables, figures, plates, reference list and appendices).

Word count: 11,597

Date: 18/03/2013

Certificate of Dissertation Supervisor responsible

I am satisfied that this work is the result of the student's own effort.

I have received a dissertation verification file from this student

Name: _____

Date: _____

Notes: The University owns the right to reprint all or part of this document.

Contents

Acknowledgements (i)

Abstract (ii)

Chapter 1:

1.1: Introduction.....P. 1 - 2

Chapter 2: Literature Review.....P. 3 - 14

2.1: Coach Education.....P. 4 - 6

2.2: Continual Professional Development (CPD).....P. 6 - 7

2.3: Learning and Reflection.....P. 7 - 11

2.4: Socially situated nature of learning.....P. 11 - 13

2.5: Communities of Practice (COP).....P. 13 - 14

Chapter 3: Methodology.....P. 15 - 21

3.1: Purpose.....P. 16

3.2: Procedure.....P. 16 - 17

3.3: Participants.....P. 17

3.4: Interview guide.....P. 17 - 19

3.5: Analysis and Interpretation.....P. 19 - 20

3.6: Trustworthiness in qualitative data analysis.....P. 20 - 21

Chapter 4: Discussion and Results.....P. 22 - 36

4.1: Adaptation to differing socially situated activity.....P. 23 - 28

4.2: Reflection.....P. 28 - 30

4.3: Perceptual relevance of continued support via CPD strategies.....P. 30 - 33

4.4: Rationale for future research.....P. 33 - 34

4.5: Limitations.....P. 34 - 35

4.6: Concluding thoughts.....P. 35 - 36

Chapter 5: References.....P. 37 - 49

Chapter 6: Appendices.....	A - AA
A: Participant information sheet.....	B - C
B: Informed consent form.....	D - E
C: Interview guide.....	F - J
D: Example transcript.....	K - Y
E: Example of matrices.....	Z - AA

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank Mr Toby Nichols (Senior lecturer of Coaching Science at Cardiff Metropolitan University) for his help and support throughout the process of producing this dissertation.

Secondly, I would like to thank each anonymous participant for taking part in this study.

Abstract

As the popularity of sport has grown, so too has the need for qualified coaches. Although there has been some research into the value coaches' assign to coach education, more information is needed to fully understand how to best prepare coaches for their field of work and to further endeavour to grasp the continual needs of coaches' post qualification. Therefore, the purpose of this project was to explore what is currently happening within the environment of the qualified PGA (Professional Golf Association) Golf professional in relation to experiences of coach education and make sense of the continued professional developmental needs (CPD) of Golf coaches, via semi-structured interviews with fully qualified PGA professionals. The objective of this study is to provide a neutral outlook on the current coaching landscape and education programs, whilst attempting to understand how coaches develop their own learning.

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1: Introduction

Jones, Armour & Potrac (2004) believe coach education to provide a basic curriculum for coaches, the first step on the ladder but a small step regarding the actual development of any coach in today's games. Although there is an increasing amount of emerging academic literature in coach education and learning advancement (Lyle, Jolly & North, 2010), there has been very little advancement of impact or evaluation studies. Nor has there been presentation of existing evidence on the effect different learning material formats have on coach learning in coach education courses. It is important to develop a thoroughly holistic and practical ideology of the complex nature involved in the current coaching landscape before examining what constitutes continued professional development (CPD) for coaches, understanding continual practice and exploring future coach education avenues for development and improvement (Cushion, Armour & Jones, 2003). Current coach education endeavours to bridge the practice-theory gap (Jones, Morgan & Harris, 2011) by engaging learner coaches in the processes involved in their own learning though such programs, quite unsurprisingly have been criticised for being divorced from the true realities of practice and whilst they encourage alternative thinking, fail to develop progressive knowledge, therefore not fulfilling their intended developmental function (Jones & Turner, 2006). In addition, course content, while increasing the coach knowledge base, must largely be held accountable for the apparent inadequacy in coach preparation (Jones, Armour & Potrac, 2004), a notion which has led this study towards research into the realities of coaching practice more specifically concerned with gaining an increased understanding of the coaching landscape and CPD learning strategies via interviews with qualified PGA professionals', before endeavouring to grasp a fuller understanding of the coaches' continual learning needs in an ever changing coaching environment.

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

2.2: Coach Education

To date, the design of coach education programmes continue to be taught along traditional didactic lines (Jones & Turner, 2006) and has not yet been treated as an area of concern and the academic literature on coach education remains relatively sparse (Lyle, 2002). However, the evident need to develop and improve upon such programmes has provided an opportunity for further investigation, yet the area to date has not been treated as problematic, although perhaps recognised by practitioners as it being so (Lyle, Jolly & North, 2010). In addition, such courses are often considered sound in theory, but appear divorced from the true realities of daily practice (Jones, Morgan & Harris, 2011) and fail to develop new progressive knowledge, thus not fulfilling their intended developmental function (Jones & Turner, 2006). Mallet, Trudel, Lyle & Rynne (2009) & Gilbert (2009) appreciate the need to develop and revise coach education programs and the structure of coach education as very little is known about how coaches experience such programs, particularly in terms of their structure, content, assessment and the true value coaches attach to them (Cassidy *et al.*, 2004). To date, available literature on coach education has focused on coach development and learning, coach effectiveness, the limitations of technical rationality and effectiveness which have guided much of the provision (Abraham & Collins, 1998; Jones, 2000).

Although the coaches' knowledge base currently allows them to transmit their subject matter, it could also be considered to render such coaches as '*un-skilled workers*' (Fernandez-Balboa, 1997a; Howley, 1995). Thus, it could be argued current coach education is developed along rationalistic lines and does not develop what Jones (2000) describes as the '*necessary intellectual and problem solving skills required*'. Similarly, Woodman (1993) confirmed the assertion that the key to improved coaching lies with improving coach education and development. Whilst it has been acknowledged that coaching is a complex process and argued to be an '*art form*' by Bourdieu (1996), coaches are expected to possess superior knowledge to most yet appear to receive significantly less support than the athletes they coach (Cushion, Armour & Jones, 2003). Lyle *et al.* (2010) believes that much of the current coaching prescriptions in published outputs often involve considerable repetition and overlap. Additionally there appears to be a consensus about what

constitutes good practice in coach education, though lacks concrete proof regarding coaching's complex reality.

Trainee coaches who embark upon coaching courses generally have been coached at some point and enter the course with a set of pre-existing beliefs about coaching before they hear any instruction which shape their engagement and belief in the course. Said beliefs are often very difficult to change, which is a problem especially if these beliefs are ill is judged (Ennis, 1994). Though who has the right to question these beliefs if we still do not fully understand the complexity of the coaching process? A common criticism of coach education programmes is that sports sciences contexts are often delivered as isolated units, with few if any real rapport with coaching (Bloom, 1997). Moreover, coaching development programmes subdivide coaching into components or modules, which results in distinct and fragmented categories within the broad coaching spectrum (Jones, 2000). Additionally, there is little if any existing evidence on the effect different learning materials, formats or designs has on coach learning (Lyle *et al.*, 2010). As mentioned, coaching as a social process often receives minute attention and indications to date are that coaching education content typically focuses little attention to coaching as a process (Tiffanye, 2007).

Chesterfield, Portrac & Jones (2010) gave an insightful representation of the current situation within coaching programmes. Graber (1991) & Anderson (1997) supports the papers overall view on coaching in the current climate stating that coaches often present the required '*front*' in order to satisfy their examiners, engaging in though not fully subscribing to the messages portrayed, while their eventual practice reverts back to pre-existing beliefs. Furthermore, coaches are unlikely to challenge the status quo in fear of failing to pass the course. Instead, present an '*outward appearance of acceptance*' similar in nature to the '*front*' proposed by Anderson (1997), whilst still harbouring disagreement if they were truthful to themselves (Cushion *et al.*, 2001).

Cushion, Armour & Jones (2003) examined how coach education and continuing professional development can utilize mentoring and critical reflection (see later notes) to situate learning in the practical experience of coaching, and draws similar conclusions to Chesterfield *et al's* (2010) study in that there has been little

agreement in the future strategic direction for the coaching profession. Additionally, Liukkonen, Laasko & Telama (1996) agreed suggesting that on such programmes, content is generally directed towards the promotion of athletic achievement with a dominant focus on enhancing performance. This echoes Jones' (2000) view of athlete performance forever taking preference ahead of coach development which could be a difficult barrier to hurdle with practitioners being regarded as '*merely technicians engaged in the transfer of knowledge*' (McDonald & Tinning, 1995, p.98), a view that many coaches would contest openly.

2.3: Continual Professional Development (CPD)

Continual professional development in the case of this investigation is concerned with how professional golfers continue to further their own learning development post qualification from the PGA program. Previous research into CPD has had difficulty linking its activity and its impact upon practitioners learning advancement. Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman & Suk Yoon (2001) contrast traditional with reformed types of CPD. Traditional forms of CPD tend to take place at specific times and are usually undertaken off-site with minimal follow-up procedures. They offer little opportunity or support to enable practitioners to integrate new learning with practice and thus are often ineffective. Reform types of CPD, on the other hand, typically take place within practitioners' working day, involve collective participation of fellow practitioners from the same institution(s), and are integrated into practice in the form of study groups and mentoring. Experience has been alluded to as a fundamental cog in shaping coaches habitual practice, thus it is argued that sources of experience should be incorporated into coach education (Cushion *et al.*, 2003). One suggested method of achieving this is for coach education to embrace mentoring within its framework as Cushion, (2001) Gilbert & Trudel, (2001) suggest to be in operation, though currently appears largely unstructured, informal and lacking in quality of outcome, but more importantly still reproduces the existing culture and coaching practice criticized by many before (Cushion, 2001). Loughran & Gunstone (1997) remind us that professional development is not an entity that can be delivered, rather working in support of practitioners to further understanding and personal growth, occupying a facultative helping role rather than an evaluative one encourages effectiveness (Abell, Dillon, Hopkins, McInerney & O'Brien, 1995). Furthermore, Stein, Smith & Silver (1999) state

that if coach education is to change, professional developers need to be more akin to a gradual transformation than tinkering around with the edges of their practice. Additionally, and in light of this evidence presented, it could be heavily argued that more formalized mentoring programs would be a worthwhile addition to coach development (Bloom, Bush, Schinke & Salmela, 1998).

2.3: Learning and Reflection

It is continually reinforced that developers of coach education should consider and recognise a range of learning opportunities in designing the curriculum and accrediting coaches (Mallett *et al.*, 2009), though there are little if any suggestions provided on how to do this. Learning, according to Schunk (2004), is considered to be an enduring change in behaviour or in the capacity to behave in a given fashion, which results from practice or other forms of experience. In order to achieve learning, Chen (1998) argued that developing the perception of relevance is crucial to continuing professional development and depends upon the inclusion of meaningful activities, such as addressing real-life situations and/or problems (Greenwood & Levin, 2003).

Ben-Peretz (2002) & Wenger (2002) reinforced the notion of coach learning through experience called informal learning or experiential learning. This occurs through the participation of everyday activities described by Sfard (1998) as a process of becoming which occurs through participating in a number of activities through participation. This style of teaching highlights the coaching convolution to create the notion that 'there is no one way of coaching all the time' and supposedly gives coaches an increased appreciation for their actions and participant learning. Yet, actual coaching experience and the observation of other coaches remain the primary source of knowledge for coaches' learning (Jones *et al.*, 2004). A notion echoed by Gilbert & Trudel (1999) as they deem participant observation as advantageous for evaluating conduct and viewing peer learners in a natural coaching environment. Upon analysis of coaches' stories shows that for most coaches, their practical experiences, whether through observation and/or discussion with other coaches/mentors, seem to be more important than their sport specific coach education program in their progression towards becoming a coach (Wright *et al.*,

2007). Conversely, formal learning situations are also considered an important feature in the current curricula of education courses. These situations are highly institutionalized, curriculum driven and formally recognized with grades (Marriam, Caffarella & Baumgartner, 2007).

Molder & Backerman (1994) state that competitive situations raise arousal level which they claim increases competition and adds relevance to the activity or problem presented, and added that evaluation and reflection are essential in identifying wrong-doings and improving performance (Schmidt, 1988), which current coach education has been accused or somewhat neglecting. Additionally student - coach involvement is frequently being restricted to isolated '*quickie*' self-reflective exercises (Jones & Turner, 2006). A notion echoed by Wenger (1998), expressing the opinion that coaches should be given access to resources and time necessary to learn, take action and make decisions that '*fully engage in their own knowledgability*'. It has been suggested that coaches learn mostly from anecdotal reports through coaching experience and observation of other coaches are the primary sources of knowledge for coaching (Goncalves, 1996; Gummerson, 1992; Smoll & Smith, 1981). However, experience and simple accumulation of years of involvement does not necessarily guarantee one will emerge to become an effective coach (Bell, 1997; Douge & Hastie, 1993). Thus, it has been proposed that coaches transform experience into knowledge through a process of reflection (Martens, 1997). In the past decade, empirical evidence has highlighted the need to reflect upon one's own and others' coaching in developing good practice (Gilbert & Trudel, 2006; Cassidy *et al.*, 2004, 2006; Cushion *et al.*, 2003). Additionally, Collins (2012) highlighted that immediate attention to reflective practice is long overdue. It is widely accepted that reflection is not an easy nor is it a quick exercise and therefore there are both constraints and enablements to coaches becoming active reflective practitioners and over recent decades, reflection as a process and becoming a reflective practitioner in the professional environment has increased in popularity and this includes sports coaching (Gilbert & Trudel, 2006).

The idea of reflection being a key evaluative and analytical component in learning advancements was first highlighted by John Dewey (1916, 1966), who regarded open-mindedness, wholeheartedness and responsibility as being crucially

present in reflective thinking. More recent theories in the literature on reflection have been presented by Schon (1983), with the introduction of the reflection-*in*-action, reflection-*on*-action theories and a third type proposed by Gilbert & Trudel (2006) of retrospective reflection-*on*-action. Briefly discussing these reflective notions brought forward by Schon, reflection-*in*-action refers to thinking about what they are doing, even while doing it and stresses that *'thinking on your feet'* and *'learning by doing'* are integral and highlight not only that we can think about doing but that we can think about something while doing it (Schon, 1983). Closely linked, reflection-*on*-action occurs *'within the action-present, but not in the midst of the activity'* (Gilbert and Trudel, 2001) of which a coaching example would be when a coach reflects between sessions. Schon (1983) refers to problem setting or *'framing'* as a key concept in reflection-*in*-action, a process where practitioners set boundaries of attention and impose a type of coherence on the current situation. He states that; *'it is through the process of framing the problematic situation that we may organise and clarify both the ends to be achieved and the possible means of achieving them'*.

Practitioners are increasingly becoming encouraged to *'stand back and reflect upon the construction and application of their professional knowledge'* (Hardy & Mawer, 1992). *'Reflection'* is a term that has multiple interpretations, defined by Dewey (1910), who many consider the founder of reflection, as *'turning a subject over in the mind and giving it serious and consecutive consideration'*. In addition, Schon concluded that the most effective reflective practitioners possess a special type of quality referred to as *'artistry'*. These practitioners see challenging practice dilemmas as deviancies in his or her professional development and set themselves the task to overcome such dilemmas (Wade, Gilbert and Trudel, 2005).

Many are in support of the emphasis being induced upon coaches becoming active reflective practitioners (see Gilbert & Trudel, 2001; Kidman, 2001), though Crum (1995) questions whether being a reflective practitioner should become standardized practice. According to Crum, the answer depends upon the definition held of physical education or coaching in this case. If they hold a *'training-of-the-physical'* view and their role is to adopt a technical or utilitarian approach, then becoming a deeply reflected practitioner will not be as paramount as the contrasting coach who regards coaching as a *'teaching-learning process'*, not viewing *'the body*

as a machine but on humans moving' and views coaching as a process that is 'socially constructed and historically situated', then said practitioner is required to insightfully reflect on a range of issues (Crum, 1995). Cassidy *et al.* (2004) contend that it is useful for coaches to 'engage in some degree of reflection', though agree with Crum that it may not always be necessary for coaches to reflect.

Tinning (1995) highlights the complexity of the reflection process and pointed that if reflection were taken-for-granted and simply a rational process, it would be easy to train practitioners to become reflective, though this is not the case. Such as the challenging nature of reflection, there are certain constraints to coaches actively engaging in reflective practice. A possible constraint regards ones willingness to experiment associated with the belief that '*thinking interferes with doing*' (Schon, 1983). In this argument, Schon (1983) recognises that within the sporting context, taking the time to stop and think is not viable. Additionally, a coach visibly stopping and thinking could be interpreted by the athlete as uncertainty, thus putting the coaches' credibility or subject knowledge at risk and furthermore, stating that when thinking of behaviour, we overanalyse and consequently lose the flow of action. It is wise to note that certain environments are more supportive to practitioners becoming reflective than others as Schon (1983) believed that reflection occurs more often in environments that promote or prioritise flexibility. Schon (1983) developed the notion that '*doing and thinking are complementary*' in the sense that each feeds the other, as it is the surprising result of action that that will trigger reflection, and it is the production of satisfactory moves that bring reflection to a close, temporarily at least until new issues trigger the reflection process to begin once again (Cassidy *et al.*, 2004).

A tool for enabling reflection is reflective discussion via conversation with their situation or colleagues, also known as '*action research*' for which there is four stages; planning, acting, observing and reflecting (Gilbert & Trudel, 2001). In regards to college or peer discussion, this process requires respected and trustworthy peers, creative thought processes, joint construction and issue characteristics from both parties to paint a full picture of the environment. This has been described as a form of collective self-reflective enquiry undertaken by the participants in social situations in order to rationalise and justify their own practices, whilst understanding their

practices and the situations such practices are carried out (Kemmis & McTaggart, 1992). Additionally, George & Kirk (1988) controversially claim that within the sporting culture, there exists a degree of anti-intellectualism, which does not facilitate coaches becoming effective reflective practitioners, albeit this claim was over 20 years ago it seems rational though stereotypical to assume all people involved in sport lack educational intellectuality.

2.4: Socially situated nature of learning

This section is concerned with how to establish the connection between perceptions and communication, but also how and why people put said perceptions into action. Original theories surrounding social learning most notably was published by Lev Vygotsky (1978), with his theory of the zone of proximal development. The 'zone of proximal development' (ZPD) has been defined as *"the distance between the actual developmental level as determined by independent problem solving and the level of potential development as determined through problem solving under adult guidance, or in collaboration with more capable peers"* (Vygotsky, 1978, p.86). Seth Chaiklin (2002) further discussed Vygotsky's (1978) notion of viewing adolescent interactional social relations with others as crucial to learning development. 'Scaffolding' has been a term used by Wood and Middleton (1975) as a means to better describe Vygotsky's (1973) view of proximal development. Upon mastering a task, the 'scaffolding' can then be removed and the student is then able to complete the task alone. Wood et al (1976, p.90) described scaffolding as *"those elements of the task that are initially beyond the learners capacity, thus permitting him to concentrate upon and complete only those elements that are within his range of competence"*. In theory, this concept of zonal development is plausible, though while highlighting the social dimension of this concept, Vygotsky did not elaborate on the actual mechanism of the process (Valsiner & van der Veer, 1993). In application to coaching, Lave & Wenger, (1991) & Bandura (1989) contend that the reformation of the individual in reciprocal relations within the social environment endorses learning as a constructive process.

Moving from Vygotsky and his social ZPD theory, 'discourse' is regarded as the language used to describe and explain coaching, particularly considering the previously mentioned perception and the value that words hold varies from person to

person (Cassidy *et al.*, 2004). Discourses are formed by ideologies, beliefs and power arrangements and consequently are reflective of those social constructions (Cherryholmes, 1988). Words are described by McGannon & Mauws (2000), as *'merely labels with which we refer to things in the world'*. However, a differing interpretation of talking comes from discursive perspective which refers to what words represent for individuals. Cassidy *et al.* (2004) perceive discursive perspective as people becoming speakers that construct and understand conversation as *'meaningful social doings'* (Wood & Kroger, 2000). Consequently, discourse enables researchers to portray their own definition somewhat reflecting the ambiguity of the topic and is perceived as different by each individual.

In the importance of studying discourse in the context of coaching, we need only acknowledge the socially constructed nature of language (Cassidy *et al.*, 2004). Thus, we as coaches require the study of discourse to further understand how speaking may influence the behaviour of others and the interactions we have with them (McGannon *et al.*, 2000). In essence, discourse assists in *'framing'* our social constructs by painting contextually informed picture in our heads of coaching as a complex social encounter (Sabo & Jensen, 1994; Jones, 2006), and in this respect knowledge of a discourse can help us better manage, but also examine our own everyday language-in-use (Cassidy *et al.*, 2004). However, discourses in which we speak can be enabling yet limiting forces. Enabling in a way that speaking and thinking in particular ways increases our *'sense-making'* capabilities, though limiting in that discourse proscribes definite ways of thinking and speaking, restricting conditions of possibility (Kirk, 1992). Such discourse only further emphasises the problematic and incoherent nature of communication and consequently coaching as a learning process. An agreed notion echoed by Cassidy *et al.* (2004) and Penney (2000) stated that a key realisation when considering issues of discourse is that we are not all going to agree upon what the focus of attention should be, what aims our energies should be directed to, and how these can be best achieved.

Giving a social learning overview, Lave (2002), suggested *'the context problem'* involved with socially situated activity and was concerned with the socially situated world, a topic that is often merely taken for granted. Lave & Chaiklin (2002) proposed the rationale *that 'persons acting and the social world of activity cannot be*

separated', though less attention has previously been given to the already mentioned difficult task of conceptualising relations between the persons acting and the social world which constitute the issue of context. Lave goes on to say '*people in activity are skilful at, and are more often than not engaged in, helping each other to participate in changing ways in a changing world*' which is in many ways linked to the next review section, that of communities of practice and how the manifestation people in social situations can influence each other and that the process of learning is not the same for everyone, instead it occurs across a range of circumstances (Lefrancois, 2000).

2.5: Communities of Practice (COP)

Human interaction has been recognised as a key ingredient in coach learning (Culver & Trudel, 2008). Bandura's (1989) work on social learning became more directed towards observational learning and '*how people influence each other*' (Lefrancois, 2000) and making the assumption '*that people could learn actions merely by observing others performing them*' (Schunk, 2004). Noting this, it is becoming an increasingly pressing issue to broadly explore the actual and preferred sources of coaches' knowledge. Considering people gather together in various numbers for a variety of reasons but in the main to achieve goals, these clusters of people have been named as '*communities of practice*' (COP) (Erickson *et al.*, 2008).

Similar to the action research concepts developed by Gilbert & Trudel (2001), anthropologists Lave & Wenger (1991) and their '*situated learning theory*' were among the first to develop work on the effectiveness and nature of COP. Lave & Wenger (1991) stated that social enterprise is influenced by our participation in daily life, are key and that COP is situated learning through participation in practice and focused on the socially organised aspects of learning that would advance the understanding of the learning processes. A number of other authors have suggested and note that coaches' COP either exist or promote coach learning (Nelson *et al.*, 2006; Cassidy & Rossi, 2006; Culver & Trudel, 2006; Trudel & Gilbert, 2004). Furthermore, Wenger (1998) suggested that COPs are not all the same, though all share certain characteristics and elements such as a knowledge domain, community of people and shared practices. Furthermore, Wenger (1998) proposed a close relationship between identity and COPs, which led him to view learning as a

transformative experience for the individuals describing it as '*an experience of identity*'. For learning to arise, Wenger (1991) believed participants have to mutually engage in a joint experience in which they have a shared repertoire. Thus, learning was not so much concentrated on knowledge acquisition but as a process of social participation (Cassidy *et al.*, 2004). Moreover, Cassidy *et al.* (2006a) and Culver & Trudel (2006) contend with Wenger *et al.* (2002), that there must be facilitators within the COP that exert expert control over the direction and length of COP discussions. Wenger (1991) further re-iterated the most important factor in a COPs success is that of adequate '*leadership*' displayed by individuals.

Cassidy & Rossi (2006) argued that the potential for utilizing the concept of communities of practice in coaching is profound, and also discussed how COPs could energize the notion of apprenticeship in coach education arguing that '*learning cannot be designed*' rather, learning '*happens design, or no design*' (Wenger, 2002). Moreover, Wenger agreed with Cassidy and Rossi, though argued that learning can be designed for the participants, in that learning can be brought about by facilitating the conditions optimal for the learning experience. Cassidy *et al.* (2004) concur with Wenger, and would lead coach educators down this pathway of thinking in regards to how to best facilitate learning.

The aims of this study are to make sense of the CPD specific to golf coaches (what is currently happening) and further understand how coaches continue to learn in their coaching environment and additionally, endeavour to discover the continual needs of coaches and barriers in learning (What is needed?), and finally to establish opinions of sample coaches [$N = 4$] and explore areas of possible alternative learning for said coaches (What could be done?). The objective of this study is to provide a neutral outlook on the current situation coach education program, and understand how coaches develop their own learning post qualification via CPD strategies specific to golf.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1: Purpose

Qualitative research has been described by Denzin & Lincoln (1994) as a study of effects and features in a natural setting in attempt to make sense of, or interpret a particular phenomenon in terms of the meanings people assign to them. This type of research has been chosen in order to fully understand the coach – athlete relationship as a socially constructed phenomenon in order to penetrate deeper significance attributed to the topic in question (Poczwardowski, Barott & Jowett, 2006). The methodology gathers the participants' personal experiences, thoughts, feelings and opinions on said topics as a whole and comprehensive phenomenon as oppose to focusing on particular unites of analysis such as emotional or behavioural expectations (Pozwardowski *et al.*, 2006) which aided the investigator in generating a holistic representation of the current situation in coaching. In addition, quantitative analysis techniques would not be suitable for this study as the results are not numerical in nature and ultimately will not coincide with the main aims of this study. It is for this reason, qualitative methods of analysis have been chosen to adopt a flexible approach to a situation to be understood (Richards, 2005). Additionally, participants were sent a participant information sheet prior to conducting the interview to inform them of what the study entailed and what the aim of the interviews were (see appendix A).

3.2: Procedure

This study involved gaining views and opinions of PGA qualified coaches in response to questions asked by the main investigator during semi-structured interviews at a convenient time and place of the participant. The overall aim was to gain a deeper, broader understanding of the continual needs of learner coaches and gain and further understand the continued support provided by their governing body as interpretive interview techniques were used as means of data collection. This interpretive, qualitative perspective is fundamentally concerned with talking to qualified golf professionals and establishing their means to learn in their coaching environment. Upon initial contact, coaches were given the option to be emailed or directly sent a participant information sheet informing them of the study. An informed consent form (see appendix B) was completed prior to the interview process and interviews were conducted at a time and in a neutral location that is suitable for the participant to ensure there is no environmental bias and to assist in producing a

flowing conversation. Interviews were face-to-face, audio-taped and then transcribed to ensure an accurate and complete record of the data gathered. Participants are given the choice, if they require, to have a copy of the transcript sent back to the respondent coaches as confirmation of accuracy.

3.3: Participants

Participants were purposefully selected on the basis that they have already qualified as a PGA teaching professional and were actively engaged in weekly sports coaching at the time of the interviews. Such participants have been described by Patton (1990) as '*information rich*' and should have the knowledge and experience the researcher requires, is articulate in description, provide relevant responses in order to generate an explanation, possesses the capacity to adequately reflect upon such experiences and possibly most importantly, is willing and able to participate in the study (Morse, 1994). Five Golf coaches were contacted about taking part in the study, of which four responded positively and were willing, able and most importantly met participant criteria for this study. All were given consent forms to sign and participant information sheets to read prior to the interview. All participants were male and had a mean age of 38 [$SD = 12.92$], [$N = 4$], and had a wealth of experience of over 50 years coaching between them. The participants were reassured at the beginning that their identities and answers during the interview would be kept completely confidential.

3.4: Interview guide

Interpretive interview techniques are used as a means of collecting data and are concerned with the perspective of understanding how people, given their interests and beliefs, construct social reality (Sparkes, 1992). Schostak (2006) attempted to conceptualise the meaning behind an interview here by focusing upon the moment of engagement between people where each attends to and address the other, such moments of engagement are critical for every dimension of what it means to be human where a project will either rise or fall. A semi-structured interview guide had been developed by the main investigator and was generally flexible and open in nature to allow participants during the interview to freely express opinions on selected issues and/or topics that arise, whilst retaining a set nucleus of consistent questions asked, which encouraged fluency in the interview, all the while accounting

for the methodical data gathering nature using participants (Patton, 2002). Some questions in the guide were not asked if the participant had sub-consciously already answered particular question(s) during their answers to another question or questions. The interviews lasted around 30 – 40 minutes in duration depend upon depth of answers provided by the participant (see appendix C).

A pilot interview was conducted to measure the efficiency of the interview as refinements had been made to the phraseology and orientation of certain questions following the pilot and although there was a standardized set of questions; any new topics for discussion that emerge during the interviews were probed and explored further (Chesterfield *et al.*, 2010). However, the pilot interview was rather uninformative in regards to the aims of the study as it was conducted with a sports student and not a professional Golfer. The answers were largely ‘made-up’ and predictable which encouraged me to stop the interview half way through as Schostak (2006) comprehends that if we knew what others were going to say, presumably we would not bother to ask them.

The full interview is separated into five closely linked, sometimes overlapping sections and was centred upon the following five core themes; introductory questions, coach education, learning and reflection, continued professional development (CPD) and communities of practice (COP). Section one explained issues of confidentiality, the reasons for audio taping and transcription and a declaration of the individuals’ rights, as well as some generalised introductory questions. Section two enabled the participant to elaborate on their personal experiences of coach education whilst gaining their PGA qualification and their general thoughts and feelings towards how the programme shaped their learning development. Section three gave the participant an opportunity to talk about their personal optimal learning methods that enable them to further develop their learning with reflective strategies being a key component in this section. Section four gave the participant the chance to talk about their socially situated experiences (COPs) both during their coach education and post qualification as well as how interactions with others during this period may have been beneficial to their learning and development as a coach. Section five concerns the participants’ opinions on the level

of continued professional developmental support received from the PGA post qualification whilst in their working environment (CPD).

3.5: Analysis and Interpretation

Content analysis methods are used with quantitative and qualitative data (Richards, 2005; Schostak, 2006); and what is more, it may be used in an inductive or deductive way noting both approaches have similar preparation phases. Which one is used is determined by the purpose of the study. The inductive approach is recommended when there is a lack of prior knowledge about the phenomenon in question or is said knowledge is fragmented from which categories are derived from the data (Lauri & Kyngas, 2005). Conversely, deductive approaches are recommended when the structure of analysis is operationalized on the basis of previous knowledge and the purpose of the study is the testing of theory (Kyngas & Vanhanen 1999). This study is more deductive in nature as it is based upon previous studies (namely, see Abraham *et al.*, 2008; Chesterfield *et al.*, 2010) conclusions that coach education currently does not adequately prepare learner coaches for professional work. Structured matrices were devised following the conduction of the interviews and further analysis of the transcriptions and arrive at informed conclusions. Noting the difficulty in devising matrices, data reduction can be of great trouble to the researcher due to the unclear criteria for such reductions especially as the researcher is often unwilling to let go of detail (Kaminiski & Pitney, 2004).

Transcripts were studied in detail to warrant content relationships before the common underlying trends were clustered and organized within the developing themes which were then categorized based on links with existent literature surrounding coach education (Patton, 2002). Transcripts were then used to inform the matrices and aid the researcher in gaining a fuller grasp of the theoretical and conceptual understanding of the topic will enable the researcher to identify common occurrences and features collectively recognized as an area of concern and possible reconstruction (Charmaz, 2006), (see appendix D). Analytical coding is seen as central to qualitative research (Richards, 2005), leading to theory ‘*emergence*’ and theory affirmation (see appendix E). Furthermore, Cote, Salmela & Russel (1995) state that common features (themes) between interviews are to be established leading to the organisation of said features into distinct groupings, known as

properties. Such a process may aid the researcher in identifying preliminary connections to varied theoretical concepts that could help explain the key issues evident in the interviews conducted (Chesterfield *et al.*, 2010).

3.6: Trustworthiness in qualitative data research

Qualitative research often seeks to gain a depth of understanding of the information individuals give from their experiences (Kaminiski & Pitney, 2004). Differing from quantitative research as this often seeks to measure an objective truth by collecting measurable data. Generally, qualitative research is objective and for this reason qualitative researchers commonly use interviews (in this case) and/or observations to collect data. However, issues of quality are a concern for both qualitative researchers and practitioners (Whitmore, Chase & Mandle, 2001). Guba (1981), Kaminski *et al.* (2004) & Shenton, (2004) contend that *validity* and *reliability* are ethical issues that need to be overcome to provide accurate results, though more recent work by Lincoln concluded the whole area of qualitative inquiry was '*still emerging and being defined*' (Lincoln, 1995).

Guba (1981) identified that credibility is often used under the same term as validity which is concerned with whether an instrument measures what it is intended to measure (Kaminski *et al.*, 2004), as Merriam, (1998) argued that validity is related to whether the research findings capture what is really occurring in the context and whether the researcher learned what he or she intended to learn. Moreover, according to Merriam (1998), the qualitative investigator's equivalent concept, i.e. credibility, is concerned with answering the question, '*how congruent are the findings with reality?*' Furthermore, Lincoln (1985) & Guba (1981) maintain the stance that ensuring credibility is one of the most important factors in establishing trustworthiness.

Kaminski *et al.* (2004) stated that reliability relates to the consistency of the research findings, or whether the findings can be reproduced. Similarly to the closeness of credibility and validity, while Shenton (2004) maintained that reliability can be put under the same term as dependability, as he contends with Kaminski *et al.* (2004) that dependability shows that if the work were repeated, in the same context, using the same methods and participants, similar results would be obtained.

However, this perspective tends to assume that the concept or phenomenon under investigation will not change or cannot be altered, such as the nature of qualitative research, with investigators being primarily concerned with the meaning individuals give to their experiences, and as human behaviour is very rarely, if ever fully static, reliability tends to be problematic (Kaminski *et al.*, 2004). Furthermore, Lincoln (1985) & Guba (1981) stress the close ties between credibility/validity and dependability/reliability, arguing that, in practice, a demonstration of the former goes some distance in ensuring the latter, which may be achieved through the use of overlapping methods, such as focus groups or in this case individual interviews. What constitutes validity and reliability is contentious, as qualitative research methods have evolved and expanded in the recent past (Kaminski *et al.*, 2004).

CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1: Adaptation to differing socially situated activity

It could be argued that coach education courses, having been developed along rationalistic lines, currently do not develop, intellectual, and practical competencies, independence and creative thinking skills in relation to making meaning and problem solving. Instead, by separating the theory from practice, high level tasks have been presented as sequential routine, which has resulted in the deskilling of the practitioner in terms of cognitive and human interaction (Jones, 2000). Participants believed that the '*social aspects*' of coaching were an important component in teaching or coaching anyone under their supervision and guidance, a notion which supports Jones *et al.* (2004) opinion that coaching is both an individual and a social process, which, because of its very nature, is inextricably linked to both the constraints and opportunities of human interaction. Coach education courses have been heavily criticized for failing to socially develop coaches adequately (Jones, 2000), which has resulted in the deskilling of the practitioner in terms of human interaction (Jones, 2000; MacDonald & Tinning, 1995; Potrac, Jones, Brewer, Armour, & Hoff, 2000). Possibly for this very reason, it could be argued, given the evidence from interviews conducted that participants valued '*on-the-job*' experience as better means of learning, rather than any didactic based formal or informal learning, as participant 3 mentions:

"I've learnt a lot more doing it myself than what someone could learn from a book. It's all experience and putting it into practice".

In addition, the sessions approach with an athlete varies upon the individual who requires the coach to adapt and change approaches for each individuals needs respectively. For example, participant 1 suggested that:

"You have to teach the person, there's no way you can generalise. I don't know how I'm going to teach that person until I've started speaking to them. But the way you put a certain idea across, no matter how good or bad they are, no idea until I start speaking to them".

Similarly, participants 2 and 4 both alluded to a '*screening*' process where the coach talks to the athlete in depth and establishes what the athlete perceives their areas of

weakness to be, watches them play two or three holes and they then agree upon the best course of action in the sessions to follow. This goes some way to harmoniously avoid *'the context problem'* of conceptualising relations between the persons acting and the social world, recognising the discursive *'situatedness of learning'* and that relational concepts of the social world should not be explored in isolation from conceptions of persons acting and interacting and their activities which constitute the issue of context presented by Lave (2002) & Wenger (2002) and further discussed in the work of Sigelman and Rider, (2006) who researched how humans acquire knowledge through experience use it to adapt to their world.

Lave (2002), Wenger (2002) & Sigelman *et al.* (2006) agree that relational concepts of the social world should not be explored in isolation from conceptions of persons acting and interacting and their activities. Thus, if context is viewed as a social world constituted in relation with persons acting, both context and activity seem inescapably flexible and changing. Supportive of these terms, participants recognised the social importance of contextualising the infamously reciprocal coach - athlete relationship and linking such a relationship to the activity that follows during their sessions as they suggest:

(Participant 2) - *"It depends very much on the individual, the screening process of finding out what the person is, is massively important"*.

(Participant 3) - *"There's more than one way to do it and it's just about creating good impact conditions, you need to build up a rapport with people, get them to have confidence in what you're doing; it's more of a reciprocal relationship because you're learning off them"*.

(Participant 4) - *"When I first work with an experienced player, I like to get an understanding of what of what their game is, what they believe their weaknesses to be". "There's not just one way to affect someone, the more you coach you realise that some learn in different ways to others, you become more rounded and realise there's five or six ways of cracking a nut"*. He adds, *"I'm just a glorified messenger; diagnosing and helping people understand their own swing"*.

Furthermore, whether the coach deem themselves to be a teacher or a coach and as a result how they approach interaction with an individual appears to be based on the level of playing ability, but also the amount of both overall golfing knowledge and how advanced the athlete is about understanding his/her own swing. In addition, participant 1 further highlights the importance of social constructs and trust within the coaching context and furthermore the already presented coach – athlete relationship by stating:

“I’m defiantly a teacher and definitely a coach, also a psychologist, so many things. You have to be very open in creating a personal communication with them and trust as well, if they don’t trust you, you can’t teach them, you can’t coach them, you can’t educate them”.

He later adds, *“When you start you’re almost scared to criticise, you just get really good at criticising people but in a nice way, a very accepting way and they appreciate that as well, that you’re honest to them”.*

According to Fox (2006) participants of learning pick up knowledge by talking and witnessing master practitioners at work through a kind of *‘practical social apprenticeship’* and in doing so gain legitimate membership in such a community by performing, usefully shaping not only knowledge but also identity. In a similar way, participants presented occasions where they had opportunity to share coaching experiences with other coaches in a more social environment which had a positive effect on advancing their coaching knowledge in regards to learning off other peoples interpretations of a situation and how they may have perceived the same situation in a different light to them or anyone else, with participants 2 and 3 suggesting:

(Participant 2) - *“There’s been a lot of influence from a lot of people who have changed the way I see things. I’m trying to get other sports coaches to come together and talk about how they coach, because that will massively help me, and hopefully them also”.*

(Participant 3) - *“We spent 5 days at the Belfry (National base for the PGA) and we’d get together as a group as well, learning and having discussions about things. It’s good to have other people’s ideas”.*

Although these experiences between coaches appear to have a positive effect on coach appreciation for learning, there appear limited if any instances where coaches were informed or better prepared for the one-to-one social interaction between themselves and the athlete about how to adequately prepare them to socially engage in an efficient manner and bring about positive outcomes. Coaches appear to be left to their own devices in regards to taking for granted the socially situated activity within conversations that will undoubtedly arise in a coaching session (Lave, 2002). For example, participant 1 talks of interaction between other coaches but also about how his style has evolved over time as a result mentioning:

“Had a guy the other day doing this movement... ‘Oh what did you say to him?’ ‘Oh I said this and he just got it’. So then you think, hmm that’s quite good, I’ll nick that!”

“I used to teach somebody how to hold the golf club in great detail; now I trick them into holding it correctly and that’s important”.

Taking into account such descriptions by participants, an evolving style is taken for granted due to the time spent endeavouring to devour meaning from direct experiences referred to as experiential learning (Ben-Peretz, 2002). Wenger (2002) often contrasted with formal didactic learning methods, but how does one trick an athlete into doing something correctly, what language best suits such a dilemma and if a said language does indeed suit a dilemma, does it change for each individual athlete as highlighted in the earlier notes? This interpretation and differentiation in experiences echoes Wenger’s (1998) notion that learning is an *‘experience of identity’* and that learning is to a degree about acquisition of knowledge but a process of social participation.

It became apparent that participants could recall an increasing amount of *‘instances of social interaction’* post qualification in their field of work as oppose to during their PGA coach education experience. For example, participant 1 talked of

an additional online business he owns where he's able to share opinions and philosophies with other coaches via what he describes as *'idle chit-chat'*.

"I have another business, an online academy, so I'm trying to push my philosophy onto other pros via this method and we chat, 'idle chit-chat'.

Subject 4 provided perhaps the only example of how a social environment furthered his learning *during* the qualification, whilst in the same breath bringing forward an arguably more forthcoming *'on-the-job'* social interaction example stating:

"I remember one instance, class of maybe 16-20 of us; they (PGA) divided us into two groups. A person would go out of the room and someone would play the pupil and put a few 'faults' in, then when we'd all decided what the faults were, the other trainee would come in and give a lesson. This always sticks in my head as we were all 'singing from the same hymn sheet. In work, quite often one of us will come in with a problem and we just discuss how we can help, see how someone else would approach it differently. So we do communicate a lot".

Bourdieu (1977, 1966) considered that a feel for the game involved being a competent social actor that resulted from the absorption of appropriate social actions and mores (Jones, 2000). It would appear that technical aspects of coaching culture are often acquired through observing, listening and interacting with fellow and more experienced coaches. For example, studies by Gould, Gianinni, Karne & Hodge (1990) and Salmela, Cote and Baria (1994) both identified and concluded that experience and other coaches are of great importance and ultimately responsible within the forces shaping coach development. Recognising experience and other coach learning, within said processes discursive perspective plays a major social role in the coaching environment, as Cassidy *et al.* (2004) highlight how the ambiguity of language could negatively affect an individuals' learning and additionally the meaning we assign to language effects a coaches ability to make sense of the current situation (Kirk, 1992). Cushion *et al.* (2003) also argue coaches' acquire development as a result of past experience as players and coaches and through adjustment and readjustment following interaction with others the specific coaching context.

In addition, Cushion *et al.* (2003) stated that the collaboration with others assists them in the deconstruction of the dominant, prevalent discourses and the effect they are having on their role and poses reflection on previous actions will help peers to bring practitioners' to a state of openness in which they are prepared to try out new strategies and behaviours.

4.2: Reflection

Recent decades has recognised reflection as a key factor in learning and refers to the extent to which individuals are able to appraise what they have learned and to integrate these experiences into future actions, thereby maximizing performance improvements (Jonker, Marije, Elferink-Gemser, De Roos & Visscher, 2012). Recognised by Jones *et al.* (2004) as a difficult process to engage in, Cassidy *et al.* (2006) further highlight the need to reflect in the development of good practice. Moreover, Robertson (2004) posed that reflection on previous actions will help to bring leaders to a state of openness in which they are prepared to try out new strategies and behaviours. Reflection as a concept appears to be the most vaguely understood issue overall for the participants that surrounded the interviews conducted for this investigation. Though participants understood the need to embrace and engage in reflective strategies as practitioners, there seemed to be a limited knowledge and displaying only basic understanding overall about specific reflection strategies, notably Schon's (1983) concepts of reflection-*in*-action and reflection-*on*-action even when both concepts were presented. For example, participant 1, who displayed the most understanding supposed:

"I always recap. What I need to do between lessons, at the end of lessons you always reflect on what went on". He later added, "I make up drills between lessons. Away from lessons I always think about the golf swing, it's my job".

Furthermore, participant 2 though outwardly appearing confident in the area of reflection appeared to confuse '*feedback*' and '*reflection*' respectively throughout the section during the interview even though feedback was not mentioned at any point during the question posed, again demonstrating the lack of conceptual understanding of the topic shown by the participants stating:

“I always use feedback, so reflection/feedback, same things”.

It could be argued that reflection has a different meaning than that of feedback, are not the same things, and are indeed two very separate variables in learning development (Dewey, 1966; Schon, 1983). Feedback has been defined as information about past or present influences a phenomenon in the present currently or the future, or information about the actual and perceived reference level of a parameter used to alter the alleged gap in some way (Ramaprasad, 1983). Conversely, reflection or reflective processes are more concerned with human self-reflection and the capacity of someone to exercise the willingness to learn about their behavioural nature and consider avenues for self-improvement (Schon, 1983). With this lack of conceptual understanding, it is perhaps unsurprising that effective reflective strategies appeared vacant from the professionals' practice investigated. Lortie (1975) recognized that there are several reasons for this inadequate level of understanding among education and coaching professionals. There is a *'relative isolation'* of individuals in educational institutions and the profession can be a secluded one in comparison to other more collegial interactional institutions that further support the culture of shared experiences such as medicine or law. Additionally, such as the time constraints which educationally based professionals are subjected to on a daily basis makes the time for quality reflection appear dramatically reduced and can become caught up in the habit of routine and strict schedule without thinking critically about their actions. It becomes difficult for a practitioner to change a habit, especially if the change is in the notoriously difficult reflective direction (Tinning, 1995). As participant 1 highlights:

“I know I should do more but money-wise and time-wise, I'm restricted”.

In addition, similar to participant 2's confusion between reflection and feedback, participants seemed to confuse reflection strategies with *'trial and error'* methods of teaching, epitomized with participant 3's comments on reflection:

“If something's not working, you need to adapt straight away. If it's not working I'll try something else until we get the result we want”.

What is more, as in the case with participant 2, there is often a lack of skills and concept knowledge necessary to enable effective reflective practice to come about. Of the participants interviewed, all seemed adequately capable to providing feedback to their athletes as they do on a daily basis, however many failed to demonstrate the personal skills to reflect critically on their own performance in comparison with others, namely participant 1 who portrayed a clearer understanding of the concept posed. It appears coaches have not been taught *how* to critically reflect at any stage of their qualification or journey to becoming a professional which in turn calls for revised structures in time and expectation of educational courses of coach development to be actively involved in the practice of critical reflection such as a '*reflective blog*' encouraged in closely linked graduate sport courses (Robertson, 2004). Moreover, as the coaching world is largely competency based, we need to encourage coaches to stand back and reflect and get them to understand why they coach as they do, recognising reflection as a catalyst for change (Cassidy *et al.*, 2003; Hardy & Mawer, 1999).

Though reflective strategies are increasingly becoming encouraged to be used *in-action* or within the action present, participants somewhat argued against Schon's (1973) reflection-*in-action* notion suggesting that it is often impractical to reflect during a session, and that thinking can often interfere with the '*doing*' or '*flow of action*'. However, these suggestions, it may be argued, are contextually redundant due to the lack of conceptual understanding of the topic area while at the same time looked upon seriously and taken into consideration as a result of their legitimate power within the industry, as participant 2 posed:

"Analysis brings paralysis; we have to make sure as coaches we don't give them too much. Pupils want all the info' and to do everything at once, which brings the challenge of condensing it down to one or two thoughts".

4.3: Perceptual relevance of continued support via CPD strategies

In this section of the discussion, it is wise to highlight the value and gratitude the participants held towards the PGA as an institute, as they demonstrated a positive and thankful stance, mentioning how invaluable being a qualified PGA professional brings to their line of work, as participants 1 and 4 suggest below. It is not the aim of this study to scrutinize the teaching methods of the PGA specifically,

but that of gaining a further understanding of the continual needs coaches in the learning process and identifying areas of possible future development for the entirety of coach education:

(Participant 1) - *“A really good experience overall. I’m a PGA professional is like having a badge of honour. It’s a really good basis, a platform of what’s important and not important; then you build your own teaching style from there”.*

(Participant 2) - *“Certainly isn’t easy to get through, the teaching side of it is pretty intense. If you don’t have a PGA qualification teaching golf you don’t really get the respect or get taken seriously”.*

Level of continued support and CPD strategies was an area that the participants felt very comfortable in talking about openly. Perhaps this was due to the degree of definitive opinion on the topic? As previously mentioned, Garet, Porter, Desimone, Birman & Yoon (2001) distinguished between the traditional forms of CPD taking place at specific times and are usually undertaken off-site with minimal follow-up procedures enforced and offer little opportunity or support to enable teachers to integrate new learning with practice and, so, are often ineffective. Reform types typically take place within the working day, involve collective participation of practitioners from the same institution or group of institutions, and are integrated into practice in the form of study groups and mentoring similar to the reflective log previously mentioned. Garet *et al.* (2001) argue that reform CPD are easier to sustain and possibly more significantly are likely to result in closer connections between new learning, experience and current existing practice. As mentioned previously, evidence has suggested that both interpersonal encounters and coach experience are predominantly responsible for shaping coaching practice, which was again evident in the interviews conducted. Therefore, continually influencing such experiences would affect the development of acquisition and coach knowledge (Cassidy *et al.*, 2003).

To date, the PGA’s CPD strategies are almost completely of the traditional variety, and whilst on such courses, participants eluded to an incentive driven points system that the PGA offer to qualified coaches for attending CPD courses. These supposedly enable the professional to, as participant 1 labelled it, *“move up the ladder”*, though none of the participants particularly assigned any real meaning or

benefit to gaining such points. Additionally, participant 1 was critical of the system and whilst describing his experiences stated:

“They have some quite interesting speakers who you can go and listen to, but that’s optional. I’ve actually given a talk to other professionals, and the other pros got points, but I didn’t get any for doing the talk”.

Similarly on the same matter, Subject 2 also indicated:

“They give you CPD points if you go to different classes. I think they help; they do have on-going support. It’s up to you whether you use it. It is offered, you’re not on your own. You can also phone the PGA if you have any problems”.

In relation to what participant 1 discussed about failing to receive any CPD points for doing a talk for other fellow PGA professionals. From the manner in which he spoke, though he felt such commitment to the cause should have warranted him gaining a few CDP points at least, it would be wise to assume he felt unfairly used and wasn’t given the correct amount of recognition for the his committed efforts. Similarly, and what is possibly more controversial was participant 4 stating:

“We felt that when we came away, they benefitted more from us than us from them”.

“I went to a coaching seminar with a fellow professional and between us we had 35 years’ experience. The guy who was giving the seminar had only been a PGA pro for about two and a half years. Everything he had was on the back of what he’d done as a player. We had respect for the guy but it’s a completely different career”.

“You can’t play for 20 years, achieve a lot, which you deserve and gain respect for, then go into a different career and suddenly be held in such high regard?”

Assigning deeper meaning in what participant 2 described, instead of using ‘I’ to describe his feelings, he uses ‘we’, which suggests he speaks to a certain extent not only for himself, but perhaps on behalf of other individuals who attended the

same CPD course. Although this is a large assumption, it but further highlights the somewhat negative stance some PGA professionals harbour towards taking part in CPD courses. Chesterfield *et al.* (2011) & Day (1999) understand that practitioners often view formal or traditional CPD with a degree of cynicism, as coaches are yet to be convinced of CPD's positive contribution to enhancing their everyday practice. Additionally, Jones (2000) and Cushion *et al.* (2003) argue that much of the current underpinning ideologies of coach education have to date failed to adequately recognise the situational variability within the coaching context. They add that as a result, there is a weakening impact of coach education as a consequence of a lack of perceived fitted relevance between course content and the methods coaches are exposed to on such courses and their practical needs. Results here recognise the prolonged negligence of coach educators which supports Cushion *et al.*'s (2003) suggestions that coach educators are naïve to assume coaches arrive as empty vessels that await filling. Thus in doing so, should not only recognise the power of experience in shaping personal beliefs, but also actively engaging coaches in critical analysis of how their personal biographies might influence their thoughts on effective coaching (Cushion *et al.*, 2003; Nelson & Cushion, 2006), as other sections of the coaching literature have argued that coach education should incorporate sources of experience other than the coaching manual (Gould *et al.*, 1990; Schembri, 2001; Lyle, 2002).

4.4: Rationale for future research

After reviewing the literature, it is apparent that there remain many areas in and around coaching that lack structural clarity, with questions being posed by many, namely Lyle *et al.* (2010) and Jones *et al.* (2011). Previous research has suggested that predominant and current formal coach education learning methods do not fully meet the learning needs of coaches and that there is minimal research that constructively evaluates the preferred sources of knowledge from which coaches optimize learning (Erickson *et al.*, 2008 & Trudel *et al.*, 2006). There has been substantial research and ideas produced regarding the key areas and design guides that should be included in coach education programs (Rowntree, 1997. Singer, 1993 & Jones *et al.*, 2004), though as previously mentioned by Lyle *et al.* (2010) as to date, no materials based on recommendations have been published in order to further learning. Which raises the question whether in fact any of the coaching

'models' bare relevance to learner engagement and development (Chen, 1998). Findings by Chesterfield *et al.* (2010) and Jones & Turner (2006) are critical of the 'gold standard' approach that seems to dictate much of program content and deem the 'one size fits all' approach as limiting to the learner and thus feel the coach educators should have more of a supportive mentoring or facilitating role in coaxing learners into developing their own philosophy on coaching.

As academics, we are hasty to offer solutions to problems that vastly remain poorly understood as highlighted in Lave (2002) & Wenger's (2002) '*problem of context*'. Solving problems is regarded as a broad topic used in most theoretical areas of study, though perhaps in the coaching context, metaphorically there is an almost hidden, additional upper floor of which nobody has yet constructed a method of access for. Therefore, if this was the case, without the full knowledge base is making premature recommendations for reforming coach education itself indeed premature? (Piggott, 2012). Furthermore, it is unlikely that national governing bodies (NGBs) will respond positively to criticism or the presentation of new ideas from outside sources which begs the question are there any opportunities to better inform coach education programs? More information is needed to fully understand how to best prepare and encourage particularly youth sport coaches to obtain further knowledge, understand and engage actively in their own learning development, which led this study into attempting to understand current coach education and the possible effects such a programme has on the development and improvement of the coach as a learner after completing the course, though further, more detailed research in the area is recommended. Additionally, coach learning doesn't seem able to be legitimately measured though should this become the case, and practical suggestions to combat such an issue can be raised, would be of great service to the coaching landscape (Wiersma & Sherman, 2005).

5.5: Limitations

This study based its findings solely on the interpretation of results via emerging themes from interview matrices devised by the main investigator, which could be argued to be a limiting factor. Additionally, a relatively small sample size of [$N = 4$] in comparison to the amount of qualified PGA professionals in the country of Wales was also thought to be a limiting factor.

Within the interviews themselves, not every question in the interview guide was asked to every participant, due to the interviewer deeming certain questions unnecessary as it may have produced a very similar answer to another previously asked question. It was also noticeable that participants tended to choose their words very carefully when talking about the PGA and their methods of coach education, indicating commitment to the PGA which could have had an effect upon the true reliability of the results. Similarly, it appeared some of the participants failed to adequately understand some of the concepts posed during the interview. For example, on the topic of reflection, participant 2 misunderstood it for that of feedback, more than likely effecting the interview and results in gaining information on the said topic area. A pilot interview was conducted with a fellow student prior to the study, though it was unhelpful in reflecting a true likeness to interviews conducted with Golf professionals. Accessing a teaching professional to conduct a pilot interview would have been helpful to further inform my interview guide, however it was impractical as a professionals' time is valuable and as they are voluntarily taking part in the study, possibly losing out on money from lessons during that time, it seemed un-necessary.

Finally, the interviewer could have possibly made further attempts to keep the interviewee 'on-track', intervening more frequently as they tended to drift from the question asked to something they felt was relevant instead of answering the question, though had the interviewer been more familiar and experienced with qualitative data and it's handling, the study may well have been better informed.

6.6: Concluding thoughts

Participants recognised the value of not only personal trust and meeting individual needs of the athlete but being flexible in the coaching environment, concurring with Cassidy *et al.* (2004) that coaches want to develop athletes who can make decisions and adapt to changing situations (Kidman, 2001). Both Cushion (2005) & Lyle (2002) contend the current formations of coaching education strategies are neither informative nor overly influential for learner coaches and suggest that coaches' are not being adequately prepared for professional practice, particularly concerning underlying social forces which is echoed in the results of this study. Consequently, the discursive perspective involved in social relations and the nature of language has emerged as a key ingredient in establishing stable and meaningful

doings amongst individuals (Cassidy *et al.*, 2004). Additionally, communication and establishing stable inter-personal connections within a discourse remains paramount to furthering subject knowledge (Cherryholmes, 1998). Cushion *et al.* (2003) viewed coaching as a social entity and considering coaches' perceptions would allow coach education programmes to become more in tune with coaches realities and motivations (Demers, Woodburn, & Savard, (2006), which in turn would allow coaches to adapt freely and apply, value judgements to their practice (Schemmp, 1993).

It could be argued, although widely considered a difficult process, influential coach educators should themselves consider implementing Schon's (1987) reflective theories into their own practice to achieve optimum coach development as the coach education spectrum will forever be a developing project, whilst emphasising the benefits of becoming a reflective practitioner to athletes (Gilbert & Trudel, 2006). Arguably, reflection is a naturally occurring phenomenon within any profession, thus insinuating that the whole process of coach education is a reflection-*in*-action, though on a larger, less apparent scale. Moreover, participants commonly alluded to their coaching *style* as an ever evolving process of learning, though possibly not recognised as so by their coach education. Participants were not overly positive towards the current CPD strategies provided to them, yet somewhat hypocritically were thankful for the overall support level provided by the PGA. Continued professional development emerged as the most vaguely understood area within the interviews for both the interviewer and participants. Thus, it is posed that CPD remains an area of uncertainty that calls for further reflection and development.

Upon analysis of the interviews, there was further evidence of the gap between what is taught and what the true realities of coaching entail. Coach educators as well as coaches, need to be made aware of the social and educational dynamics (Armour & Jones, 2000) and empathise with the problematic pedagogical interpretations involved in coaching (Cassidy, 2000).

CHAPTER FIVE
REFERENCES

- Abell, S.K. Dillon, D.R. Hopkins, C.J. McInerney, W.D., & O'Brien, D.G. (1995) Somebody to count on: Mentor/intern relationships in a beginning teacher internship program. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 173-188.
- Abraham, A. & Collins, D. (1998) *Examining and extending research in coach development*, Quest, 59-79.
- Anderson, A. (1997) *Using personal histories to explore theories about the teaching/learning process in physical education*, Avante, 71-82.
- Bandura, A. (1989) Human agency in social cognitive theory. *American Psychologist*, 1175–1184.
- Bell, M. (1997) *The development of expertise*. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, 34-38.
- Bloom, G.A. Bush, N. Schinke, R.J. & Salmela, J.H. (1998) The importance of mentoring in the development of coaches and athletes. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 267-289.
- Bourdieu, P. & Wacquant, L.J.D. (1996) *The purpose of reflexive sociology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977) *Outline of a theory of practice*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Broadbent, D.E (1982) Task combination and skills to the elderly. In: A. Ostrow (ed), *Aging and motor behaviour*. Indianapolis, Benchmark Press, 285-303.
- Callary, B. Werthner, P & Trudel, P. (2011) A brief online survey to help sport organization continue to develop its coach education program. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 31-48.
- Cassidy, T. & Rossi, T. (2006) 'Situated learning: (Re) examining the notion of apprenticeship in coach education', *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 235-246.
- Cassidy, T. Jones, R. & Potrac, P. (2004) *Understanding Sports Coaching: the social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice*. London: Routledge.
- Cassidy, T. & Rossi, T. (2006) Situated Learning - Examining the Notion of Apprenticeship in Coach Education. *Internal Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 235-246.

- Cassidy, T. Potrac, P. & McKenzie, A. (2006a) 'Evaluating and reflecting upon a coach education initiative: The CoDe of Rugby', *The Sports Psychologist*, 145-161.
- Chaiklin, S. (2003) Zone of Proximal Development in Vygotsky's Analysis of Learning and Instruction. In: Kozulin, A. Gindis, B. Ageyev, S & Miller, S. *Vygotsky's Educational Theory in Cultural Context*. London: Routledge, 39-44.
- Charmaz, K. (2006) *Constructing grounded theory: a practical guide through qualitative analysis* (London, Sage).
- Chesterfield, G. Potrac, P & Jones, R. (2010) 'Studentship' and 'impression management' in an advanced soccer coach education award. *Sport, Education and Society*, 299-311.
- Collins, D & Abraham, A. (1998) National Association for Physical Education in Higher Education. *Examining and Extending Research in Coach Development*, 59-79.
- Cote, J. Salmela, J. H. & Russel, S. (1995) The knowledge of high performance gymnastics coaches: methodological framework, *The Sport Psychologist*, 65-75.
- Crum, B. (1995) 'The urgent need for reflective teaching in physical education', in C. Pare (ed.) *Training of Teachers in Reflective Practice of Physical Education*, Trois-Rivieres, Quebec: Universite du Quebec a Trois Rivieres.
- Culver, D and Trudel, P. (2006) 'Cultivating coaches' communities of practice: Developing the potential for learning through interactions', in R. Jones (ed) *The Sports Coach as educator: RE-conceptualising Sports Coaching*, London: Routledge.
- Cushion, C. (2001) Coaching research and coach education: Do the sum of the parts make the whole? SportaPolis (September). Retrieved from <http://www.sportsmedia.org/Sportpolisnewsletter4.htm>
- Cushion, C. (2011) Coach and athlete learning: a social approach. In: Jones, R.L. Potrac, P. Ronglan, L.T. *The Sociology of sports coaching*. Oxon: Routledge. 116-179.
- Cushion, C.J. (2005) *Coaching Research and Coach Education: Do the Sum of the Parts Equal the Whole?*

- Cushion, J. Armour, K & Jones, R. (2003) Coach Education and Continuing Professional Development: Experience and Learning to Coach. *National Association for Physical Education in Higher Education*, 215-230.
- Davies, S. (2012) Embracing reflective practice. *Education for Primary Care*. 23, 9-12.
- Day, C. (1999) Developing teachers: the challenge of lifelong learning (London, Falmer Press).
- Demers, G. Woodburn, A. & Savard, C. (2006) The development of an undergraduate competency-based coach education program. *The Sport Psychologist*, 162-173.
- Denzin, N. K. & Lincoln, Y S. (1994) Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research, *Handbook of qualitative research* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Dewey, J. (1910) *How We Think*, Boston: Heath
- Douge, B., & Hastie, P. (1993) Coach effectiveness. *Sport Science Review*, 14-29.
- Ennis, C.D. (1994) *Knowledge and beliefs underlying curricular expertise*. *Quest*, 164-175.
- Erickson, K. Bruner, M, W. MacDonald, D, J. & Cote, J. (2008) Gaining insight into Actual and Preferred Sources of Knowledge. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*.
- Fernandez-Balboa, J. (1997a) *Knowledge base in physical education teacher education*. A proposal for a new era. *Quest*, 161-181.
- Fox, S. (2006) *'Inquiries of every imaginable kind'* ethnomethodology, practical action and new socially situated learning theory, 1-20.
- Garet, M. porter, A. Desimone, L. Birman, B. & K, Yoon. (2001) What Makes Professional Development effective? *American Education Research Journal*, 915-945.
- Gilbert, W. & Trudel, P. (1999) An evaluation strategy for coach education programmes, *Journal of Sport Behaviour*, 234-250.
- Gilbert, W. & Trudel, P. (2001). Learning to coach through experience: Reflection in model youth sport coaches. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 16-34.
- Gilbert, W. & Trudel, P. (2005) Physical Educator. Learning to coach through experience: Conditions that Influence Reflection.
- Gilbert, W. (2009) Formal vs. Informal Coach Education. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 335-337.

- Gould, D. Gianinni, J. Krane, V. & Hodge, K. (1990) Educational needs of elite U.S. national Pan American and Olympic coaches, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*.
- Graber, K. (1991) Studentship in pre-service teacher education: a qualitative study of undergraduate students in physical education, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 41-51.
- Greenwood, D & Levin, M. (2003) Reconstructing the relationship between universities and society through action research, in: N. Dezin & Y. Lincon (Eds). *The landscape of qualitative research: theories and issues*. Thousand Oaks, Sage, 131-166.
- Guba, E.G. (1981) Criteria for assessing trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries, *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 75-91.
- Gummerson, T. (1992). Sports coaching and teaching. London: A & C Black Gilbert, W. & Trudel, P. (1999) An Evaluation Strategy for Coach Education Programs. *Journal of Sporting Behaviour*. University of Ottawa, Human Kinetics.
- Hardy, C. & Mawer, M. (1999) *Learning and Teaching in Physical Education*, London: Falmer Press.
- Hardy, C.A., & Mawer, M. (1999). *Learning and teaching in physical education*. London: Falmer.
- Hellison, D. & Templin, T. (1991) *A Reflective Approach to Teaching Physical Education*, Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Howley, A. & Howley, C. B. (1995). The mechanisms of anti-intellectualism in schools. In C. B. Howley, A. Howley, & E. D. Pendarvis (Eds.), *Out of our minds*. New York Teachers College Press, 44-76.
- Jones, R. Armour, K. & Portrac, P. (2004). Sports coaching cultures: From practice to theory: London: Routledge.
- Jones, R. L & Standage, M. (2006) First among equals: shared leadership between universities and society through action research, in: Denzin N. & Lincoln Y. (Ed) *the landscape of qualitative research: theories and issues*. Thousand Oaks, Sage, 131-166.

- Jones, R. L. & Turner, P. (2006) Teaching coaches to coach holistically: the case for a Problem-Based Learning (PBL) approach, *Physical Education and Sports Pedagogy*, 181-202.
- Jones, R. L. (2000) Toward an applied sociology of coaching, in: R. L. Jones & K. M. Armour (Eds) *The sociology of sport in practice: theory and practice* (London, Addison Wesley Longman), 33-43.
- Jones, R. L. Armour, K. M. & Potrac, P. (2004) *Sports Coaching Cultures: From Practice to Theory*. London: Routledge.
- Jones, R. Morgan, K. & Harris, K. (2011) Developing coaching pedagogy: seeking a better integration of theory and practice. *Sport, Education and Society*, 1-17.
- Jones, R.L. (2000). Toward a sociology of coaching. In R.L Jones & K.M Armour (Eds.) *The sociology of sport: Theory and practice* London: Addison Wesley Longman, 33-43.
- Jonker, L. Marije, T. Gemser-Elferink, I. De Roos, M. & Visscher, C (2012) The Role of Reflection in Sport Exercise. *The Sports Psychologist*. Human Kinetics, 224-242.
- Kaminski, T.W. & Pitney, W.A. (2004) Athletic Therapy Today. *Strategies for Establishing Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research*, 26-28
- Kausler, D.H. (1990) *Experimental psychology, cognition and human aging*. London: Springer-Verlag.
- Kemmis, S. & McTaggart, R. (ed) (1992) *The Action Research Planner*, 3. Geelong, Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.
- Kidman, L. (2001) *Developing Decision Makers: An Empowerment Approach to Coaching*, Christchurch, NZ: Innovative Press
- Kirk, D. (1992) 'Physical education, discourse and ideology: Bringing the hidden curriculum into view', *Quest*, 35-36.
- Kyngas H. & Vanhanen L. (1999) *Content analysis (Finnish)*. Hoitotiede
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991) *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Lave, J. (1988). *Cognition in practice: Mind, mathematics and culture in everyday life*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Learning to assist teachers in new settings in new ways. *Harvard Educational Review*,
- Lefrancois, G. (2000) *Theories of Learning*, Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thompson Learning.
- Lincoln, Y.S. (1995) Emerging criteria for quality in qualitative and interpretive research, *Qualitative Inquiry*, 275-289.
- Luikkonen, J. Laasko, L. & Telama, R. (1996) Educational perspectives of youth sport coaches: Analysis of observed coaching behaviours. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 439-453.
- Lyle, J. (2002) *Sports Coaching Concepts: A Framework for Coaches' Behavior*, Routledge, London.
- Lyle, J. Jolly, S & North, J. (2010) The learning formats of coach education materials. *International Journal of Sports Science*, 35-48.
- MacDonald, D. & Tinning, R. (1995) Physical education teacher education and the trend to proletarianisation: A case study. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 98-118.
- Mallett, C. J. Trudel, P. Lyle, J. & Rynne, S. (2009). Formal versus informal coach education. *International Journal of Sport Science & Coaching*, 325-334.
- Martens, R. (1997) Successful coaching Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- McDonald, D. & Tinning, R. (1995) Physical education teacher education and the trend to proletarianisation: A case study. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 98-118.
- McGannon, K.R. and Mauws, M.K. (2000) 'Discursive psychology: An alternative approach for studying adherence to exercise and physical activity', *Quest*, 148-165.
- Merriam, S. B. Caffarella, R. S. & Baumgartner, L. M. (2007). *Learning in adulthood, a comprehensive guide*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Merriam, S.B. (1998) *Qualitative Research and Case Study Applications in Education*, San Francisco: California: Jossey-Bass.
- Morse, J. M. (1994) Emerging from the data: the cognitive processes of analysis in qualitative inquiry, in: J. M. Morse (Ed.) *Critical issues in qualitative research methods*. Newbury Park, CA, Sage, 24-43.
- Mosston, M. & Asworth, S. (2002) *Teaching physical education*. Columbus, OH, Merrill.

- Nelson, L. & Cushion, C. (2006) Reflection in coach education: the case of the national governing body coaching certificate, *The Sport Psychologist*, 174-183.
- Nelson, L. Cushion, C. & Potrac, P. (2006) Formal, Non-Formal and Informal Coach Learning: A Holistic Conceptualisation, *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 223-234.
- Pankhurst, A. (2011) Fit for purpose: *Linking Coach Education and Development to Athlete Development*.
- Patton, M. (1990) *Qualitative research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage Publications.
- Patton, M. (2002) *Qualitative research evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA, Sage.
- Penney, D. (2000) 'Physical education in what and whose interests, in R.L. Jones and K.M. Armour (ed) *Sociology of Sport: Theory and Practice*, London: Longman.
- Piggott, D. (2012) Coaches' experiences of formal coach education: a critical sociological investigation. *Sport, Education and Society*, 535-554.
- Poczwadowski, A. Barott, J. E. & Jowett, S. (2006) Diversifying approaches to research on athlete-coach relationships. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 125-142.
- Potrac, P. Jones, R.L. Brewer, C. Armour, K. & Hoff, J. (2000) Toward a holistic understanding of the coaching process. *Quest*, 186-199.
- Ramaprasad, A. (1983) "On The Definition of Feedback", *Behavioral Science*.
- Richards, L. (2005) *Handling Qualitative Data*, A Practical guide. Sage Publications.
- Robertson, J. (2004) *Coaching leaders: The path to improvement*, 1-13.
- Rowntree, D. (1997) *Making Materials-Based Learning Work*. London. Kogan Page.
- Sabo, D. & Jensen, S.C. (1994) 'Seen but not heard: Images of Black Men in sports media', in M.A Messner and D.F. Sabo (ed) *Sex, Violence and Power in Sports: Rethinking Masculinity*, Freedom, CA: The Crossing Press.
- Schempp, P. (1993) *The nature of knowledge in sport pedagogy*. World University Games Conference, Buffalo, New York.
- Schmidt, R.A. (1988) *Motor control and learning*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

- Schon, D. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner: How professionals think in action*, New York: Basic Books.
- Schostak, J. (2006) *Interviewing and Representation in Qualitative research*. Open University Press.
- Schunk, D. (2004) *Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Towards a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sigelman, C.K & Rider, E.A. (2006) *Life-Span Human Development*, Melbourne: Thomson.
- Singer, R.N. Lidor, R. & Cauraugh, H. (1993) To be aware or not aware? What to think about while learning and performing a motor skill. *The Sport Psychologist*, 19-30.
- Smoll, F. L. & Smith, R. B. (1981) Preparation of youth sport coaches: An educational application of Sports psychology. *The Physical Educator*, 85-94.
- Sparkes, A. C. (1992) the paradigms debate, in: A. C. Sparkes (Ed.) *Research in physical education and sport: exploring alternative visions*. London, The Falmer Press, 9-60.
- Stein, M. Smith, M. & Silver, E. (1999) *The development of professional developers*. The Cambridge Press.
- Steinberg, G & Glass, B. (2001) Can the Five-Step Strategy Enhance the Learning of Motor Skills in Older Adults? *Journal of Aging and Physical Activity*, 1-10.
- Stenhouse, L. (1975) *An Introduction to Curriculum Research and Development*, London: Heinemann.
- Tiffany, M. (2007) Coaches' Preferences for Continuing Coaching Education. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 25-26.
- Tinning, R. (1995) 'We have ways of making you think, or do we? Reflections on "Training" in reflective teaching', in C. Pare (ed) *Training of Teachers in reflective Practice of Physical Education*, Trois-Rivieres, Quebec: Universite du Quebec a Trois Rivieres.
- Trudel, P. & Gilbert, W, D. (2006) Coaching and Coach Education in: Kirk, D. O'Sullivan, M. & McDonald, D. *Handbook of Physical Education*, Sage, London, 516-539.
- Trudel, P. & Gilbert, W. (2004) *Communities of Practice as an Approach to Foster Ice Hockey Coach Development*, in: Pearsall, D. J. & Ashare, A. A. (ed)

- Safety in Ice Hockey: ASTM International, West Conshohocken, Pennsylvania University Press, 167-179.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978) *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard.
- Wenger, E. (1998) *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning and Identity*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. McDermott, R. & Snyder, W. (2002) *Cultivating Communities of Practice: A Guide to Managing Knowledge*, Cambridge, M.A: Harvard University Press.
- Whitmore, R. Chase, S.K. & Mandle, C.L. (2004) Validity in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 522-537.
- Wiersma, L.D. & Sherman, C.P. (2005) Volunteer Youth Sport Coaches' Perspectives of Coaching Education/Certification and Parental Codes of Conduct, *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 324-338.
- Wood, D. Bruner, J. & Ross, G. (1976) The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Child Psychiatry*, 89-100.
- Wood, L.A. and Kroger, R.O. (2000) *Doing Discourse Analysis: Methods for Studying Action in Talk and Text*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Woodman, L. (1993) Coaching: A Science, an art, an emerging profession. *Sports Science Review*, 1-13.
- Wright, T. Trudel P & Culver, D. (2007) Learning how to coach: the different learning situations reported by youth ice hockey coaches. *Physical Education and Sports Pedagogy*, 127-114.
- Lincoln, S. & Guba, G. (1985) *Naturalistic inquiry*, Beverly Hills: Sage.

CHAPTER SIX
APPENDICES

(Appendix A – Participant information sheet)

Study Title: UNDERSTANDING THE USEFULNESS OF COACH EDUCATION AND
THE IMPACT CONTINUED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES HAVE
ON LEARNER COACHES

Participant Information Sheet

Main Investigator: Thomas Lloyd Williams

Email: ST10001659@cardiffmet.ac.uk

Contact Number: 07971512158

University: Cardiff Metropolitan

Supervisor: Toby Nichols

Email: tnichols@cardiffmet.ac.uk

University: Cardiff Metropolitan

What is the purpose of the study?

The purpose of this study was to examine the usefulness of coach education programs and CDP among PGA qualified Golf teaching professionals and attempt to further understand how coaches continue to learn whilst establishing barriers to such learning and highlighting coach education areas for possible future developments.

Who is doing this research and why?

This main researcher of this study will be Thomas Lloyd Williams (Undergraduate student). This study is part of a student research project supported by Cardiff Metropolitan University.

Once I take part, can I change my mind?

Yes! After you have read this information and asked any questions you may have we will ask you to complete an Informed Consent Form, however if at any time, before, during or after the sessions you wish to withdraw from the study please just contact the main investigator. You can withdraw at any time, for any reason and you will not be asked to explain your reasons for withdrawing.

How long will it take?

The interview session should take around 45 minutes in duration.

What will I be asked to do?

You will be required to honestly answer various questions on topics such as program structure, personal learning and content. The interview will be audio taped and subsequently transcribed to make the results tangibly usable.

What am I getting out of participating in the study?

The interview undoubtedly has the capacity to refresh your memory of what you learnt when qualifying as a professional golf tutor. The interview should give you an appreciation of your own coaching methods and encourage you to think critically about said methods.

What personal information will be required from me?

Length of time as a golf teaching professional, time since qualification from the course and hours actively engaged in coaching per week.

Are there any risks in participating?

No, participant identities in this study are protected and will be labelled in the discussion/results section under a completely different name to remain anonymous.

Will my taking part in this study be kept confidential?

Yes, the results of the interview will be strictly confidential. Only the main investigator and supervisor will have access to the results and will be stored securely on the University computer system.

What will happen to the results of the study?

Audio recordings will be transcribed to analyse the data and alternative names will be used.

I have some more questions who should I contact?

Should you have any questions regarding the study, contact the main investigator (Thomas Lloyd Williams).

What if I am not happy with how the research was conducted?

If you are not happy with how the research was conducted, please contact Professor Scott Fleming (Cardiff School of Sport) or the main investigator.

(Appendix B – Informed consent form)

**CARDIFF METROPOLITAN
INFORMED CONSENT FORM**

Title of Project: UNDERSTANDING THE USEFULNESS OF COACH EDUCATION
AND THE IMPACT CONTINUED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES
HAVE ON LEARNER COACHES

Name of Researcher: Thomas Lloyd Williams

Participant to complete this section: Please initial each box.

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet dated 01/01/13 for this evaluation study. I have had the opportunity to consider the information, ask questions and have had these answered satisfactorily.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that it is possible to stop taking part at any time, without giving a reason.

3. I also understand that if this happens, our relationships with the Cardiff Metropolitan University or our legal rights will not be affected.

4. I understand that information from the study may be used for reporting purposes, but I will not be identified.

5. I agree to take part in this study on the post PGA foundation and CPD programme.



Name of Participant

Signature of Participant
Date

Name of person taking consent
Date

Signature of person taking consent

(Appendix C - Interview guide)

Tom Williams
Interview Guide

Reminder: Please answer the following questions in full, honestly, openly and in as much depth as possible. The more honesty and depth your answers hold the more beneficial and informed my study will be. These questions are designed to develop an increased understanding and appreciation of your own learning as a coach, so please doesn't just tell me what you think I want to hear, because it's probably not. All of your answers are confidential and will not be used for any other purpose than to inform my study. If you would like a break, or to stop the interview at any time you are perfectly within your rights to do that.

Intro –

1. Talk to me about your journey or experiences that lead you into becoming a Golf professional?
Player
 - *Achievements*
 - *Swing/ Handicap*
 - *Highs and lows*
 - *Areas of concentration?*

2. The terms 'Teacher' and 'Coach' are often used interchangeably within sports coaching. Would you say you were more of a teacher or more of a coach or does it tend to change?
 - *Why?*
 - *Remind – No correct answer, matter of opinion.*

3. Can you tell me about your own teaching or coaching philosophy?
 - *By philosophy I mean your general approach to the way you do something. Usually influenced by values and beliefs.*
 - *How you think?*

4. So you've now completed the PGA qualification, how much teaching/coaching experience did you have prior to that if any?
 - *Hours per week?*
 - *Voluntary or paid?*

5. Can you describe to me your general thoughts and feelings about the PGA qualification; overall was it a positive or negative experience for yourself and why that was?
 - *Positive or negative?*
 - *WHY?*

6. What would you say that you learnt or took from the program that you really applied into your coaching?
 - *key messages*
 - *Key themes*

7. To what extent do you still desire to teach golf professionally **now**, maybe in relation to when you started the course?
 - *Feelings*
 - *Vocation?*
 - *Is it now more of a job?*

Coach Education –

1. A message often received from coaches is that on education courses, sometimes officials try and 'coax' participants into thinking that there is a set way or method of coaching (If that makes sense). How do you feel about that comment? Would this be correct? Explain your answer...
 - *Force?*

2. Talk to me about any opportunities you had to share your coaching experiences with peers via face-to-face interaction or group discussion?
 - *Beneficial to your learning experience*
 - *Enough??*

3. Can you talk to me about some of the main concepts they brought forward as being important in what you do, within the program?
 - *Time spent on understanding 'coaching' techniques?*

4. Style is something personal; tell me about your 'style' in coaching?
 - *How you think you come across?*
 - *Friendly*
 - *Calm*
 - *Direct*
 - *Demanding*

5. How or why do you think you've come to adopt this 'style' of coaching?
 - *Experiences (developed through time)?*

- *Way you've been taught?*
 - *Your philosophy and personality?*
6. Can you talk to me about how your coaching has changed or adapted over time since qualifying as a teaching professional?
 - *Has an area become more 'rounded off'?*
 7. It is widely accepted that coaches enter the course with a 'set of pre-existing beliefs', or how you think you should coach regarding your own views on coaching. Would you say these remained the same, changed a little or changed a lot after completing the course?
 8. So we've talked a lot thus far about your coaching style and philosophy. Talk to me about anything you think I've missed or anything you would like to highlight further?

Learning

Reflection

- Reflection in-action... Thinking about something even while doing it Eg: In a session, changing a drill or practice routine because it might not be working
 - Reflection on-action... Within the action present but not within the midst of the activity Eg: Between coaching session
1. Reflecting upon your own performance can be quite a difficult and challenging process, talk to me about any types of reflection strategies you might use in your coaching, as complex or basic they might be?
 - *Further your learning?*
 - *Told about its benefits?*
 - *Frequency? Do you reflect after each session?*
 - *Reminder – In or On action?*
 2. How do you react if I say to you that thinking too much about something can interfere with the 'doing' part or the flow of action within a session?
 - *What are your thoughts?*
 - *Multi-tasking, challenging?*

(For example, a golf coach might suggest that a player change his or her grip on the club. Here, it is reasonable to expect that there would be a loss of flow until the player has become accustomed to the new grip)

 - *Overanalyse?*
 - *Changing things too much?*

3. Okay so, think about the time you spend on the PGA course (use hands), then think about the time you've spent in the coaching environment after qualifying as a pro (use hands), talk to me about the amount and value of what you've learnt 'on-the-job' professionally coaching after you've sort of left the course behind?
4. Authors have proposed that learning occurs via two different mechanisms; Acquisition (Formal) and Participation (Informal). Which one would you say you favour or favoured regarding *your own* learning and why?
 - *Acquisition is through a teacher to the student*
 - *Participation is active engagement in the coaching environment*
5. Would you say you might tend to use '*Retrospective reflection*' more frequently than other reflective techniques?
 - *Outside the action-present*
 - *Outside of a session, where the coach can no longer affect athlete. Most commonly used?*
 - *After session (Re-thinking)*

COP

1. Talk to me about the use of any opportunities to share your coaching experiences with peers or colleagues in the professional environment?
 - *Eg: Pro Shop*
 - *Beneficial to your learning experience*
 - *Enough??*

Scenarios (2 & 3)

2. Can you tell me how your coaching style might change when you are coaching two individuals one both ends of the experience and ability continuum?
 - *Knowledge*
 - *Dealing with?*
3. Can you tell me how your coaching style might change when you are coaching an individual as oppose to a group session?
 - *Less dominant?*
 - *Guided discovery?*
4. During the course you may have been introduced to certain theories or methods about HOW to coach or teach someone, can you give me an example of where you've transferred a theory or method explained on the course into your coaching?
 - *Did it work for you? Were you convinced?*

- *Problems encountered?*
- *Overcoming obstacles?*

CPD

5. Talk to me about the level of continued support you received from the course?
Did it do what you wanted it to?
 - *On-going assessment?*
 - *Additional work?*
 - *Enough?*
6. Talk to me about any competitive coaching situations in the course and how it applied to your learning...
 - *Did it create a greater rapport with peers or increase group tension?*
 - *Would you have preferred more or less?*
7. Talk to me about how you feel if I said to you that much of coaching is about shaping what knowledge you've acquired or what you already know? Or do you feel that you've not really got much more to learn as a coach?
8. Tell me about or describe to me how you personally might go about dealing with mistakes or negative processes during a coaching session...
 - *Eg: Not understanding concept*
 - *Re-describe, Re-enforce?*
9. So we've now talked a lot about your learning and what that looks like in the coaching environment. Is there anything you think I've not covered or you want to highlight or discuss further?

(Appendix D - Example Transcript - Participant 1)

TOM WILLIAMS
INTERVIEW WITH
PARTICIPANT 1

UNDERSTANDING THE USEFULNESS OF COACH EDUCATION AND THE
IMPACT CONTINUED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES HAVE ON
LEARNER COACHES

Interviewer: Just a brief reminder to start off with; please answer the questions fully and honestly and openly and in as much depth as possible. The more honestly and openly you answer the more beneficial it will be and the more informed my study will be. The questions are designed to assist and develop my understanding and appreciation of your own learning as a coach; so please don't tell me what you think I want to hear, because that's not the answer I want to hear anyway! All your answers are confidential and if you want a break, or to stop the interview at any time, you appreciate you have the right to do that.

Q: Could you tell me a little bit about your journey and the experiences which led to your becoming a golf professional?

A: Yes, I started playing when I was 8 years old. My father gave a little cut down 5-iron golf club and encouraged me to have a go at that. I was pretty good from the off, I could hit it, so I played throughout my youth. Going to school, I did A Levels, went through that period and went to university to do a Business Studies degree. I didn't really like it, I didn't really know what I wanted to do, like most people did, so I came back and started playing golf. Then I got quite good really really quickly at it and thought "I want to do this for a living." So then I got a job as a training professional, signed the PGA papers and went on from there. That's my journey into it. (1 minute 37 seconds)

Q: What are your achievements to date? Obviously you're a PGA pro, but is there anything additional to that? Any tournaments or ... ?

A: No, I'm very much a teaching professional. I don't get all that much time to play. (1.50)

Q: *What handicap did you eventually get down to?*

A: I got down to 4 and I got down from 8 to 4 in about two months, so that was a really significant drop. As soon as I got to 4 I got the job. So then I signed my papers, so it was quite a rushed thing from coming back from university. (2.10)

Q: *But you knew it was something you really wanted to do?*

A: Yes, I was pretty good. I was off 8 and then I think it was about 2 months, I just practiced and played, I practiced every day, worked on my swing a lot, and then the job came up as soon as I dropped my handicap. So then it was straight into the job; straight into the papers, so that was a really short turnaround, from worrying what I was going to do, thinking "Blood 'ell! What am I going to do with my life?" Then it all happened really, really quickly. (2.39)

Q: *The terms "teacher" and "coach" are often used interchangeably in coaching sports. There's no right or wrong answer to this, but would you say you're more a teacher or more a coach? Or maybe you're both at the same time?*

A: I'd say I'm a lot of things. I'm definitely a teacher and definitely a coach. You're a psychiatrist, you're so many things, you're a friend, you have to be very open to creating a personal communication with them and trust as well, between you, because if they don't trust you, you can't teach them. You can't coach them. You can't educate them. (3.16)

Q: *Would you say that trust is a bigger part?*

A: Trust is an issue without a shadow of doubt, it's getting the person comfortable and also to understand – I think understanding why is the most important thing when you're teaching somebody. You can't just say to somebody "Do that!" (3.350)

Q: *Because they don't understand it...*

A: You can say that to children, if you say "Do that!" they say "OK." But if you say "You need to do this." To an adult, they'll say "OK, why? Why can't I do it my way?" so understanding what's wrong and why it's not helping their golf game and things like that, at the last lesson I spoke for half of it about mental approach, because you get to know your clients quite well and become friends with them as well, and you can see when somebody's got good technique – there's a fine balance in golf between really good technique and the correct mental approach to it, because it's very, very much a mental game. (4.18)

Q: *Could you talk briefly a little bit about your own coaching philosophy, the values you have which you put into most of the coaching sessions you do. The things you bring into every session.*

A: In every session the most important thing at the start is enthusiasm, making the person feel comfortable, making them feel happy and relaxed is very important and probably the most important thing in a session whenever you're trying to get somebody to do something, is that they relax. My coaching philosophy is a technical one, making them understand what a golf swing is; because most people don't understand what a golf swing is. Then you explain it very simply, no jargon. Jargon's for professionals. Use simple words, lots of visual video analysis, lots of feedback. My teaching philosophy is show them 7 key positions, which you then get them to hold at 10-second intervals, making sure they're perfect and always ask them the question in between, are they comfortable and also make sure they breathe! You find that people hold their breath a lot when they're learning something. (5.40)

Q: *How much coaching experience did you have prior to PGA qualification, if you had any?*

A: Not really any. I had a little bit when I was younger; not much at all. (6.00)

Q: *Could you tell me about your overall thoughts and feelings about PGA qualification. Was it a positive or a negative experience for you and why that might be?*

A: It was a really good experience. They give you a licence to teach. You've got to love it, because the qualification is now world-wide, so it's a great organisation, which means that if you say to somebody "I'm a PGA professional" that stands for something. So it's like a badge of honour, almost, that you have to go through the qualification. (6.40)

Q: *What would you say you've learned, mainly, what you took from that, the key lesson and the key themes they wanted to get through to you?*

A: I think professionalism at all times; courtesy, just really things which are associated with golf. For example, if you're teaching a child to play golf it's a great thing for a young child to come into the game, because it'll teach them good manners, how to act, how to be decent people as well, so very much those sort of things, which I had anyway. I went to public school as well, so that was always instilled into me. Public speaking was always instilled into me and those things as well, which has obviously helped me, talking to people as well. With regards to the PGA training, there are different departments which are very important. There's the Teaching Departments, they also adapt quite a lot as well, so the training programme now has changed from when I went through it. It's changed from when my boss at the time went through it as well. For example, in the playing lesson you have to do after the examination, you would teach a professional. They changed that, which I thought was a really good idea. They put an advert in the local paper and got people from all over the area just to come for free golf lessons. So that was a great thing, to have free golf lessons for some man or woman, or a junior. (8.05)

Q: *So they changed that over time? They haven't just stuck to one format?*

A: They're very adaptable, they're always looking for ways to try to change the way it's done. You wouldn't say they do it "This is it! We do it this way! That's it!" They're not like that at all, they will evolve, they're always evolving. (8.25)

Q: *So they didn't try to coax you into believing there was a single right way to coach?*

A: Yes and no. There are a lot of basics which are instilled in you when you go through the training. You have to have set up. The key words for PGA teaching are: Explanation; Demonstration; Application. So explanation of what they want to be changing. You need to demonstrate what they're doing and what they're doing wrong, and how you want them to do it. Then you apply it to them. So it's very much that sort of process which has stuck with coaching. The names of how to hold the golf club, aim, hold stance, ball position, posture and body alignment. Take away wrist hinge, rotation, magic movement? (guess) transition, impact, extension and follow-through. These are positions which are key to how they're taught. Mentality now is brought into it, we had psychology classes when I was doing it, we had about the mental game, course management, rules, business management, repairs – in fact the repairs guys were awesome they were two really awesome guys. (9.44)

Q: To what extent do you still desire to teach golf professionally now in relation to before the PGA programme? Before it and now, can you remember the feelings you had? Obviously you wanted to do it beforehand, but in relation to now do you still have the same feelings –“This is what I'm meant to do.”

A: Yes, I feel it's what I'm meant to do, definitely. I'm good at it, your teaching style will evolve, you'll know what works and what doesn't. When you first start out it's very much trial and error, because you're trying to get somebody to do something which is in your head. It's difficult. But then the more you learn ... so my development has probably been more through teaching people, experience studying, and I learned from a 70-year-old the other day. He said something and I thought “That's brilliant! I'm nicking that. That's perfect!” The way he said it, I just loved it, so you've got to be open, because the way you think isn't the same way somebody else thinks, so you have to have all these mind-sets when you teach somebody, pull this one, pull that one ... and you think well, “OK, he's not quite doing what I'm saying. I said this to this guy; that nailed it for him. Let's hit back, let's see if he responds better to this.” You say the same thing in a different way and they get that, that way as well.

Q: Within the programme now, did you have any opportunities to share your coaching experiences with peers, face to face, interaction with them or anything like that? Where you could learn off other people and they could learn off you?

A: Yes. Not really, when you're going through training, it's very much classroom-based, there are master professionals down there who will get you in a group, but it's more of a discussion-based thing. (11.45)

Q: *Would you personally prefer those formal methods or would you prefer informal, getting out there in the environment?*

A: I remember a master professional teaching and I asked him "Do I have to teach the hold like this? It's the PGA way and you have to memorise it?" I could probably still recite it for you – on how to teach the whole of the PGA Manual – it's changed a little bit, but as I said, I have no idea now, because it's still evolving. That's quite good. But I asked him "Do I have to teach like this?" "No, just teach like this here and then you'll find your own methods." So it's a really good basis, a platform of what's important and not important; then you build your own teaching style from there. (12.38)

Q: *Would you say your coaching has become more rounded off and shaped since qualifying and getting out and doing your own teaching. Do you think it's become more "rounded off"?*

A: More efficient, yes. (12.58)

Q: *So you can do things more efficiently because of your experience?*

A: Yes, definitely. You start off and I wouldn't say I've ever given a bad lesson or bad information, because I haven't, but you get better at putting the information across; your knowledge increases as well. So what I know now, and what I knew then, are totally differently. There's a huge different. That's like anything, it's just experience. I'm a better driver now than I was then because I've driven every day. I'm a better public speaker because I talk to people every day. That's just life. So the more you do something the better you get at it, yes. (13.40)

Q: *It's accepted that the coaches enter the course with a set of pre-existing beliefs of how ... you go onto the course with your own beliefs about how to teach*

people. Would you say they've remained the same, changed a bit or changed a lot after completing the course?

A: I'd say my beliefs now are different, they've changed quite a lot, because you come out of the PGA training course and you're excited, you've got this qualification, you've worked 3 years to get it and then you think "OK, I'm on my way now!" Then you start teaching and you only learn from your mistakes, because you're trying to tell somebody to do something, but you can see they're not doing it, and you've got to be so patient as well, you've got to be very honest with them too, that's one of my big things – honesty. So I will never say to somebody "You're doing it correctly." When they're not. That's when they'll go away and end up doing something wrong but you have to be very diplomatic about how you say that. You have to say NOT "You're not doing that ..." and "What were your thought processes then? What were you thinking?" You've just spent the last 10 – 15 minutes telling them what to think, and you ask them "What are you thinking?" and they say "I dunno!" So you say "We need to switch on here and start again." (15.03)

Q: So it's how you interact with people?

A: Yes, definitely, that's changed massively. You could almost say that when you start you're scared to criticise. You're thinking "Oh God, I need to criticise, but I need to do it in a way ... oh, what shall I say?" You just get really good at criticising people in a very nice way, in a very accepting way and they appreciate that as well. That you're honest to them as well. So that's changed a lot. The golf swing philosophy is – little things that have changed here and there, what's important, what's not important, the imagery of the golf swing I have now is a million times better than when I first came out. (15.43)

Q: The imagery as a process isn't really important?

A: Yes, definitely, without a shadow of doubt, both coach and player, so when you look at a golf swing you can almost see everything but not really look at anything. You can almost look through it and just see the swing and see what's going on. There's a picture in your head. That's how I teach, anyway, you can see it in one swing most of the time as well. You just need to get them to hit a few shots to see if it's consistently wrong. But the imagery of what the golf swing is, in my head, is what's valuable to me. That's what I pass on to people, and to get them to

visualise the golf swing. Most changes are made ... people are also very unaware of how to practice and how to change. It's not really repairing, it's a visualisation change, it's a thought process change; it's a perfect practice change, an understanding of what you're trying to do, visualising what you're trying to do, understanding and visualising what you do wrong and what it looks like and just basically visualisation skills are huge in golf. Huge. Playing as well, you stand behind a shot you've got to visualise it, but also when you want to make a change you have to visualise it as well. (17.10)

Q: Could we talk about reflection. Reflection is known to be a very difficult and challenging process for anyone. Are there any reflection strategies which you use in your coaching, complex or really simple, which might be during your lessons or after the lessons, or the week after when you think about it? Any reflections you use at all? Reflection in action, while they're hitting balls – you think “Should I change this?” rather than going in and changing things; or reflecting on it so after they've gone away...

A: During the lesson you definitely need to reflect, video analysis helps massively with that. So there will be a time where they've worked, and you take a picture at the start, you then improve. Then, talking about visualisation, the visualisation and reflection are quite close – so then we show them and you reflect on the changes and how you've made it, and they can see the images and so they can process them, they can go away and visualise that as well. With regards to ... at the end of the lesson you always reflect on what went on. You always recap, you always think “OK, right. This is what we did today. We need to get these key points really clear in your mind, so that when you go away you can remember what we worked on; you'll remember how to make the changes. What I need you to do between lessons, how you need to think when you're making the changes – all these different things.” Away from lessons, when I'm not in front of them, yes, you recall lessons, they'll pop into your head and ... (19.03)

Q: Do you ever think “This was good but maybe next time I should do this with him.”? Are there any times when that happens?

A: I wouldn't say that next time, you do think about people's golf swing and you do think about “He's getting it, but he's...” You get stubborn golfers, for example yesterday, this guy's been having lessons, he's been with another pro for about two years and he's got a decent swing, he's got loads of good things in there. But he makes a vicious over-the-top move, his right shoulder rolls out, his right arm

straightens far too early, it's bad from there on his downswing, so he needs to drop it back onto the plain on the downswing on the slot or the transition. Five sentences, a bit of an explanation; showed him – changed! Like that! So he just takes on board, brilliantly, what's said to him. So he just changed like that. But then you get somebody else who you think "Well, why can that guy change and why can't he change?" So then you think "OK, maybe it's me and the way I'm explaining it." So you know this is when I'm talking about calling on experience of getting one person to change like that and then you get somebody stubborn not changing and that's just the resistance in them. You can tell somebody to hold the golf club more loosely a million times, and the only time they'll do it is when **they tell themselves** to do it. So you've got to make them aware of this as well. I say that's one of my speeches, just call loads of different speeches, that's one of the ways I use. Away from lessons, then you make up drills, loads of drills. I probably make up five drills a week. It's my job, I think about it all the time, I constantly think about the golf swing as well. I wouldn't say it's as if I go home and say to my wife "Hang on love. I'm thinking."! But it does pop into your head a lot and you'll come up with these clever little drills, "Wow, that's good!" then you can make like... rotation to classes, to passing someone a cup of coffee. Let's have a nice level rotation, you can think about the top of the backswing like leaning over a fence; wiping the mirror with a hanky in your back pocket – millions of them! Those are some of the things you've learned from other pros as well, some you make up yourself as well, so there's a lot of reflection on "How can I be a better teacher?" That's really the process of getting better; never settling, never thinking you're a good teacher. I know I'm a good teacher, am I a great teacher? If you ask me the same question in another 40 years, as a teacher who taught every day, I'd give you the same teacher. "I won't say I'm a great teacher. I'm a good teacher, I can always get better." (21.55)

Q: How would you react if I said to you that thinking too much about something can interfere with the "doing" part of it? The flow in action, of what you're doing?

A: You have very much the process. So, you start off with someone who wants to play golf. Their unconscious incompetence is bliss. They don't know what they're doing, so they're totally unaware that they're rubbish! Then they want to get better, so then they start thinking "OK, I'm doing things wrong here." But their first few shots, though, were bliss! Just trying to hit the ball. Then they can't do it, then they become conscious of how incompetent they are. Then they call someone like a PGA pro, and they come along and get it pointed out in the first couple of lessons and become very conscious of their incompetence. Then what happens is that they'll move up a stage and then they'll become conscious of their mistakes and they'll be conscious incompetents. Then they'll move up again and the next stage after that is conscious competence. That's bad, to play golf with conscious competence. The

end goal has to be unconscious competence. So it's like learning to play a musical instrument; it'll click. It won't click straight away you can't expect it to. The thing is with golf that you get somebody through the door and you say "OK, I've had two lessons but I can't hit the ball." "Can you play the piano?" "Yes." "How long did it take you to learn the piano?" "About 10 years." "Are you still learning?" "Yes, I'm trying to play this song at the moment I'm not very good at." - It's exactly the same. "Can you speak another language?" The same. (23.34)

Q: We have spoken about this in other questions, have you ever had an experience where you've been able to share your experiences of teaching with another pro? Has that benefited you, do you think or has it hindered you because you thought "His way's better." Or "My ways are better and I don't want to tell him in case he uses them?" Do you know what I mean?

A: No, I don't think that. I think we should help each other. I have another business which is selling websites to golf professionals and it has an online academy, so I'm trying in a way to push my philosophy onto other pros as well. But then, I'm not saying that the way I do it is correct; but I have a facility for Website-wise I tell them I'll design them a website for a monthly fee and they'll have a recap lesson facility in there. So then they can go away, upload the lesson, which is what I was doing at the start. So basically, this lesson here, which I'm doing – I'm going to upload this so it's paid and you can go home and log on. So it's live, so backswing, then he's working on extension, (No. 6) here now we're wagging the golf club, putting a waggle in and then a little hip turn, and that's position No. 4. So just help him with that, make sure his hand moves slightly forward as he waggles instead of back, the elbow folds in and – there you go – so he's learning the position as a number instead of giving him any jargon. So, that's uploaded to the website, so I'm quite lucky, I speak to a lot of other pros and they use this facility. But we chat, idle chit-chat "Oh, I had a guy the other day ... he was completely pronating his left wrist at impact. It took me all lesson, then he nailed it!" "Oh, what did you say to him?" "Oh, I said this and he just got it." "Ok, that's quite good, I'll nick that." We say the same things to each other. (26.12)

Q: So that benefits all of you?

A: Oh yes, of course! It makes people better at golf and you can't knock it. I'm into sharing. (26.25)

Q: *If I give you a couple of scenarios, and ask how your coaching might change as a result. At one end of the continuum you have someone who's very new to the game, not got a great ability. And at the other end you have someone who's played the game for 10 years, with a low handicap. How would your coaching stance or approach to each player change?*

A: My approach changes with every lesson.

Q: *But in the main, if you had to put it under an umbrella, a few terms ... to each one. Firstly let's talk about the beginner. If you were going to go in to them, what would be your main approach or your main stance to them?*

A: I know what you mean, what are the main things I'm going to instil in him, but people are people. You have to teach them as a person, there's no way you can generalise. I don't know how I'm going to teach a person until I've started speaking to them. You can't go in there like that, otherwise you will end up giving a bad lesson. The basics in a beginner and the basics in the good player, aim, hold stance, ball position, posture and body alignment, those things need to be right. Usually the beginner doesn't know them. The good player does know them but is making a very silly mistake, and a lot of the time with a good player, it's something very, very simple. But the way you actually put the message across? No idea until I actually start speaking to them. (28.06)

Q: *During the course you might have been introduced to certain theories or methods about how to teach or coach someone. Could you give me just a brief example of how you've transferred that theory or method explained on the course, into your coaching?*

A: Again, I'd say – the PGA way, you go with that blueprint, and that's what it is, they tell you it's a blueprint, and they're smart enough to know that the more you teach the better you're going to get at something; you're going to find different ways of doing things. But again it's a difficult question to answer. (29.05)

Q: *There might have been different sections, they might not have said, or they might just have been making you aware and if that's the case, that's fine.*

A: It's more like, really with the regards to the message you put across, from the PGA years, this is what we want you to be, and really it's just good manners. It's just things like that, it evolves the way you teach. I used to teach somebody to hold the golf club in great detail; now I trick them into holding it correctly and that's important. For example, I teach somebody how to hold a golf club by carrying a basket of balls. I can trick them into doing it. "Just carry that for a moment. Hang on let me just move that out of the way and put the golf club in there. OK. You've actually put it in the right place" because one of the things I do, I do a lot of drills now with the club the other way round, to de-weight it, so that people are more comfortable in the position. If you hold something thinner, naturally you have a better hold on it. When the grip gets big, then they're naturally there ... If you take the right hand out of the equation as well, the dominant hand, and just get them to hold it with the left hand, it's like a trick, but there's no way I'd have found this out by teaching first of all. I still can't tell you how I actually figured that out! It just happened. (30.22)-

Q: Could you talk to me a little bit about the level of support the course has given you? After you've qualified is there any on-going assessment or additional work you have to carry out?

A: There isn't no, but they are very productive. I know I should do more of it but money-wise and time-wise I'm restricted. – CPD – continued professional development – there are points and the more points you get the more you can go up the ladder. Yes, I'd like to do more but with some of these courses you stay away from work, I can't afford to do that. Some of them are on line as well. I need to look at that. It's one of those things, I've been meaning to look at it for 6 months. So there are loads of different courses and they have some quite interesting speakers who you can go and listen to, but it's optional. You don't **have** to do that, because you've done your 3-years training... (31.210)

Q: Have you done any of them?

A: I've given a talk, actually. I gave a talk to other professionals and the other professionals there got points, but I didn't get any for doing the talk! I thought I should have got a few, but it was beneficial for me to do the talk. But that was lesson communication, on-line learning and things like that. We also have regions, which is quite good. Our region's ... Graham Mailings, a really nice guy, and there

are loads of tournaments as well. Again, it's things I want to do, but it's just difficult, with time and other commitments etc. (32.08)

Q: Could you describe how you personally would deal with mistakes or negative processes during a session? For example when the person you're coaching isn't quite doing what you ask? You'd tell them but are there any other ways of dealing with that? Would you alter the way you teach them?

A: Yes, I'd covered that in other areas. You come up with about 5 drills a week and each drill is designed for something. It's just pick another drill, try this drill. You can do that, certainly. You need to point it out to them. You don't need to shout at them, you need to ... I said before about a guy where I asked "What did you think?" and he said "I dunno." "Well, that's not very good is it? What have I been saying for the last 20 minutes?" You try to brainwash somebody as well, you say the same things again, so you explain to them what they're doing wrong and then you almost try to hypnotise them. In the last lesson I was saying "Waggle." OK. "Hip." OK. "4" That's what he's doing. Now that makes sense to you but that doesn't make perfect sense to him, so what he's doing is, he's setting his wrist, or creating lag in his golf swing. Then he's turning his left hip and playing his left hip. He's learning the position just prior to hitting the ball, which we call 4. So he's doing the drill to get into that. He has to make sure he has the key point on when he goes to waggle the club that the left hand does not move back, it's actually goes forward a little bit, keeping the left arm straight. I'm giving him feel as well. (34.05)

Q: Would you re-describe or re-demonstrate it to him?

A: Yes, you'd demonstrate, you'd explain again, you'd demonstrate, you'd ask "Do you not understand anything? Do you know what you're doing? OK." Again the problem is the application of the person's mind, because that's the hardest thing to teach. Controlling somebody's mind. If you have somebody saying "No." in their head, there's nothing you can say. You have to break down that barrier and you have to get through that before they can actually change, and that's why I'm saying I don't know how I'm going to teach somebody until I meet them. (334.350)

Q: Does the programme teach you how to do that or does it ...?

A: It's life, isn't it?

Q: *But did they not say to you "Look, this is what you're going to encounter. This is the way to get across to them."? Was it go out and just learn as you go along?*

A: We had professionals teaching us some of whom had 20 or 30 years' experience, and we'd ask them questions and they'd help, but nothing can truly prepare you for getting into a person's mind, because that's the hardest part about teaching somebody. It's trying to educate them, trying to get them to think clearly. "What were you thinking?" (35.18)

Q: *So in that respect you're a teacher but at the same time you're teaching a bio-mechanical swing, that you're the coach then. It's a very fine line, isn't it?*

A: Yes, as I said, then you may get a response "What are you thinking?" "Oh I know, I'm sorry, this happened before I came out ..." and you may even say then "Well, what are you doing here then? Bloody 'ell, let's stop now. Put it away for another day. You go and do that." Then they'll have a chat about it and then you become a psychologist for 10 minutes or you may ... for example, I had a lesson, the lady came through the door. I know her really, really well. She's gone from a pretty terrible golf swing to a **beautiful** looking golf swing. I've been telling her all the time "You've got one of the best swings at club" (I never lie, so if it's rubbish, I say to people "I'll never lie to you," you have to have that honesty. "I'm not going to shout at you. I'll shout at you in a nice way." That's also quite a good skillset to have as well, to be very negative to somebody but also encouraging in the same process. I'm quite good at that. That wasn't always easy, because I started thinking "Oh, should I say that? He's not going to take it ..." You've got to say it, "You'll get there, you'll get there" Always encouraging at the same time, that's really important) But this lady was panicking and technically there was no reason why she should be hitting bad shots. OK, so she stood there just hitting balls at the start and I'm not saying anything and she's talking and I'm trying to pick up on things like this and she's really quite panicky in her voice. She's hitting a ball and every time she hits the ball she's not getting any better and she's hitting awful shots. Swing-wise, obviously there's something wrong, but you can see swing, after swing, after swing, like that, it's good enough to work, so the engine behind that golf swing, which is the mind, is totally out. So the swing has nothing technically wrong with it – OK, I can pick 15 faults if you want me to – but these are faults that can give you more distance; more accuracy. These are not faults which will make you miss the ball, like you are doing. So the engine, the mind isn't right. So I'm talking to her, trying to find

out what was going on and finally I found out that she was playing in her first competition **ever** in about 3 days' time. She was totally panicking about it. (38.00)

Q: So it was more that you were trying to get into her head as opposed to just changing her swing.

A: Yes, she didn't need the lesson, she didn't need to change her swing. She definitely needed her confidence reinforced, yes, and it took me 40 minutes to actually figure out. "What's going on, there's something going wrong. Technically that should work. What's going on in your head? Is there anything else? What's happening, is there anything? Why are you panicking?" "No, I'm all right!" Then finally, realised, she said and it was "Oh, so there it is! Bloody 'ell!" you've got to be so nervous, I can help you, now I know what I need to know to teach her. It took me 40 minutes to find out. I finally calmed her down and she started hitting the ball again. She won! She won the cup! I got a text "Won it!" Then she won the one after that as well, then she came second in the one after that, so her first three competitions she won the first 2 and came second in the third. Then she went a little bit rubbish again. Because mentally she thinks she's going down. But you can't tell them all "You've got the best swing in the ladies' section in the club. IT's going to be awesome!" "No, it's not! No! No it's not, no it's not!!" So it's finally breaking that down, that's the hardest thing to do. (39.12)

Q: I've got some cracking information there. Thank you very much for your time.

A: Not a problem. (39.20)

Q: That's the end of the interview.

Ends: 39 minutes 23 seconds

(Appendix E – Example of Interview matrices)

	<i>'Teacher' or 'Coach'?</i>	<i>Reflection strategies used?</i>	<i>Thoughts on too much thinking interfering with 'doing', or flow of action?</i>	<i>Value to time spent on the job?</i>	<i>Formal or Informal preference for own learning?</i>
RJ	“Definitely a teacher and definitely a coach, you’re also a psychiatrist, you’re a friend, you’re many different things”.	“I always recap. What I need to do between lessons”. – “I make up drills between lessons. Away from lessons I always think about the golf swing, it’s my job”. – “How can I be a better teacher?”	“Unconscious incompetence is bliss, conscious competence is bad, and the end goal is unconscious competence”. – “It won’t ‘click’ straight away, you can’t expect it to”.	“Style has evolved; my development has probably been more through teaching people”. – “You’ve got to be open”.	Question not asked.
IR	“Teacher and a coach are similar but different; teaching someone fundamentals and understanding, then coaching someone how to do it”. – “Depends very much on individual which stance you take”.	“Only way to get better is feedback, how else are you going to know what you did wrong and how to improve” (somewhat getting feedback mixed up with reflection)	“Analysis brings paralysis; we have to make sure as coaches we don’t give them too much”. – “Pupils want all info and to do everything at once, which brings challenge of condensing down to one or two thoughts”	“Great value on the job, because as you learn more and understand more you become a better coach”.	“Informal always, I’ll do a minimal amount inside then get them outside”.
CB	“Overall, more of a coach, because you take more of a holistic approach to things and it’s not just about the golf swing anymore”.	“Something’s not working, you need to adapt straight away. If it’s not working I’ll try something else until we get the result we want”	“100% agree. We can overcomplicate it and I’ve had a habit of doing that in the past”	“I’ve learnt a lot more since I’ve qualified now”. – “I’ve learnt a lot more doing it myself than what someone could learn from a book”. –	“More hands-on”. – “I think people learn better when they put it into practice”. – “I think you’ve got to be out there

				"It's all experience and putting it into practice"	shadowing somebody"
DR	"Changes depending on pupil". – "Teaching definitely for youngsters and novice beginners, coaching is more for the experienced, better player".	Didn't answer question.	"Yes, certainly you can over-think something". – "There are certain drills where you have no choice but to think about them, but of course that's where the practice comes in because when you're on the golf course you don't want to be thinking". – "You can't be thinking about every individual moment".	(Reacts positively to statement) "You have to learn to adapt to what you've got in front of you, not what the book says"	"Need a certain amount of instruction". – "But it's just about getting out there, I like to get out there and work at something".