Student name: Alex Goldman	***Student ID:*** ST10001674
Programme: SC	

Dissertation title:	An Examination of the Coaching Behaviours of a Semi-Elite / Developmental Cricket Coach
Supervisor:	Kerry Harris

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 findings of previous related research including gaps in the literature and relevant contributions; logical flow to, and clear presentation of the research problem/ question; 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 [2] 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 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.	
	Presentation 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	

---

[1] This form should be used for both quantitative and qualitative dissertations. The descriptors associated with both quantitative and qualitative dissertations should be referred to by both students and markers.
[2] 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.

CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERISTY
Prifysgol Fetropolitan Caerdydd

CARDIFF SCHOOL OF SPORT

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE
(HONOURS)

SPORT COACHING

TITLE:

An Examination of the Coaching Behaviours of a Semi-Elite / Developmental Cricket Coach

(Dissertation submitted under the discipline of)

Sport Coaching

NAME: ALEX GOLDMAN

UNIVERSITY NUMBER: ST10001674

ALEX GOLDMAN

ST10001674

CARDIFF SCHOOL OF SPORT

CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY

AN EXAMINATION OF THE COACHING BEHAVIOURS OF A DEVELOPMENTAL / SEMI-ELITE CRICKET COACH.

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: 11,143

Date: 19/March/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:

<u>Notes:</u>

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

Acknowledgement

Firstly, I would like to thank my dissertation tutor Kerry Harris, for the dedication, continual support and guidance that she has given me during this academic year, whom without I would not have been able to complete this study.

Secondly, I would also like to thank my family for their endless support and care throughout my entire education, especially during my final year.

Thirdly, I would like to thank all participants for their time and allowing the information gathered with from observations and interviews to be used within this study.

Lastly, I would like to thank my friends, at university and at home, for all the laughs which have helped me through the year.

Abstract

In recent years there has been an increase in the number of studies conducted examining coach behaviours, in a variety of sports at an elite level, through the use of systematic observations (Guzmán & Goméz, 2012). Zetou, Ampraisie, Michalopoulou and Aggelousis (2011) explain that it is an important area of coaching science, as coach behaviours can affect the interactions between coach and athlete; although it almost impossible as a coach, to be able to identify and behave in a way in which all athletes will be satisfied. Few existing studies have accounted for the athletes perceptions of the coach behaviours and furthermore, gained an insight as to how the coach behaviours effect the interactions between coach and athlete. The aim of this study sought to extend the existing coach behaviour literature, and to provide an insight of the coach behaviours demonstrated at a semi-elite / developmental cricket club.

The Arizona State University Observation Instrument (A.S.U.O.I) was utilized to gather data of one coach from four training sessions (Lacy & Darst, 1989). Drawing upon the results of the A.S.U.O.I, semi-structured interview guides were developed. The head coach and six athletes were interviewed to gain further information regarding the observed coach behaviours. The interviews were transcribed and interpreted; key themes were then drawn from the transcription and used to identify the coach behaviours demonstrated at a semi-elite level, the coach-athlete interactions and the power relationship between coach and athlete.

The results of the A.S.U.O.I were found to be in accordance with existing literature of coach behaviours examined at an elite level. Categories regarding instruction, praise and silence were found to be the most frequent coach behaviours observed (Potrac *et al.*, 2002; Potrac *et al,* 2007). The interviews however, provided some discrepancy between the coach and the athletes' perspectives for the use of the coach behaviours at a semi-elite level of cricket.

Key Words: *Coach Behaviour, Instruction, Feedback, Praise, Interactions.*

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Introduction

Coaches are central to any sporting team (Cushion & Jones, 2001) as the coach's role is to set the path and quality of individual athletes' experiences. Through the use of terminology, discourse and actions, coaches have influence over athletes' performances, training, and their social and emotional well-being. Therefore, it is recognised that coaches, of any level, should have an understanding of the specific sporting exercise with regards to training, technical knowledge of skills and techniques, to be able to provide feedback, as well as being aware of the athletes' psychological state (Zetou, Amprasi, Michalopoulou & Aggelousis, 2011). Hence, it is vital that coaches create an atmosphere where all of the above can be achieved through the awareness of athletes' desired coach behaviours (Duda, 2001; Duda & Ballaguer, 2007).

The value of coach observation has been recognised many times in recent studies of coaching science (Erickson, 2009). In recent years there has been an increase in the number of researchers investigating coaching behaviours most commonly associated with feedback and leadership, through the use of systematic observations (Guzmán & Goméz, 2012). However, despite the increase and awareness of coach behaviours, little existing research has been conducted with semi-elite and developmental teams or individuals. A significant amount of research suggests that the coaches' behaviour assumes the role of a 'significant other' for athletes and can have an impact on not only performance of the athletes, but also their emotional and psychological state (Horn, 2008; Smoll *et al.,* 1993). Therefore, it is vital that coaches are aware of their behaviours in order to be able to achieve the best performance from athletes. Smoll and Smith's (1989) Cognitive-Meditational Model (CMM) suggests that the way in which a coach behaves towards an athlete effects the way the athlete responds to the coaches' behaviours. Zetou *et al.* (2011) explains that for a coach to achieve the best performance from an athlete, the behaviours of the coach must be those which are most desired by the athletes themselves. However, as discovered by Chelladurai's (2001, 2007) revised Multidimensional Model of Leadership (MML), it is dependent on the characteristics of the individual athlete as to which coaching behaviours athletes prefer, as this can determine the interactions and therefore the

relationship between the coach and athlete. Longueville *et al.* (1998) study concluded that there was often a mismatch between the coach and the athletes perceive of the effectiveness of coach-athlete interactions. This creates a dilemma for the coach as to which behaviours would be most effective to use in order to create a positive interaction between themselves and their athletes. However, many coaches may not be consciously aware of the behaviours they express during interactions with athletes, such as giving an athlete instruction or feedback.

Feedback and instruction are often closely associated with coach behaviours and also as one of the fundamental tools that a coach or teacher should possess (Lee, Keh & Magil, 1993; Nicaise, Cogérino, Bois & Amorose*,* 2006; Nicaise, Bois, Fairclough, Amorose & Cogerino, 2007). In previous research there have been many conflicts of opinion as to the amount of research conducted regarding feedback within coaching. One explanation for this is due to the assumption that feedback underpins many other areas of sport and coaching research such as power, coach behaviours and the coach-athlete relationship (Solomon *et al.*, 1998). However, as Markland and Martinek (1998) explain, feedback is a very complex task in itself and can be determined by many factors such as the type, timing, and quantity of feedback that is delivered, all of which can have an effect upon the athlete. Existing literature suggests feedback occurs more commonly to individual athletes as opposed to groups, during practise and training sessions, rather than the competition, match, or game scenarios (Fishman & Tobey, 1978; Silverman, 1991).

The power of the coach is often regarded as fundamental to the relationship that a coach and athlete may have; impacting on the interactions between them (Lee, Chai & Bargh, 2001). French and Raven (1959) identify six forms of power: Legitimate, Reward, Coercive, Referent, Informational and Expert. French and Raven's research imply that each of the different uses of power, and how the athlete perceives the power of the coach, may influence coach-athlete interactions, and therefore the coach-athlete relationship. Power is a sensitive matter and therefore should not be taken for granted. In this respect it is important that coaches are aware of the way in which they convey their control over their athletes. The coaches' behaviour could affect the interactions and influence they

have over their athletes such as the respect and trust between the athlete and coach. With this issue in mind it is surprising that there is a lack of literature examining athletes' perceptions of the coaches' behaviours, as this information would give recognition to the behaviours most desirable by the athletes (Cogérino *et al.,* 2006; Nicaise *et al.,* 2007). This shortage of material could be due to the supposition that athletes' perceptions of feedback don't apply directly to the coaches' interaction and the results based on the performance. On the other hand Doyle (1977) and Lee *et al.* (1993) oppose this view; they agree that the athletes' perceptions of instructions and feedback, given from coaches, act as a direct link on the learning outcomes of the athlete. The information from previous literature has come to establish the importance of the similarity between the information a coach conveys, and the way in which the athlete perceives and interprets the information.

1.1 Aims and Objectives of the Study

The specific aim of this study was to examine the behaviours of a cricket coach at a semi-elite level. To address the aims of the study, the researcher seeks to gain an insight as to:

- The coach behaviours displayed at a semi-elite / developmental level of cricket.
- How the coach's behaviours affect the interactions between the coach and the cricket team.
- Gain an understanding of how the athletes perceive the coach's behaviours, and how the coach's use of power affects the athletes' reception of feedback.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.0 Introduction

Coaching has been described as a complicated process that requires interactions involving the coach, athlete, and the environment (Harrison *et al.*, 1999). Literature has come to the assumption that coaching should be seen as an ongoing process. However, despite an increased appreciation and realisation that such a process exists, the complexities and ambiguities of the 'coaching process' means that no distinct framework has been developed to be applied to all coaching scenarios, and at all levels (Jones *et al.*, 2002; Lyle, 2002).

2.1 Feedback

Although intrinsic feedback is vital, Franks (1994) stated that it is the coaches' responsibility to give external feedback to allow athletes to improve their performance. One of the most obvious and vital parts of the coaching process, that every coach requires, is the ability to give feedback to their athletes in order to help the athlete achieve their full potential (Côte *et al.,* 1995; Nicaise *et al.,* 2007). Although there is considerable literature supporting that feedback improves performance, research from Lee *et al.* (1993) and Yerg (1981), investigating the effectiveness of feedback in physical education, concluded that feedback may be non-significant and even, at times, detrimental on performance.

Pritchard *et al.* (2007) suggests that this is because the majority of feedback given does not consider the complexities and prioritization in which it is given. Coaches dedicate a huge amount of time delivering verbal feedback to their athletes including information on performance, strategies and tactics, outcomes and results (Cassidy *et al.*, 2004). Feedback is considered to be of great importance in any sporting activity and as one of the common tasks any teacher or coach has to give an athlete (Lee *et al.*, 1993; Nicaise *et al.,* 2006). This is important to improve the athletes' understanding of a specific skill or performance. Therefore, it is fundamental that coaches understand the way in which athletes interpret the feedback that they receive so that they best understand how to go about applying it through their coaching behaviours. In a sports pedagogy and physical education context, feedback is associated with the coaches' response to a specific performance and widely associated with motor learning (Lee *et al.,* 1993). Motor

learning literature explains that feedback consists of two elements: knowledge of results and knowledge of performance (Ibid, 1993). Feedback can be considered a very simple task from a novice coaches' point of view; the common assumption is that through positively reinforcing the athlete, their performance will improve. This however is not the case; feedback is considered much more complex as explained by Markland and Martinek (1998). They explain that factors such as: the type, timing, and quantity of feedback delivered, may have differentiating effects upon the learner.

Gilbert (2002) stated that within the last thirty-two years, only 7% of all sports coaching literature related to feedback. This was opposed by Solomon *et al.* (1998), who argued that research regarding feedback is in fact extensive. A possible explanation for this is that the area of feedback is included within other sporting areas such as communication, the coach-athlete relationship and coaching behaviours. Findings from previous studies of feedback have found that coaches give feedback or instructions in several different ways: positive, negative, verbal, demonstrative, mechanical and others (Molier *et al.,* 2010). There does however appear to have been a common theme among previous research conducted; that verbal feedback or instructions commonly consist of positive and quite general statements such as 'good shot' or 'nice bowl'. It has also been generalised, based on the results of many studies, that feedback is more prevalent to individual athletes, as opposed to groups, and also during practice and training sessions rather than competition, match, or game scenarios (Fishman & Tobey, 1978; Silverman, 1991). Studies have also found that males receive more feedback than females: particularly praise, criticism, and technical information (Cogérino *et al.,* 2006; Nicaise *et al.*, 2006).

Nevertheless, one overwhelming theme that has arisen from reviewing existing literature is that there is little that provides information research from the athletes' point of view, regarding the athletes' perceptions of the coach or teachers feedback and instructions (Cogérino *et al.,* 2006; Nicaise *et al.,* 2007). Many different aspects of feedback have been studied, such as the timing of feedback from coach to athlete, relevance, content, and results following feedback (Magill, 1993). Through the use of systematic observations, results of studies have

concluded that feedback from coaches and teachers, does improve the performance of athletes and students in physical education. Conversely, this is not true of all studies. Some have concluded that the use of feedback is not completely necessarily to improve performance. One suggestion for these assumptions is that the athletes' perceptions of the feedback from their coaches are not widely acknowledged. This is due to the supposition that athletes' perceptions of the feedback don't apply directly to the coaches' interaction and the results based on the performance. Research from Doyle (1977) and Lee *et al.* (1993) oppose this view; they agree that the athletes' perceptions of instructions and feedback, given from coaches, act as a direct link on the learning outcomes of the athlete.

2.2 Coach Behaviours

The value of coach observation has been recognised many times in recent studies of coaching science (Erickson, 2009). In recent years there has been an increase in the number of researchers investigating coaching behaviours, most commonly associated with feedback and leadership. Much of this research suggests that the coaches' behaviour assumes the role of a significant other for athletes, and can have an impact, not only on performance of the athletes, but on them emotionally and psychologically (Horn, 2008; Smoll *et al.,* 1993). Existing literature suggests that coaching behaviours are largely associated with technical feedback regarding the correction of mistakes, allowing coaches to develop an environment where they can best improve and promote the athletes' potential (Duda & Ballaguer, 2007). According to Zetou *et al.* (2011) for a training session to be successful the coaches' behaviours should be those most desired by the athletes. However, as discovered by Chelladurais (2001, 2007) revised Multidimensional Model of Leadership (MML), it is dependent on the characteristics of the individual athlete as to which coaching behaviours athletes prefer.

Many different systems and methods have been used to observe and analyse coaching behaviours including: The Coaching Behaviour Recording Form (CBRF) developed by Tharp and Gallimore (1976), Coaching Behavioural Assessment System (CBAS) by Smith *et al.* (1977), Lacy and Darst's (1984) Arizona State University Observational Instrument (A.S.U.O.I) and the Coaching Analysis

Instrument (CAI) by More and Franks (1996). The CBAS (Smith *et al.,* 1977) and the A.S.U.O.I (Lacy and Darst, 1984) appear to be the most frequently used in recent research of coach observation. The CBAS (Smith *et al., 1977*) was developed through the analysis of several different coaches in different sports. The CBAS is divided into twelve different coach behavioural categories; eight of the categories relating to the response to athlete behaviour, and four by the coach. Erickson's (2009) research coded coaching behaviours using the CBAS and generated individual coach profiles, calculating the relative frequency of expression of each of the behavioural categories within the CBAS. Results from Smith *et al.* (1977) CBAS research concluded that coaches that gave high levels of instruction, and praise, towards athletes, were better received by the athletes. In addition to this, athletes also found sessions more enjoyable. Following this research, Smith *et al.* (1977) developed the Coach Effectiveness Training programme (CET) in order for coaches to be better informed of the best coach behaviours to use when interacting with their athletes. Based on the original CABS (Smith *et al., 1977*), Amorose and Horn (2000) developed the Coaching Feedback Questionnaire (CFQ). The CFQ was designed to gather an understanding of the athletes' perceptions of their coaches' behaviours. The CFQ had a series of types of feedback which the athletes then had to grade on a five point scale; five being most preferred, and one being least preferred. Similarly, the A.S.U.O.I is a categorised coding system of fourteen coach behaviours which has been used recently in examination of professional football coaches (Potrac *et al.*, 2007). It is evident from viewing the extensive amount of research regarding coach behaviours, that it is important coaches are aware of their own behaviours as it can have an effect upon the way in which athletes and coaches interact.

2.3 Coach-Athlete Relationship and Interactions

The relationship between coach and athlete is a fundamental part of the coaching process (Jones, 2004). Their relationship is likely to determine interactions, which may influence the quality of the athletes' performance as well as the athletes' motivation (Jowett & Cockerill, 2003). The interactions between coach and athlete can, to a great extent, determine the relationship that the coach and the athlete share. An athlete that does not have a good level of relationship with their coach

may not take on board the feedback that the coach gives them. Likewise a coach that has a low level of relationship with the athlete may not interact with them the same way as with other athletes; as a result the athlete suffers. In recent years the coach-athlete relationship has been studied extensively though a variety of different approaches including observations, in-depth/semi-structured interviews and questionnaires (Longueville *et al.*, 1998). Interviews, concerning both coach and athletes' perceptions with regards to the effectiveness of interactions in sport have recently been used in abundance. The level of coach expertise has also been examined. A study by Longueville *et al.* (1998) investigated the perceived effectiveness of interaction between elite, Olympic level coaches and athletes, in France. The results concluded that the interactions were perceived differently by coaches and athletes. The results also showed that coaches used direct conflict to gain compliance and push athletes to their limits. Furthermore, the coaches gave feedback based on the individual athletes' characteristics. From the athletes' perspective, the results found they felt they could not question their coaches' because of their high standing International and Olympic status, knowledge and experience. However, not all of the interactions were deemed negative; many of the athletes understood the reasoning for the coaches' behaviour and the resulting effectiveness of the French team. The democratic style of the coaches and the power that the coaches had over the athletes was an important factor affecting the coach-athlete relationship in this study.

2.4 Power

Power is one of the most problematic concepts within sports coaching literature (Slack & Parent, 2006). Jones *et al.* (2002) conclude from a gathering of research, that power is always present within social activity. Power is one way in which coaches gain compliance from athletes, such as the coaches' ability to punish athletes, evident from many studies including Longueville *et al.* (1998). However, this was not the only form of power used by the coach; it was evident from the analysis of the Longueville *et al.* (1998) study that coaches often used punishment to gain control, respect and compliance from the athletes. The way athletes perceive their coaches behaviours, such as in the Longueville *et al.* (1998) study

could be an important factor as to how athletes perceive the feedback. Different types of power that the coach may possess or be perceived to possess could determine the relationship that the coach and athlete have and therefore effect their interactions. The way power is used within different contexts could be for many reasons such as race, gender or sexuality (Harris & Jones, 2012).

French and Raven (1959) research support that the use of power within the coach-athlete relationship is often used by coaches at all levels. French and Ravens (1959) theory of power proposes six different types, known as the 'social bases of power': Legitimate power; the position that the coach has within the club, Expert power; the specific knowledge obtained by the coach through experiences or courses, Coercive power; the coaches ability to punish or discipline the athlete, Informational power; the coaches ability to use information to produce a logical argument to influence the athlete, Referent power; the athletes' desire to be like their coach because of certain characteristics they admire, and Reward power; the coaches ability to reward the athlete for success or correct practice. It was argued that the six types of power were too broad and lacked specific definitions (Koslowsky & Schwarzwald, 1993). Results from a study by Laios *et al.* (2003) demonstrated that the use of expert power has the most influence over an individual or team. More recently Potrac, Jones and Armour (2007) investigated the behaviours of a high level football coach and used French and Raven's notion of power to interpret their observations, collected through the use of the A.S.U.O.I. Potrac *et al.* (2007) concluded that the football coaches gained respect from their athletes through the use of power; through his ability as head coach to be coercive, or the rewarding of players, and how he presented himself to his athletes. The finding of the study proposed that the coach being observed was heavily influenced by his own desire to perform in the way that he perceived most desirable by his athletes and their expectations of him in the role of a professional football coach. This showed that the coach had an awareness of the behaviours he displayed towards his athletes, as well as showing consideration the athletes' expectations. By doing so the coach believed that he would generate better social bonds and interactions between himself and the athletes, in turn gaining the athletes' respect. Potrac *et al.* (2002) concluded that if the coach did not meet the athletes' expectations, with regards to their social position, this may have a

detrimental effect as to the athletes' respect for the coach. According to Potrac *et al.* (2002), without respect from athletes, coaches cannot function. More recently, studies by Purdy (2008) and Purdy, Jones and Cassidy (2009) investigated the social concept of power, using Bourdueu's concept of 'Capital', and how it affected the coach-athlete relationship within an elite sport, through the analysis of athletes' journals. In line with the findings of Potrac *et al.* (2002), the studies concluded that for coaches to be successful, they must be aware of the various forms of power that they use to influence and gain compliance and respect from athletes (Purdy, 2008; Purdy *et al.,* 2009).

2.5 Chapter Summary

The previous literature shows a controversial argument for different coach behaviours and how these behaviours influence the coach-athlete relationship through their interactions together. An overwhelming factor that regularly appears in the literature is the lack of research examining the athletes' perceptions of coach behaviours. Therefore, examining how athletes perceive their coaches' behaviours is essential, and one of the primary aims of this study. An understanding of the way in which an athlete may receive the feedback, through coach behaviours, will fundamentally determine how the coach applies the feedback and modify their behave

CHAPTER THREE
METHODS

3.0 Rationale and Justification of Method

Qualitative research is extremely diverse and offers the researcher a large variety of techniques to collect data (Draper & Swift, 2010). However, choosing the appropriate research methods are crucial to ensure high-quality data collection (Ibid, 2010). Collection of qualitative research will allow the author to develop new theories and hypothesis (Creswell, 2003; Merriam, 2002). Qualitative data can typically be categorised into three basic methodological forms: interview, observation, and document analysis. There are limitations to qualitative studies as such research often uses small samples which can restrict the ability to generalise results to a wider audience. However, qualitative methods of research allow for a richness of in-depth information that quantitative research cannot provide alone (Jones, 2004).

 Although there is a vast amount of literature examining coach behaviours, there is little seeking to identify athletes' perspectives of coach behaviours as many of these studies used quantitative forms of data collection which doesn't allow for in-depth and detailed information of the athletes' true feelings. Therefore, is it important to perform a qualitative study to gain the best possible understanding of how coach behaviours influence coach-athlete interactions through the thoughts and feelings of both the coach and the athletes (Gratton & Jones, 2010; Sugden, 2005).

A mixed method approach is one concept widely discussed within qualitative research. It is described by Olsen (2004) as the mixing of data, or methods, so that different viewpoints are used to draw conclusion upon a specific topic such as the use of surveys and interviews combined within one study. The combination of these two data collection methods should both draw upon the same conclusion and not contradict one another; they should be bought together to show different viewpoints on the same incident. This study used a combination of systematic observations prior to semi-structured interviews. The observations of the coach provided a numerical value of the frequency every time a categorised behaviour occurred; this is a form of quantitative research (Lacy & Darst, 1989). The interviews and focus group however, provided in-depth and detailed information of

the coach and players' thoughts and feelings and therefore is a form of qualitative research.

3.1.1 Systematic Observations

Observations are necessary as they allow researchers to identify the behaviours of individuals or groups within their natural environment, such as observing a football coach taking a session at a football club (Gratton & Jones, 2004). This allows the researcher to observe behaviours and information that the individuals may not be aware of and therefore not mentioned during an interview (Gledhill *et al.,* 2007). Systematic observations allow for specific and clearly set items to be observed through the use of categorisation and checklist systems; these systems allow the researcher to record the observations systematically (Berkeley Thomas, 2004). In agreement with Gratton and Jones (2004), a non-participant observation, where there is no interaction from the researcher with either the activity or the participants, is the easiest form of observation. Non-participant observations don't allow the researcher to interfere with the session or the athlete, and therefore are less likely to change the behaviours of those taking part; this method was adopted for the present study.

The data collection method used to collect the required information of coach behaviours was a revised version of the Arizona State University Observation Instrument (A.S.U.O.I), originally a fourteen-category system developed by Lacy and Darst (1984) (see Appendix A). The A.S.U.O.I was a development of the original system, the Coach Behaviour Recording Form (CBRF), produced by Tharp and Gallimore (1976) who devised a ten-category system designed to observe coach behaviours within the coaching context. The main reasons for selection of the A.S.U.O.I was the large amount of existing literature, examining team sports, that have used this system to analyse coach behaviours (Potrac *et al.*, 2007). Also a study by Potrac *et al.* (2007), who investigated professional coach behaviours, confirmed that the A.S.U.O.I allowed for valid, descriptive and qualitative data of coach behaviours during sessions.

Several of the category names were changed from the original A.S.U.O.I to be suited to British terminology. For this investigation the researcher has included an extra category; 'Humour.' Although there are very few studies of humour within a coaching context, there are several within pedagogical studies (Grisaffe, Blom and Burke, 2003). Several studies examining the use of humour within a classroom environment have found humour to be an effective way of developing relationships (Weaver & Cotrell, 1998; Neuliep, 1991 and Burke, Peterson & Nix, 1995). This category appears in many other systematic observation studies such as the CBAS (Smith *et al., 1977*) and the CBRF (Tharp & Gallimore, 1976); their study bought about the awareness that coaches use humour when interacting with athletes to develop their relationships with the athletes. Also separate categories for 'non-verbal' behaviours were added. Zetou *et al.* (2011) stated that non-verbal behaviours can amount up to 5% of total behaviours shown; therefore making non-verbal behaviours significant amongst other coach behaviours.

3.1.2 Interviews

"The interview is undoubtedly the most common method by which qualitative data is collected in sport research," (Gratton & Jones, 2010, p.154). The present study used semi-structured, open ended focus groups (Patton, 2002). Interviews and focus groups were used after the observations to gain an in-depth understanding of the thoughts and feeling of both the coach and the athletes, which cannot be seen from observations alone. A focus group allows the researcher to interview two or more individuals at the same time. Focus groups allow the researcher to utilise group dynamics, to explore the participants concerns, identify group norms and knowledge as well as the way in which these are generated in everyday life (Kitzinger, 1994; 1995). Open ended questions were used to identify the influences upon which the coaches' practice was shaped (Harris & Jones, 2012), such as the behaviours used by the coach. Interviews can be used to collect data that is difficult to measure in other ways, such as the thoughts and feeling of players. Interviews allow the participant to be much more open and detailed with their answers than a questionnaire as the researcher can probe for further information or examples. This results in gaining far richer information than other forms of data collection such as questionnaires (Gratton & Jones, 2010). As outlined by Gratton and Jones (2010), there are many reasons to use interviews

as a form of data collection: interviews allow for the interviewer and the participant to meet and introduce themselves therefore creating a trust between the two, they allow the participant to talk freely about their own first hand experiences (Flick, 2007), they allow for unexpected useful knowledge to be accounted for, "they allow the researcher to ask questions such as 'why' instead of 'how' to gain a deeper insight into the social world" (Harris & Jones, 2012, p75), and allows the interviewer to see the body language of the interviewee which may be particularly useful in certain research studies.

Although there are several reasons to perform interviews there are also some disadvantages: interviews can be extremely time consuming, not only of the interview itself but also the time to travel to the interview venue, performing an interview for your own research can add a conscious or unconscious bias to your results and findings, there are also issues of 'quality' of the interview as the analysis can only be based upon the answers given and that there is always the issue of how to analyse the data collected from interviews which may be dependent upon the type of study.

Much of the previous literature examining coach behaviour has used systematic observations, some with the addition of questionnaires. Therefore, as there is little existing literature examining the athletes' perceptions it was decided that interviews would give more descriptive and qualitative data because of the personal thoughts and feelings of both the coach and athlete that interviews allow researchers to explore (Gratton & Jones, 2004).

This study used two forms of interview; firstly, a semi-structured interview process was used for the coach. As the interview was of a semi-structured nature, an interview guide was used to provide specific themes relevant to the objectives of the study (Harris & Jones, 2012). However, due to the semi-structured nature of the interview, the researcher may be flexible as to the timing of questions, or even add questions to gain a further understand based on the answers of the participant, allowing for more qualitative data to be collected. The interview began with a brief explanation of the aims of the study, followed by basic introductory questions to try and make the participant feel relaxed (see Appendix C for

interview structure and questions). Secondly, six athletes were interviewed together forming a focus group. The questions were set out in the same way as the coaches' questions (see Appendix C for interview guide and structure). However, when performing a focus group method the researcher may use several participants together to create more of an open conversation between the group. The focus group method has many advantages: it can be a very time efficient procedure due to interviewing a group of participants together instead of individually, it allows the participants to freely and openly discuss issues between themselves which may bring about new perspectives or conflicts of opinion, and it can make the participants feel more comfortable with others around them. However, there are some disadvantages: some participants may hideaway amongst the rest of the group and therefore not contribute any information, it is possible that some participants may conform to the same answers as other members in the focus group because they feel uncomfortable giving a different opinion to those around them and also the data may become more difficult to analyse because of contradicting opinions within the group and also the amount of information that is given compared to an individual interview where there is only one persons opinion.

3.2 Participants

A considerable amount of qualitative studies use some form of purposive sampling to gather small numbers of participants. Purposeful sampling allows the researcher to deliberately choose participants with a specific purpose in mind to best address the aims of the research (Marshall, 1996; Neuendorf, 2002). In the case of the present study athletes who had been at the club the longest were selected as it was assumed that they have a greater knowledge and perspective of the coaches' behaviours.

The participants used for this study were one head coach and six semi-elite developmental cricket players from a British University. The participants were chosen using purposive sampling (Patton, 2002). In the case of this study the researcher selected players who possessed the longest amount of experience with the current head coach (three years), as the research required information regarding the athletes' perceptions of the coach's behaviours. Players who

possessed the most experience with the coach were able to give more in-depth reviews of the coach's behaviours because of the duration of time they had spent with the coach. The players ranged in age from 18-24 years old. Informed consent was obtained from the coach and the players prior to the commencement of the study.

3.3 Procedure

The head coach of a semi-elite cricket team was emailed with information regarding the aim of the study, and to ask for permission to be observed and interviewed. Having agreed to take part in the study, a meeting was organised between the researcher and the participant to further discuss the aims of the research and to arrange when sessions took place and where it would be safe and convenient for the researcher to observe the session. It was agreed that the researcher would observe four sessions, each between sixty and ninety minutes in duration (over a four week period). In accordance with existing research using systematic observations; observations were made of 'typical' training sessions, including technical drills where interactions between coach and athlete are common. All observations were video recorded from the start of the warm up to the very end of the session. A microphone was attached to the coach to make it easier for the researcher to hear what the coach was saying throughout the sessions. During the recording process the researcher stood and videoed by the side of the training ground to get the best possible view of the coach behaviours. Analyses of the observations were made using the video recordings. This allowed the researcher more time to analyse and review the video footage.

Based on the analysis of the video footage two semi-structured interview guides were developed (one for the coach and one for the athletes' focus group) in line with the study objectives. Six of the team's athletes were then approached and asked to take part in a focus group. Upon agreement, times and venues were chosen and the location was decided by the participant to ensure that they felt relaxed within familiar surroundings, such as their homes or training grounds (Gratton & Jones, 2004). All interviews were recorded using a Dictaphone. Upon completion of the interviews each interview was transcribed verbatim and

analysed and then sent back to the participant to check the transcriptions were correct.

3.3.1 Pilot Study

A pilot study was conducted on all methods to be used during the investigation. The purpose of the pilot study was to firstly: test that all the equipment that was to be used worked correctly, secondly, ensure that the interview structure was logically ordered and enabled the researcher to address all the aims of the study, thirdly, allow the researcher to familiarise themselves with the questions and finally, check if the use of triangulation was the best method to gain the required data (Kumor, 2003). No modifications were made as a result of the pilot study.

3.4 Data Analysis

Marshall and Rossman (1999) stated that when using qualitative research, both data collection and data analysis are bought together coherently to interpret data. Upon completion of analysis of the recorded coaching sessions the total numbers of behaviours for each category were added together to form a total number, these were then added to give a total number of all behaviours observed. This produced quantitative data that allowed the researcher to identify which behaviours the coach used most frequently, and likewise, which behaviours were used least frequently. Based on the results of the observations, key themes were identified which allowed for the development of the semi-structured interview. Upon completion of the interviews, they were then transcribed and analysed (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The transcriptions were then read through, identifying and highlighting recurring themes, thoughts and feelings from the individuals that were interviewed (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Clustering is one method that can be used for many types of qualitative data interpretation; it is used where researchers are trying to gain a better understanding of a phenomenon by grouping themes which are similar so that comparisons can be made (Ibid, 1994). The highlighted themes were then clustered into table relevant to each behaviour category. This allowed easier analysis of the thoughts and feelings of the participants for each individual behaviour category.

3.5 Reliability and Validity

Gratton and Jones (2009) define reliability as, the consistency of the results obtained. To minimise observation and data collection errors, the intra-observer reliability of both the instrument and the researcher, were addressed. Intra-observer reliability is a means of testing the agreement of data collected of the same event, by the same researcher, but on two separate occasions (Potrac *et al.,* 2007). The test was carried out by analysing the recording of the first coaching session (see results in table 1). The same analysis took place, two weeks later to allow for previous recording to be forgotten (see results in table 2). The level of intra-observer reliability was then determined by calculating the percentage of agreements between the first and second observations for the frequency (the number of times behaviours were recorded). The percentage agreements were then assessed using Altman's (1991) evaluation scheme (see *Table 1.*) to give a 'strength of agreement' rating, varying from poor to very good.

Table 1. Shows Altman's (1991) Evaluation Scheme to give a 'Strength of Agreement' Rating Varying from Poor to Excellent.

Percentage Agreement	Strength of Agreement
> 80%	Excellent
60% - 80%	Good
40% - 60%	Moderate
20% - 40%	Fair
< 20%	Poor

To ensure trustworthiness of the interviews the interview transcriptions were identical to the recorded interviews, the transcribed interviews were sent back to the participant to be checked to ensure that there was no researcher bias.

3.6 Data Presentation

Each individual behaviour category observed was counted into a total number of behaviours. The total numbers of behaviours were then divided by the total number of behaviour categories. This gave each category a percentage rating. However, as discussed in the work of Lacy and Darst (1989), the inclusion of 'use of first names', as an independent category, often decreased the percentages of the other behaviours and therefore misrepresents their values. When calculating the percentages of each individual behaviour category, the total of each category was divided by the total number of behaviours excluding the 'use of first names.' The 'use of first names' was considered separate, and the percentage was achieved by dividing the total number of first names by the number of behaviours observed.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations need to be addressed prior to the start of any investigation (McNamee, Oliver & Wainwright, 2007). Ethical issues are particularly prominent throughout qualitative research designs because of the exploration of private and personal information (Halloway, 1997). Therefore, it is necessary to fully inform the participant of the study and its contents, and obtain fully informed consent. This study used participants who were all aged 18years or older. To observe their behaviours at the training session, consent was not required. However, introductions and an outline for the reasons why they would be observed and filmed during the sessions were provided. The interviews did require informed consent as the content of the interview explored personal thoughts and feelings from the coach and the athletes that they may not have wished to be shared with one another (see Appendix B). Upon making contact with the participants, the researcher outlined the aims and objectives of the study. The participants who wanted to continue and take part were given consent forms which included information regarding confidentiality and protection. In keeping with the Cardiff Metropolitan University ethical considerations, it was explained to the participants that they had the right to withdraw at any point should they wish to do so. Consent forms were signed and given back to the researcher.

3.8 Limitations of Research Methods

Observations

Observations have been used in a vast amount of research regarding coaching behaviours, although there are several limitations to using this approach. Sugden (2005) puts forward that observation regarding coach behaviours is essential. However, observed behaviour that is analysed can be subject to distortion, especially if the participants know that they are being analysed and observed (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). This behaviour effect is known as the 'Hawthorne' effect. It occurs where there is perceived to be an external threat which involves concerns that the participants are performing differently to their normal behaviour due to the awareness that they are being observed (Goodwin & Goodwin, 1996). Also, there is the issue of researcher misinterpretation during observations. Researchers can become susceptible to what they perceive to see based on their motives and preconceptions about the research (Charmaz, 2006). The researcher could also make the mistake of wrongly categorising the observed behaviour based on what they want to see rather than what they do see (Charmaz, 2006). Observations are however subjective to the individual researcher and how they perceive their observations.

Interview / Focus Group

Interviews, like observations, have been used in a vast amount of coaching behaviour related studies. However, there are several limitations to the interview and focus group approaches used in this study. Interviewer bias is a commonly observed limitation using interviews as data collection methods. This occurs where the interviewer may have a preconceived idea of the results and therefore probe the participant for certain information during the interview or may interpret the transcriptions of the interview upon completion. In order to avoid researcher bias in this study an interview guide was used to provide specific themes relevant to the objectives of the study (Harris & Jones, 2012). Another limitation was organising the focus group (Gibbs, 1997) as certain individuals may shy away from a group interview because of a lack of confidence or may not wish to express their thoughts and feelings in front of peers, also finding a time where all of the six

participants were available at the same time was harder than first thought.. Another factor identified by Morgan (1988) is that the researcher has less control of a focus group than an individual interview due to the interactions between the group. Finally, focus groups are not anonymous or confidential because of the open interaction that occurs due to the nature of a focus group (Gibbs, 1997).

CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Results of the A.S.U.O.I

4.1.1 Pilot Study Results

The results of the pilot study allowed for the recognition that no modifications to the behaviour categories were needed. Also the results of the intra-reliability of both the instrument and the researcher, according to Altman's (1991) Evaluation Scheme, proved to be 'Good' or 'Excellent', proving the results to be data collection method to be both reliable and consistent.

Table 2. The Frequency and Percentages of Behaviours Observed in the First Observation of the Pilot Study.

Observation 1		
Coach Behaviour	Frequency	Percentage %
Use of First Name	24	
Pre-Instruction	23	**7.01%**
Concurrent Instruction	34	**10.37%**
Post Instruction	8	**2.44%**
Questioning	13	**3.96%**
Physical Assistance	0	**0.00%**
Demonstrations	22	**6.71%**
Hustle	31	**9.45%**
Verbal Praise/Reward/Encouragement	31	**9.45%**
Non Verbal Praise/Reward/Encouragement	17	**5.18%**
Verbal Discipline/Critciism	2	**0.61%**
Non Verbal Discipline	2	**0.61%**
Humour	10	**3.05%**
Management/Organisation	52	**15.85%**
Uncodable		**0.00%**
Silence	83	**25.30%**
TOTAL	**352**	**100.00%**
TOTAL (Not including 'Use of First Name'**)**	**328**	

Table 3. The Frequency and Percentages of Behaviours Observed in the Second
Observation of the Pilot Study.

Observation 2		
Coach Behaviour	Frequency	Percentage %
Use of First Name	46	
Pre-Instruction	18	**7.17%**
Concurrent Instruction	8	**3.19%**
Post Instruction	21	**8.37%**
Questioning	27	**10.76%**
Physical Assistance	0	**0.00%**
Demonstrations	15	**5.98%**
Hustle	21	**8.37%**
Verbal Praise/Reward/Encouragement	27	**10.76%**
Non Verbal Praise/Reward/Encouragement	13	**5.18%**
Verbal Discipline/Critciism	4	**1.59%**
Non Verbal Discipline	1	**0.40%**
Humour	8	**3.19%**
Management/Organisation	24	**9.56%**
Uncodable	3	**1.20%**
Silence	61	**24.30%**
TOTAL	**297**	**100.00%**
TOTAL (Not including 'Use of First Name'**)**	**251**	

Table 4. The Percentage Agreement Between Observations 1 and Observation 2 of the Pilot Study.

Coach Behaviour	Obs 1	Obs 2	Percentage Similarity Between Observation 1 and Observation 2 (%)	Strength of Agreement (Altman, 1991)
Use of First Name	24	24	100	Excellent
Pre-Instruction	12.59%	12.42%	98.64	Excellent
Concurrent Instruction	8.39%	9.15%	91.69	Excellent
Post Instruction	4.20%	3.27%	77.85	Good
Questioning	11.19%	11.76%	95.25	Excellent
Physical Assistance	0.00%	0.00%	100	Excellent
Demonstrations	4.90%	4.58%	93.46	Excellent
Hustle	6.99%	8.50%	82.23	Excellent
Verbal Praise/Reward/Encouragement	13.29%	12.42%	93.45	Excellent
Non Verbal Praise/Reward/Encouragement	14.69%	15.03%	97.73	Excellent
Verbal Discipline/Criticism	2.10%	3.27%	64.22	Good
Non Verbal Discipline	4.20%	2.61%	62.14	Good
Humour	4.20%	3.27%	77.85	Good
Management/Organisation	4.90%	4.58%	93.46	Excellent
Uncodable	2.80%	3.27%	85.62	Excellent
Silence	5.59%	5.88%	95.06	Excellent

Table 4. shows that the researcher had a high level of intra-observer agreement, tested using Altman's (1991) Evaluation Scheme. All categories were found to have an intra-observer rating of either 'Good' or 'Excellent' therefore showing that the observations were consistent and reliable.

4.2 Observation Results Table

Table 5. Combined Summary of All Observed Behaviours.

Coach Behaviour	Total	Percentage (%)
Use of First Name	184	
Pre-Instruction	84	**6.56%**
Concurrent Instruction	91	**7.10%**
Post Instruction	71	**5.54%**
Questioning	116	**9.06%**
Physical Assistance	0	**0.00%**
Demonstrations	68	**5.31%**
Hustle	93	**7.26%**
Verbal Praise/Reward	175	**13.66%**
Non-Verbal Praise/Reward	63	**4.92%**
Scold/Discipline/Criticism	16	**1.25%**
Non-Verbal Scold/Discipline/Criticism	9	**0.70%**
Humour	39	**3.04%**
Management/Organisation	125	**9.76%**
Uncodable	15	**1.17%**
Silence	316	**24.67%**
TOTAL	**1465**	
TOTAL (Not including '*Use of First Name*'**)**	**1281**	**100%**

As shown in Table 5. a total of 1465 coach behaviours were observed and recorded. In accordance with results previous research examining the use of coach behaviours (e.g. Potrac *et al.,* 2002; Potrac *et al.,* 2007), through the use of the ASUOI, it is unsurprising that behaviours concerned with instruction (*Pre-Instruction, Concurrent Instruction, Post Instruction, Questioning and Demonstrations*) totalled to a third (33.57%) of the total behaviours. Further analysis of the instructional categories shows that categories that directly related to instruction (*Pre-Instruction, Concurrent Instruction and Post Instruction)* accounted for 1/5 of all behaviours observed. In addition to this there is a significant difference between the ratio of Praise and Scold categories, approximately 10:1.

4.3 Discussion

This section will discuss relevant themes that developed during the interviews in relation to the aims and objectives of this study, firstly, by discussing the results of the A.S.U.O.I in relation to previous studies of elite sports coaches, secondly, identifying why certain behaviours were used by the coach and also the athletes' perceptions of the coach behaviours, finally, recognise how the coach behaviours effect the interactions and relationships between the coach and athletes.

4.4 Coach Behaviours Demonstrated at a Semi-Elite Level

Reflecting upon the result of the A.S.U.O.I, Instruction, Praise and Silence were the three highest behaviour categories observed during the cricket training sessions.

Use of *'Instruction'*

Instruction has been considered as one of the most significant coach behaviours (Tinnings, 1982). Coinciding with recent studies examining coach behaviours, instruction was found to be the most frequent active coach behaviour (54.9% in Bloom *at al.*, 1999; Potrac *et al.,* 2002; Potrac *et al.,* 2007; and 45.72% in Zetou *et al.*, 2011). Potrac *et al.* (2007), suggest that the high level of instructions are due to the coach trying to ensure power over his athletes. Drawing on the work of Jones *et al.* (2004) it may be argued that that the high frequency of behaviours regarding instruction is partially due to 'Role Theory'. This theory suggests that coaches use vast amounts of instructional information because coaches perceive it to go hand-in-hand with their perceived role, consciously or subconsciously (Isabel, António, António, Felismina & Michef, 2008). During the interview with the coach it was evident that the coach believed his primary role was to improve performance by giving the players technical and tactical instructions:

> *Coach: "…my main roles are to ensure that players improve. I suppose that technical information is my main role in group sessions, to make sure that the players get the right technical information".*

However, during the athletes' focus group it became apparent that they disagreed with the coach's view of his role within the group. The athletes believed that they train and compete at a highly competent level and that they therefore do not require the high level of instruction and technical feedback displayed by the coach during the observed sessions:

> Athlete: "I think that at the level that we are playing now the coach should take more or a manager's role, more like you see in football. We are all at a stage now where we know our individual strengths and weaknesses and what we need to work on. So we don't really need a person there to coach us, instead we need someone to be there and overlook the session and the team and make sure everything runs smoothly."

This may be due to the coach's preconceived image of what a good coach looks like, based on the experiences the coach has had as a player or coach. Furthermore, it may be due to the coach's belief that high levels of instruction behaviours will result in the achievement of their goals, such as elite football coaches' desire to win (Potrac *et al.,* 2007). In addition, Potrac *et al.* (2007) propose that high frequencies of instructional behaviour are a way in which coaches ensuring the power relationship between coach and athlete. However, during the interview it was discovered that the coach was studying a Masters in Sport Coaching:

> Coach: "I'm currently studying a Masters in Coaching Science, so we are covering theories in there that are … not theories but related to human life experiences, theories like 'role theory', 'orchestration', things like that..."

This knowledge that the coach had gained through his education informed him of the complexities of coaching and why coaches act as they do. When asked if the masters in sports caching had an effect on his own caching style and his awareness of how he interacted with the players he answered:

> Coach: "Yeh all the time. I always try to reflect on how I have spoken with them, how I've dealt with them, it's an ongoing process."

In recognition of French and Raven's (1959) basis of power, the instructional behaviours such as demonstrations and knowledge of the skills and techniques would fall under 'Informational Power', the coach's ability to form a logical argument in order to change athletes' behaviours. In the case of the present study, the coach may have used high levels of instruction to demonstrate his knowledge in order to attain power from the players, and by doing so enhance the players respect for the coach. During the interview the question was asked, *"Do you feel you gain respect from your players because of your knowledge you demonstrate when giving instructions or feedback?"*

> *Coach: "Yeh I think I do, but as a coach what I tend to do as a coach is not tell them but instead try and draw it out of them. What I'd like to think that you would have seen from the recording is that, for example is if a players head was falling forward, instead ask the player, 'why did you play that shot?' I think that they learn more from that and that they remember it better themselves."*

Drawing further upon the work of French and Raven (1959), during the focus group it was confirmed by the athletes that the coaches use of instruction and the information he possessed as a coach had gained the athletes' respect:

> *Athlete: "He is extremely knowledgeable within the cricket context and picks up on small faults that sometimes I don't realise I am doing."*

Use of *'Praise'*

High levels of praise were used throughout all of the sessions that were observed, accounting for nearly 19% of all behaviours, much higher than scold which accounted for only 2% of all behaviours. Scold has been linked to French and Raven's (1959) notion of Coercive power, such as the coach's ability to punish an athlete; as a result the athlete can become resentful of the coach foring a negative relationship (Potrac *et al.,* 2007). Praise, like Instruction, falls parallel with existing research, which suggests that effective coaches use more praise than less

effective coaches (Potrac *et al.,* 2002; Potrac *et al.,* 2007). Praise can heavily influence the power relationship between coach and athlete; as explained by French and Raven (1959) 'Reward Power' is the control that someone has over another's rewards'. In this study the 'rewards' are that of verbal praise such as, "good strike", "nice pick up", "yeh it's good, very good", and non verbal praise such as clapping, thumbs up or nod of the head. In keeping with the work of Potrac *et al.* praise can be used not only to ensure confidence and motivation in players but also to reinforce players' behaviours (Potrac *et al.,* 2002). Although, as outlined by Carreira da Costa and Pieron (1992), praise is only an effective tool when it is used appropriately. Newell (1981) stated that specific information produces greater benefits than non-specific feedback. Schmidt's (1991) research, which supports Newell, concluded that too much praise can be used by coaches who give feedback which is not specific and therefore reduce the motivational effect. Following this view, Cushion and Jones (2001) asked the question of whether feedback which is not specific to athletes' performance is useful at all? Potrac *et al.* (2007) proposed this as an area for future investigation. During the coach interview it was asked, *"Do you feel praise is important in coaching?"* The coach replied:

> *Coach: "Yeh, I do feel it is important, however, it needs to be used at the right times. I think that you can give too much praise. I think that it needs to be done constructively because you could get into a habit. I've seen coaches that give praise like, "good shot" and yet it's not really a good shot and a good player would think that 'he's just told me it's a good shot and it isn't really' and that's not right."*

The athletes were also asked if they believed praise was an important to them as players and how it made them feel:

> *Athletes: "I find that from our coach it is probably the biggest thing that he can give because as I said before a lot of us are good players, we don't need to be coached the basics anymore, just the motivation is enough for us as players and what I think we all need as a team…I think that if the coach can deliver confidence and motivation to players that, within our team, it is all we need, that's what is best for us."*

In agreement with Newell (1981), the coach agreed that specific information is very useful to players but that it is important for the athletes to try and identify why they are being praised prior to the coach telling them:

> *Coach: "Yeh, if I do say 'good shot' or 'well played' or whatever I will then question the athlete as to why. So ill say, 'that was a very good shot, but why do you think it was a good shot?"*

The coaches reasoning relates back to the 'instruction' category, that athletes retain the information better if they can think for themselves.

Use of *'Silence'*

Silence accounted for 25% of all behaviours observed. While this was one of the highest behaviour frequencies in the present study, it is lower than previous studies of coach behaviours in elite football and tennis (Rupert & Buschner, 1989, Potrac *et al.,* 2002; Potrac *et al.,* 2007). This may be due to coach's self awareness of this behaviour, which was identified during the interview as something that the coach believed he did not do enough. Although it would seem that the coach was not engaged or being lazy during these instances, it was noted during the observations that 'silence' occurred when the coach was observing a practice or performance of a skill. It is acknowledged that coaches do not need to be constantly involved during practice or training session as it would be impractical and unrealistic for coaches to constantly communicate to, or demonstrate to athletes throughout the duration of a session (Miller, 1992). Van Lingen (1997) suggested that it is essential that coaches allow for athletes to play or practise without constant coach instruction or remark; he states that this allows the athletes to think for themselves but also allows time in which coaches can carefully consider and analyse the performance; this was confirmed by Cushion and Jones (2001. The coach agreed that it is important to give the players responsibility on the own learning and criticised himself:

> *"I get involved too much and what I'm trying to do is orchestrate towards the players and give them empowerment for them to go away and do their own thing."*

This point related back to the earlier view from the athletes; that they wish that the coach would take more of a managers role within the team and allow the athletes to analyse themselves, giving them more freedom to think for themselves and approach the coach if they have an issue that they wish to discuss. This is an area of research that could be developed as the specific thoughts of the coach during the 'silent' periods were not thoroughly established.

4.5 The Coach-Athlete Relationship and Interactions

Jones (2004) outlined the importance of the relationship between coach and athlete, as it is a vital part of the coaching process. During the athlete focus group it was evident that the athletes do have respect for the coach, for his ability as a player and his knowledge as a coach (French and Ravens, 1959).

> *Athlete: "He never talks about his previous playing or coaching experience but what he does do is show how good he is through demonstrations, for example he will usually hit the stumps 9/10 times, spot on. Our coach has played a very good level of cricket and he is still is one of the top leg spin bowlers in the country. I think that we all respect him for his ability as a player and a coach to demonstrate that."*

However, the athletes believed the coach's behaviours during coach-athlete interactions were inappropriate at the semi-elite level at which they play. As a result the players believe that the coach has reduced his power within the group and in some cases caused negative relationships between the coach and players, allowing some of the players to become docile during training (Purdy *et al.,* 2009). One theme that arose was the coach's use or humour and banter with players during the session. Weaver and Cotrell (1988) identified humour as an important coach/teacher trait. The coach argued that it is important to build a rapport with the group and the use of humour can generate a more relaxed and open environment (Gilliand & Mauritsen, 1971; Weaver & Cotrell, 1988). The coach did follow by identifying that there should always be a line draw as to how far that banter should go:

> *Coach: "I need to know and the players need to know where to draw the line and how far the banter can go, because at the end of the day you are playing an enjoyable sport. Obviously I am getting older and some of the players are now getting younger and I'm am trying to stay on the same wave length with them whether it is using electronics, using facebook or twitter of whatever so that I can interact with them and have convocations with them so yeh I do think it is important."*

The coach went on to explain that the use of banter allowed the players to see a different side of him that wasn't just as a coach but someone that they could feel they could approach and talk to about any issue they wish (Weaver & Cotrell, 1998; Neuliep, 1991). The players' however portrayed the view that the coach's behaviour was unprofessional at a semi-elite level:

> *Athletes: "I think there has to be a discrepancy between coach and athlete or players and I personally think that he is too friendly as a coach. An example would be that we have this group on facebook, which he is a part of and has access to. I think it should just be a players' thing where we can express ourselves to one another. I don't want to use the word 'childish', but it's the truth and that's how I see it."*

One of the players mentioned that the coach also coaches a higher level team than their own; who train at the same location but before theirs begins:

> *Athlete: "We have an allocated time slot just after them so we get to watch a lot of their training sessions and you can tell that he* (the coach) *cares more about them than us, which I understand because they are a higher level side, but I don't think that means that he should treat us any differently to them; it would make us appreciate him more I think."*

Not all the interactions were deemed to be negative. The athletes explained that the coach has built a good rapport with them and small things such as saying "hello", or asking how the players are outside of the training environment, which was appreciated by the athletes.

> *Athlete: "He got a rapport with us that, even though he is the leader and the coach, we can still go and talk to him about any other issues."*

From the interviews it is apparent that the coach has gained a lot of respect from the athletes though his expert knowledge and his ability as a player (French & Raven, 1959) which has led the coach and athletes to build a good rapport with one another and enabled them to interact and build a successful coach-athlete relationship.

The breakdown in the relationship appeared to be that there was a misunderstanding between the coach and athletes with regard to the perceived role that the coach should undertake and also that the athletes had no indication of the specific targets that the coach set for the team, which shows a lack of communication between coach and athlete.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

5.0 Conclusion

This study set out to examine the coach behaviours demonstrated within a semi-elite / developmental cricket club. Furthermore, the study sought to investigate how the coach behaviours affected the interactions and relationship between coach and athlete though the use of interviews.

The results of the A.S.U.O.I were found to be similar existing studies of elite coach behaviours, 33.57% of the total behaviours observed were instructional, regarding technical feedback and analysis, demonstrations and questioning. Praise accounted for 20% and nearly 25% of the results concluded the coach was silent, often observing performances of the players. Upon completion of the observations the interviews and focus group bought about several interesting themes and explanations of the observed coach behaviours. It was the coach's belief that it was his role to deliver a high frequency of instruction. However the players' perception of the coach's role should be that of a managerial position due to the semi-elite level of the club and the players abilities. It also emerged that although the players had a high level of respect for the coach through some of the behaviours the coach used such as the quality of his demonstrations and the knowledge that he possessed, it was believed that the coach should act more professionally during session and treat them more as athletes than friends. These athletes perceptions were not something that the coach appeared to be aware of based on the interview. This showed that there was a discrepancy between the coach and athletes perceptions of the behaviours used by the coach which coincidently had a negative effect on the relationship between the coach and athletes at the cricket club.

5.1 Limitations and Direction for Future Research

Many existing studies have utilised the A.S.U.O.I for the examination of coach and teaching behaviours (Potrac *et al.*, 2007). Although the results of the A.S.U.O.I provide quantitative data, the system provides a clear categorised method of identifying specific coach behaviours. The addition of the interviews provided

qualitative data, which when combined with the A.S.U.O.I allowed the researcher to attain a firm understanding of the reasoning for the use of the behaviours demonstrated by the coach at a semi-elite level as well as the athletes' perceptions. Upon analysing the interview transcriptions several areas were identified for development and as a focal point for future research: firstly, little information of the specific thoughts of the coach during periods of silence were not thoroughly established during the observations or the interviews, the A.S.U.O.I could be modified to categories the specific behaviours of the coach during periods of silence. Secondly, a key theme that emerged from the interviews was the discrepancy between the coach and the athletes' perceptions of the coach's role. Further studies at a semi-elite level in cricket and other sports could identify the perceived role of the coach at the level of sport. Finally, the present study specifically aimed to investigate the behaviours of one coach of a single cricket team and therefore the results may not be generalised across other cricket teams or sports played at this level. Further studies would provide a more established understanding of the coach behaviours used at a semi-elite level.

REFERENCE LIST

Reference List

Altman, D.G. (1991). Practical Statistics for Medical Research, London: Chapman-Hall, 404

Amorose, A.J. and Horn, T.S. (2000). Intrinsic Motivation: Relationships with Collegiate Athletes' Gender, Scholarship Status, and Perceptions of their Coaches' Behaviour. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 22,* 63–84

Berkeley Thomas, A. (2004). Research Skills for Management Studies: London: Routlage

Burke, K. L., Peterson, D. and Nix, C. L. (1995). The Effects of the Coaches' use of Humour on Female Volleyball Players' Evaluation of their Coaches, *Journal of Sport Behaviour, 18*, 83-90

Bloom, G. A., Crumpton, R. and Anderson, J. E. (1999). A Systematic Observation Study of Teaching Behaviours of an Expert Basketball Coach, *The Sport Psychologist, 13* (2), 157-170

Costa, C. F. & Pieron, N. (1992). Teaching Effectiveness: Comparison of More and Less Effective Teachers in an Experimental Teaching Unit, *Sport in Physical Activity: Moving Towards Excellence,*1-39

Cassidy, T., Jones, R. L. and Potrac, P. (2004). Understanding Sports Coaching: The Social, Cultural and Pedagogical Foundations of Coaching Practice. London: Routledge, 38-44

Charmaz, K. (2006). Constructing Grounded Theory*: A practical guide through qualitative analysis.* London: Sage

Chelladurai, P. (2001). *Managing organizations for sport and physical activity: A systems perspective.* Scottsdale, AZ: Holcomb Hathaway

Chelladurai, P. (2007). Handbook of Sport Psychology. New York, **3**, 113–135.

Côté, J., Salmela, J. and Russell, S. (1995).The Knowledge of High Performance Gymnastic Coaches: Competition and Training Considerations. *The Sport Psychologist* **9**, 76-95

Cushion, C. and Jones, R. L. (2001). 'A Systematic Observation of Professional Top-Level Youth Soccer Coaches.' *Journal of Sport Behaviour ,* (4) 35–76

Darst, P.W., Mancini, V.H., and Zakrajsek, D. (1983). Systematic Observation Instrumentation for Physical Education*.* West Point, NY: Leisure Press.

D' Arripe-Longueville, F., Fournier, J.F. and Dubois. A. (1998).The Perceived Effectiveness of Interactions between Expert French Judo Coaches and Elite Female Athletes, *The Sport Psychologist*, (12), 317-332

D'Arripe-Longueville, F., Saury, D., Fournier, J. and Durand, M. (2001). Coach-Athlete Interaction during Elite Archery Competitions: An Application of Methodological Framework used in Ergonomics Research to Sport Psychology, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology (*13), 275-299

Dearnley, C. (2005). A Reflection on the use of Semi-Structured Interviews, Nurse Research, **13** (1), 19-28

Doyle, W. (1977). Paradigms for Research on Teacher Effectiveness, *Review of research in education:* In L.A. Shulman, (5), 163-198

Draper, A. and Swift, J.A. (2010). Qualitative research in nutrition and dietetics: data collection issues, Journal of Human Nutrition and Dietetics, **24** (1), 3-12

Duda, J. (2001). Goal Perspectives Research in Sport: Pushing the Boundaries and clarifying some misunderstandings, *Advances in Motivation in Sport and Exercise*, Champaign: Human Kinetics, 78-81

Duda, J. and Ballagure, I. (2007). Coach-Created Motivational Climate, *Social Psychology in Sport*, Champaign: Human Kinetics.

Erickson, K. (2009). *First Application of a Novel Methodology to Examine Coach-Athlete Interactions in Competitive Youth Sport.* Ontario: Queen's University Kingston, 1-89

Flick, U. (2007). *'Designing Quantitative Research'*; The SAGE Qualitative Research Kit, SAGE Publications ltd, London.

Franks, I.M. (1996). Use of Feedback by Coaches and Players, *Science and Football III*, London: E & FN Spon

French, J. R. P., and Raven, B. H. (1959). *The Bases of Social Power: Studies in Social Power.* Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, 150–167

Gibbs, A. (1997). Focus Groups, *Social Research Update*, **19**, 3-9

Gilliland, H. and Mauritsen, H. (1971). Humour in the Classroom, *The Reading Journal,* 753-765

Goodwin, W. L and Goodwin, L (1996). *Understanding Quantitative and Qualitative Research in Early Childhood Education.* New York: Teachers College Press, 58-65

Gratton, C & Jones, I. (2004). *Research Methods for Sports Studies,* New York

Gratton, C. and Jones, I. (2010). *Research Methods for Sport Studies,* New York: Taylor & Francis (2), 154-238

Grisaffe, C., Blom, L. C. and Burke, K. L. (2003). The Effects of Head and Assistant Coaches' Uses of Humour on Collegiate Soccer Players' Evaluation of Their Coaches, *Journal of Sport Behaviour,* 103-109

Harrison, J.M., Preece, L.A, Blackemore, C.L, Richards, R.P. and Wilkinson, C. (1999). Effects of two Instructional Models: Skill teaching and Mastery learning, Skill Development, Knowledge, Self-Efficacy, and Game Play in Volleyball, *Journal of Teaching Physical Education,* 34-57

Hogg, M. A. and Vaughan, G. M. (2008). Social Psychology, Harlow: Prentice Hall **4**

Horn, T.S. (2008) Advances in Sport Psychology, Human Kinetics, (3), 239-269

Isabel, M., António, S., António, R., Felismina, P. and Michef, M. (2008). A Systematic Observation of Youth Amateur Volleyball Coaches Behaviours, *International Journal of Applied Sports Sciences*, **20**, (2) 37-58

Jones, R., Armour, K. M. and Potrac, P. (2002). Understanding Coaching Practice: A Suggested Framework for Social Analysis, *Quest*, **54**, (1) 34-48

Jones, R., Armour, K. and Potrac, P. (2004). *Sports Coaching Cultures: From Practice to Theory.* London: Routledge

Jowett, S. and Cockerill, M. (2003). Olympic Medallists' Perspectives of the Athlete-Coach Relationship. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* (4), 313-331

Kitzinger, J. (1994) The Methodology of Focus Groups: The Importance of Interaction between Research Participants, *Social Health*, **16**, 103–121.

Kitzinger, J. (1995) Introducing Focus Group, (311), 299–302

Koslowsky, M. and Schwarzwald, J. (1988). The Use Of Power To Gain Compliance: Testing Aspects Of Ravens, Theory In Conflictual Situations, *Social Behaviour and Personality*, **21**(2), 135-144

Kumar, R. (2003). *Research Methodology: A Step by Step Guide for Beginners,* London: Sage **2**

Lacy, A.C. and Darst, P.W. (1984). Evolution of a Systematic Observation System: The ASU Coaching Observation Instrument, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education,* **3,** 59-66

Laios, A., Theodorakis, N. and Gargalianos, D. (2003). Leadership and Power: Two Important Factors for Effective Coaching, 150-154

Lee, M. A., Keh, N. C. and Magil, R. A. (1993). Instructional Effects of Teacher Feedback in Physical Education, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education,* 228-240

Lee Chai, A.Y. and Bargh, J.A. (2001). The Use and Abuse of Power: Multiple Perspectives on the Causes of Corruption, Psychology Press, Sussex, 47-47

Longueville, F., Fournier, J. F. and Dubois, A. (1988). The Perceived Effectiveness of Interactions Between Expert Judo Coaches and Elite Female Athletes, *The Sport Psychologist,* **12**, 317-332

Lyle, J. (2002). Sports Coaching Concepts: A Framework for Coaches Behaviour: Routledge, Canada, (9), 35-58

Magill, R. A. (1994). The Influence of Augmented Feedback on Skill Learning Depends on Characteristics of the Skill and the Learner, (46), 314-327

Marshall, M.N. (1996). Sampling for Qualitative Research. Oxford University Press, **13** (6), 522–525

Maykut, P. and Morehouse, R. (1994). *Beginning Qualitative Research: a philosophic and practical guide.* London: Routledge.

Marshall, C. and G. B. Rossman (1999). Designing Qualitative Research. Thousand Oaks,Calif., Sage Publications. 149-151

Miller, A.W. (1992) 'Systematic Observation Behaviour Similarities of Various Youth Sport Soccer Coaches', *Physical Educator,* (3) 136–43

McNamee, M. J., Olivier, S. and Wainwright, P. (2007). *Research Ethics in Exercise, Health and Sport Sciences.* London: Routledge.

Merriam, B. S. (2002). Introduction to Qualitative Research, Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, 1-6

Miles, M, B. and Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative Data Analysis: An expanded Sourcebook, London: Sage **2**

Molier, B.I., Van Asseldonk, E.H.F., Hermens, H.J. and Jannik, M.J.A. (2010). Nature, Timing, Frequency and Type of Augmented Feedback; Does it Influence Motor Relearning of the Hemiparetic Arm After Stroke? A Systematic Review, *Disability and Rehabilitation,* 32 (**22**), 1799-1909

More, K. and Franks, I. (1996). Analysis and Modification of Verbal Coaching Behaviour: The Usefulness of a Data-Driven Intervention Strategy. *Journal of Sport Science,* 14, 523-543

Morgan D.L. (1988). *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research.* London: Sage.

Neuendorf, K.A, (2002). The Content Analysis Guidebook. London: Sage, 71-88

Neuliep, J. W. (1991). An Examination of the Content of High School Teachers' Humour in the Classroom and the Development of an Inductively Derived Taxonomy of Classroom Humour, *Communication Education,* **40**, 343-355

Nicaise, V. (2006). Students' Perceptions of Teacher Feedback and Physical Competence in Physical Education Classes: Gender Effects, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education,* **25**, 36-37

Nicaise, V., Cogérino, G., Bois, J. and Amorose, A.J. (2006) Students' Perceptions of Teacher Feedback and Physical Competence in Physical Education Classes: Gender Effects, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education,* Human Kinetics, Inc. (25), 36-57

Nicaise, V., Bois, J., Fairclough, S. J., Amorose, A. J. and Cogerino, G. (2007). Girls' and boys' perceptions of physical education teachers' feedback: Effects on performance and psychological responses, *Journal of Sports Sciences*, **25** (8), 915-926

Olsen, W. (2004). Triangulation in Social Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods Can Really be Mixed, *Developments in Sociology,* 1-30

Patton, M. Q. (2002).Qualitative Research & Evaluation Methods, Sage

Potrac, P., Jones, R. L. and Armour, K. M. (2002). *"It's all about getting respect":* The coaching behaviours of a Top-Level English Soccer Coach, *Sport, Education and Society*, **7** (2), 183-202

Potrac, P., Jones, R. L. and Cushion, C. (2007). Understanding Power and the Coach's Role in Professional English Soccer: A Preliminary Investigation of Coach Behaviour, Soccer and Society, **8**, 33-4

Purdy, L., Jones, R. L. and Cassidy, T. (2009). Negotiation and Capital: Athlete's use of Power in an Elite Men's Rowing Programme: *Sport, Education and Society,* **14** (3), 321-338

Rahim, M.A. (1998). Some Psychometric Properties of Two Measures Of French and Ravens Bases Of Power, *The Journal of Psychology,* (5), 465-472

Schmidt, R.A. (1991). *Motor Learning and Performance:* Principles to Practice. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics

Sim, J. and Wright, C.C. (2005). The Kappa Statistic in Reliability Studies: Use, Interpretation, and Sample Size Requirements, *Journal of Physical Therapy*, **85** (3), 257-2

Slack, T. and Parent, M. (2006). Understanding Sport Organizations, London: Human Kinetics **2**

Smith, M., and Cushion, C.J. (2006). An Investigation of the In-Game Behaviours of Professional, Top-Level Youth Soccer Coaches. *Journal of Sports Sciences,* **24** (2), 355-366

Smith, R.E., Smoll, F.L. and Hunt, E. (1977). A System for the Behavioural Assessment of Athletics Coaches, *Research Quarterly,* **48** (2), 401-407

Smoll, F.L. and Smith, R E. (1989). Leadership Behaviours in Sport: A Theoretical Model and Research Paradigm*, Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, **19** (18), 1522-1551

Smoll, F.L., Smith, R.E., Barnett, N.P. and Everett, J.J. (1993). Enhancement of Children's Self-Esteem through Social Support Training for Youth Sport Coaches*. Journal of Applied Psychology,* **78** (4), 602-610

Solomon, G. B., DiMarco, A. M., Ohlson, C. J. and Reece, S. D. (1998). Expectations and coaching experience: is more better? *Journal of Sport Behavior,* **21** (4), 444-455

Sugden, J. (2005). Is Investigative Sociology Just Investigative Journalism? *Philosophy and the Sciences of Exercise, Health and Sport.* London: Routledge.

Tharp, R.G. and Gallimore, R. (1976). What A Coach Can Teach A Teacher. *Psychology Today,* **9** (8), 75-78

Tinning, R. I. (1982). Teacher reaction to the trial materials: *A Victorian case study. Australian Journal for Health: Physical Education & Recreation,* **95**, 11-14

Van Lingen, B. (1997) *Coaching Soccer: The Official Coaching Book of the Dutch Soccer Association.* Spring City, PA: Reedswain Videos and Books, Inc.

Weaver, R. L. and Cotrell, H. W. (1988). Motivating Students: Stimulating and Sustaining Student Efforts, *The College Student Journal,* **22**, 22-32

Yerg, B.J. (1981). The Impact of Selected Presage and Process Behaviours on the Refinement of a Motor Skill, *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education,* **1** (1), 38-46

Zetou, E, Ampraisie, E., Michalopoulou, M and Aggelousis, N. (2011). Coaches Behaviour Assessment Through Systematic Observation. *Journal of Human Sport & Exercise,* **6** (4), 585-593

APPENDICES

APENDIX A – Original A.S.U.O.I (Lacy and Darst, 1989)

ASUOI Lacy and Darst (1989)

1. *Use of the first name*: Using the first name or nickname when speaking directly to a player, for example, 'Nice pass, Steve' or 'Jonesy, that was a poor tackle'.

2. *Pre-instruction*: Initial information given to player(s) preceding the desired action to be executed. It explains how to execute a skill, play, strategy and so forth associated with the sport.

3. *Concurrent instruction*: Cues or reminders given during the actual execution of the skill or play.

4. *Post instruction*: Correction, re-explanation, or instructional feedback given after the execution of the skill or play.

5. *Questioning*: Any question to player(s) concerning strategies, techniques, assignments, and so forth associated with the sport, for example, 'What is your role on defensive corners?' or 'What is the correct technique for taking a throw-in?'

6. *Physical assistance*: Physically moving the player's body to the proper position or through the correct range of a motion of a skill, for example, guiding the player's foot through the movement of a chipped pass in soccer.

7. *Positive modelling*: A demonstration of the correct performance of a skill or playing technique.

8. *Negative modelling*: A demonstration of the incorrect performance of a skill or playing technique.

9. *Hustle*: Verbal statements intended to intensify the efforts of the player(s), for example, 'Run it out, run it out' or 'Push yourself, push yourself'.

10. *Praise*: Verbal or non-verbal compliments, statements, or signs of acceptance, for example, 'Great goal' or a thumbs-up sign.

11. *Scold*: Verbal or non-verbal behaviours of displeasure, for example, 'That was a terrible effort' or scowling.

12. *Management*: Verbal or non-verbal behaviours related to the organizational details of practice sessions not referring to strategies or fundamentals of the sport, for example, setting out cones or 'Get into teams of five'

13. *Uncodable*: Any behaviour that cannot be seen or heard, or does not fit into the above categories, for example, checking injuries, joking with players, being absent from the practice setting, or talking with bystanders.

14. *Silence*: Periods of time when the subject is not talking, for example, when listening to a player, or monitoring activities.

APPENDIX B – Participant Consent Form

Study Title:

'An Examination Of The Coaching Behaviours Of A Developmental/Semi-Elite Cricket Coach.'

Aims and Objectives:

- Examine the different coaching behaviours demonstrated at this level.
- Interpret these behaviours in light of recent research on interactions
- Explore the link between power and the reception to feedback
- Examine athletes' perceptions of the interactions and how they perceive the coaches' power

1. I understand the aims and objectives of the study and am happy to continue and take part.

2. I understand that I have the right to withdraw from this study at any point should I wish to do so.

3. I understand that my identity will be completely protected throughout the study, including the answers I give during the interviews and the results.

4. I understand and give permission for the use of a Dictaphone during the interviews .

5. I give permission for the information obtained in my interview to be used as part of the results for this study only

Participant Name: (PRINT)……………………………………………

Participant Signature…………………………………………………..

Date:…………………………………………

Researcher Signature………………………………………………….

Date:…………………………………………

APPENDIX C – Interview Guides

Coach Interview Guide

Introductory Questions

1. Could you tell me about your playing experience?
2. Could you tell me a bit about how you got into coaching cricket? How long? Level? Etc.

The Coaches Role

1. As a coach, what do you feel is your main role?
2. How have you come to think this?
3. Do you think that your experiences of being coached have had an effect on the way *you* coach?
   - How?
4. Is that because you liked the way you were coached or because you think it is most appropriate to interact with your current team?
5. Do you feel you are constantly aware of the way you are interacting with players and the behaviours that you use?

Instruction

1. One of the highest behaviour categories I observed was the use of instructions, largely regarding technical feedback to individuals. Is instruction important as a coach?
   Why?
2. Do you feel that instruction towards an athlete underlay the role your have as a coach?
3. Are you aware that different players may want different types of feedback or instruction?
4. When do you think the best time is to give feedback?
6. Why?
5. Do you think about the **amount** of information you are giving to athletes?
6. Do you think you gain respect because of your knowledge of the sport you show through instruction and feedback, relating to the informational power?

Praise

1. Was the second highest behavioural category. Is praising or rewarding athletes important in coaching?
7. Why?
8. What effect does praise have on the athletes? Motivation, confidence?
2. When you give praise, do you think it is best to be specific about what you are praising?
   - "Nice one Gar", "Good D"
3. Do you believe that too much praise can have a detrimental effect?
4. Does your ability to give praise demonstrate the power you have as a coach?

Scold

5. On the other hand, I didn't observe many instances of discipline or scold towards players.
6. Do you feel that too much discipline has a detrimental effect on the interactions between players and yourself? Or is it because the group you work with don't require a high level of discipline?
7. Do you think instead of using criticism, you use post instruction instead, giving key points to improve performance?

Silence

1. Another of the highest categories was 'silence', time where you stood back. Usually this was time spent observing performance before giving feedback or instruction.
2. Do you think that it is important to stand back and let the players 'have a go' before you come in?
3. Do you think that too much instruction can have a detrimental effect on the player?
4. Do you try to encourage players to analyse their own performance?
   - How do you do that within your coaching? Questioning?

Humour

1. I noticed that you often use humour amongst players and have a bit of banter. Is that important in creating a good relationship with players?
2. How do you think it makes the players feel?

Management and Organisation

1. A high amount of instruction we organisational or management instruction. Why do you think that it is necessary to give so many organisational instructions?

Power – As a coach you have legitimate power through your role.

1. What types of power are you aware that you use during coaching sessions?
2. Do you feel that you have respect from the players?
   - Why is that?
3. What ways do you try to maintain respect through the coaching sessions?

Coach-athlete relationship and interactions.

1. So overall do you feel that you have a successful coach-athlete relationship with your team?
   - How do you think that it is displayed from the players?
2. Do you feel that you are approachable to players?
3. How do you try to create the best possible relationship between yourself and the players?

Thank you again for allowing me to observe you sessions and the time you have taken to allow me to do this interview.

Athlete Interview Guide

Background and demographic information

1. Can you tell me a bit about yourself?
   - Playing career so far?
   - How long have you been coached by your current coach?

Expectation of the coach

1. What do you expect from a cricket coach at this level?
2. Are you coached in a way that you would expect for the level of the club?
3. Instruction was one of the highest categories that I observed.
   - Do you think that it is the coaches' role to give feedback?
   - Do you think you get enough feedback as players?
   - Do you like the way that the coach gives feedback? How?
   - When is the best time to receive feedback?
4. Praise.
   - Do you think praise is important as a player?
   - How does it make you feel? Confidence? Motivation?
   - What specific kinds of praise are important?
   - Is there too much praise?
5. Scold.
   - Do you think that scold is not used enough within your group?
6. Silence.
   - Times where the coach steps away from you as players. Do you think that it helps you develop individually?

Athletes Perspectives of the coach

1. Do you have respect for the way he coaches?
   - Why?
7. What behaviours that the coach uses do you particularly like?
   - Why is that?
8. Is there any behaviour that you don't like about the way he coaches?
   - Why is that?
9. Do you feel that the coach is approachable?
   - Why?
   - Is that important to you?
10. Do you feel equally treated amongst the team?
    - Why is that?
11. How would you describe your relationship do you have with your coach?
    - Why?
    - How has this been developed since the first time you met?
12. At times the coach used humour amongst the players. Is that important to you and why?

Humour

How does it make you feel that the coach uses humour? How does it affect your relationship?

Do you have a good relationship with your coach? Why is that?

Power

13. Are you aware that the coach may have forms of power over you? Such as the power to select a team based on your performance? Power of the role the coach has within the team?
14. What types of power are evident, during the sessions, from the coach?
    - How are these displayed?
15. What effect do they have on how you perceive the coach? (give you respect for him, fear him, make him more approachable?)
16. Do you feel that you are able to express yourself during the session such as asking questions?