

Central Lancashire Online Knowledge (CLoK)

Title	Pragmatic research in sport: coaching philosophies in action - a values chain to inform practice
Type	Article
URL	https://clock.uclan.ac.uk/31036/
DOI	
Date	2016
Citation	Grecic, David and Grundy, Andrew (2016) Pragmatic research in sport: coaching philosophies in action - a values chain to inform practice. <i>Journal of Qualitative Research in Sport Studies</i> , 10 (1). pp. 211-232. ISSN 1754-2375
Creators	Grecic, David and Grundy, Andrew

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work.


For information about Research at UCLan please go to <http://www.uclan.ac.uk/research/>

All outputs in CLoK are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including Copyright law. Copyright, IPR and Moral Rights for the works on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the <http://clock.uclan.ac.uk/policies/>

Published by:

Sport and Wellbeing Press

University of Central Lancashire, Preston, UK.



Journal of Qualitative Research in Sports Studies

Volume 10, Issue 1, December 2016

Pragmatic research in sport: coaching philosophies in action - a values chain to inform practice

¹ David Grecic (University of Central Lancashire)

² Andrew Grundy (Myerscough College, Lancashire)

ISSN: 1754-2375

ISBN: 978-0-9955744-0-3 (318 pages)

JQRSS Article No: 8/11-10-1-2016-PG[56]-100

To cite this article:

Grecic, D. and Grundy, A. (2016) Pragmatic research in sport: coaching philosophies in action - a values chain to inform practice. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Sports Studies*, 10, 1, 211-232.

Self-archived URL link to this article:

[https://www.academia.edu/30978070/David_Grecic_and_Andrew_Grundy_2016_Pragmatic_research_in_sport_coaching_philosophies_in_action_-_a_values_chain_to_inform_practice. Journal of Qualitative Research in Sports Studies 10_1_211-232](https://www.academia.edu/30978070/David_Grecic_and_Andrew_Grundy_2016_Pragmatic_research_in_sport_coaching_philosophies_in_action_-_a_values_chain_to_inform_practice.)

Advice to submitters - see JQRSS Guide to Contents & Open Call for Papers:

https://www.academia.edu/3513281/JQRSS_Overview_Guide_to_Contents_and_Editorials_by_Volume_-_Open_Call_for_Papers

JQRSS Mapping of Articles (2007- to date):

https://www.academia.edu/8827414/Mapping_of_JQRSS_articles_across_Undergraduate_and_Postgraduate_research

Copyright © Clive Palmer and the individual authors

Notice:

The discussions, statements of fact and opinions contained in the articles of The Journal of Qualitative Research in Sports Studies are those of the respective authors and cited contributors and are set out in good faith for the general guidance of student supported research and the promotion of pedagogical discussion in teaching and learning contexts. No liability can be accepted by the Editor, Advisory Board, the reviewers or the authors/submitters for loss or expense incurred as a result of relying upon particular statements made or circumstances outlined in this journal.



Online – Open Access Research Profiles:

academia.edu: <https://uclan.academia.edu/ClivePalmer>

ResearchGate: http://www.researchgate.net/profile/Clive_Palmer

British Conference of Undergraduate Research <http://bcur.org/journals/>

Pragmatic research in sport: coaching philosophies in action – a values chain to inform practice

David Grecic and Andrew Grundy

(University of Central Lancashire¹)

(Myerscough College, Lancashire²)

Keywords: *coaching, philosophy and beliefs, athlete-centred practice, humanism*

Abstract

Sports coaching philosophy is an area with numerous studies conducted into its origins, development and operation. One under researched concept however, is how a coach's own values can impact upon their professional practice. This paper presents qualitative data from eight high level performance sport coaches, all from different disciplines, which demonstrate how personal values have influenced and continue to influence their coaching. A Values Chain is then presented to illustrate a Values Based Coaching Approach. This highlights two coaching archetypes and offers a framework for practicing coaches to reflect upon their own values and how these directly and indirectly affect their own and their players' performance. The study demonstrates how qualitative data can be used to construct tangible models, provide support for practical coaching and continued coach development.

Introduction

There is a wide body of research regarding sports coaching philosophy. This ranges from the exploration and understanding of what a sports coaching philosophy is (Gearity, 2009; Jenkins, 2011; Jones, Armour and Potrac, 2003; Lyle, 1999; McCallister, Blinde and Weiss, 2000; Stewart, 1993; Wilcox and Trudel, 1998), how to develop one (Burton and Raedeke, 2008; Kidman, 2005), what it looks like in practice (Carless and Douglas, 2011) and its value to coach and athlete performance (Grecic and Collins, 2013; Jenny and Hushman, 2014; Lyle, 2002). Despite the merits of understanding the role of beliefs and values in related fields (see Value-Based Teaching, Value-Based Leadership literature) this component of philosophy seems an under researched and an ill-defined concept within sports coaching.

In order to set the study in context one must first consider why philosophy itself is important to guide professional practice. Philosophy is widely considered to be the first academic discipline, with its history dating back before 3,000 BC (Hardman and Jones, 2013). According to Hannula (2003:3) 'philosophy is the set of principles

or ethics that you live by'. Kidman and Hanrahan (1997:4) relate this directly to the act of coaching. They define a coaching philosophy as 'a personal statement that is based on the values and beliefs that direct ones coaching behaviours'. Indeed, Martens (2012:13) states that 'a philosophy is not really expressed by what you say, but by what you do!'

Developing a coaching philosophy

Martens (2012) suggests that a coaching philosophy is not easy to develop, however, if done with sound reasoning, many benefits are possible. Coaching philosophies will change over time as life experiences impact on practice and as coaches develop and reflect upon their own coaching (Lyle, 2002). Parkin (2003, cited in Bennie and O'Connor, 2010:309) reinforces this belief by stating that, 'a coach's system or philosophy can and should change over time, yet provides clear guidelines for consistency, trust, cooperation, understanding and expectation, as it relates to discipline, teamwork and communication between all parties'.

Why is a coaching philosophy important?

Kidman and Hanrahan (2011) highlighted the importance of understanding the value system that guides coaching and governs actions and suggested that coaches should write down a philosophy to clarify personal values and goals and provide a tangible reference point. Baker and Esherwick (2013:199) supported this when talking about coaching stating that, 'if you enact your philosophy by staying true to your priorities, then you are acting with integrity'. As sports coaching is based upon effective and impactful decision making (Abraham and Collins, 2011), Hannula (2003:4) suggested that every coach must develop a philosophy that will be 'the base' for these coaching decisions. Jenny and Hushman (2014) proposed that having a precisely articulated coaching philosophy makes the philosophy clear to understand within the coach's own mind. It sets standards for their athletes and their parents alike and it gives other coaching staff and support staff a edict to work from, and a clear well defined path to follow. This view is supported by Bompa (1999) who suggested that a coaching philosophy provides a framework which a coach can use for guidance, as a set of principles which can inform decision making, and therefore help to overcome practical problems and aid the consistency in coaching. Burton and Raedeke (2008:4) also noted that each time coaches are confronted with difficult choices, their philosophy should allow quicker and easier decisions to be made. Rotella (1990) reinforced this by suggesting that a coaching philosophy provides a belief system that allows coaches to develop a deeper faith in themselves and their ability to perform in their specific role. He noted that a coach who clearly understands their philosophy will not only enable better clarity for themselves, but should also enable a positive outcome for those players whom they work with.

As sports coaches deal with philosophical issues on a daily basis, philosophical tools can be used to develop a more rational and coherent understanding of coaching in general and of their own coaching behaviour (Hardman and Jones, 2013). Partington and Cushion (2011) stated that these tools include reflective tools, i.e. observations, interviews and film; sociological tools, which include contextual and longitudinal research studies; and philosophical tools, i.e. ontology, epistemology and axiology. It is here in this final philosophical element that we see great potential for practicing coaches to develop their professional practice. As such a brief description of these tools now follows.

According to Lawson (2004:1) ‘ontology derives from Greek... and it is the science or study of being’. Alston (1989) states that ‘epistemology is the study of knowledge’. While Hogue (2011) defines axiology as ‘the study of values (or of ones values)’, and once amalgamated for the purpose of research, should expose the core foundations of a philosophy. Whilst the ontology of coaching practice has been well covered by the research community (Martens, 2005; Abraham and Collins, 2011; Cushion and Lyle, 2010; Lyle, Jones and Potrac, 2005), and epistemology has been explored in this context too (Collins, Collins and Grecic, 2013; Partington and Cushion, 2011; Grecic, 2015; Grecic and Collins, 2012, 2013; Grecic, McNamara and Collins, 2013; Grecic and Palmer, 2013), the important and defining role of values however seems to have been overlooked in this specific context.

Values

The Oxford English Dictionary defines values as principles or standards of behaviour; one’s judgements of what is important in life (OED, 2016). Lyle (2002) argued that the individual values held by a coach are general conceptions about what they find important and as such could guide their behaviours. Although there is little current research into this area within sports coaching, in other domains the importance of values is recognised and embedded within professional practices. Within business and management, a Values Based (VB) approach is widely promoted. Indeed research has revealed that leaders who consistently display ethical, authentic and transformational values and have an authentic, moral and ethical belief system are more successful as leaders than those who lack these values based qualities (Brown, Trevino and Harrison, 2005; Copeland, 2009).

Within the health professions, Values Based Recruitment and Values Based Learning (VBL) have become prominent approaches (Copeland, 2014). Here it is no longer sufficient to have the technical skills alone to be able to do a job, but it is now necessary for individuals to also demonstrate how their values align to the organisation’s humanitarian values. According to Graber and Kilpatrick (2008:179) ‘healthcare organizations have unique structures and are subject to societal expectations that must be accommodated within an organizational values system’.

This relates not just to recruitment processes but also to how employees are developed, for example, how organisational learning is managed. Within education too the merits of a VB approach is promoted. Here the need to align students' values to teaching practices is recognised (Christie, Tett, Cree, Hounsell and McClune, 2008) whilst pedagogical models have also been created to promote positive values in all students (Metzler, 2011).

Copeland (2014) recognised the importance of the VB approach and noted that it could provide different professions, including sports coaching, with valuable insights into the ethical relationships between the social actors. Indeed, within the high-pressured and often chaotic sports coaching environment (Bowes and Jones, 2005) how can we be sure that sports coaches are solely engaging in ethical conduct (Copeland 2014). Given that values are subjective and that behaviours can be influenced, in the sports coaching environment there is always a potential for conflict. Such conflict can be positive but more often it causes individual's behaviours and/or values to change, which leads to frustration, anger and dissatisfaction.

A coach's values can be compromised due to a number of external influences, such as organisational policy or strategy being incongruent to the coach's, for example long term athlete development being compromised for short term, superficial gains. In sports coaching in particular Dieffenbach, Lauer and Johnson, (2010) noted that there is immense pressure to make decisions for reasons other than the 'right thing to do'. Pelaez (2010) however, found that sports coaches provide important moral guidance for their athletes. To enable effective and ethical decision making, Lyle (2002:166) suggested that a coaching philosophy should identify those values that are felt most strongly. Therefore, as Lyle (2002) suggested, this study aims to investigate what coaches' philosophies look like in practice and the role that their values play in underpinning professional practice. Thus, the intention is to identify what their guiding principles are and how they impact upon those whom the coach works with, i.e. players, backroom staff and other stakeholders.

Research philosophy – Pragmatism

This study adopted a pragmatic research philosophy as its prime focus was to make a difference to coaching practice (Bryant, 2009). Pragmatism is a philosophical school of thought that developed in America during the early twentieth century. It has its origins in the work William James (1907), but is also highly influenced by John Dewey's concepts of human experience and asking about what really works (Dewey, 2008). The imperative of pragmatic research therefore is that knowledge should make a difference in action (Dewey, 1931). Pragmatism for us as researchers is a philosophy of knowledge construction that emphasises practical solutions to applied research questions (Giacobbi *et al.*, 2005). It is a

process that extracts theory from practice and then applies this back to practice to form what Glasgow (2013:273) describes as ‘intelligent practice’. As the name suggests, Pragmatism is focused on those ideas that apply practically, disclaiming philosophy’s reputation of being excessively idealistic and abstract (Dewey, 1931).

Creswell (2003) noted that Pragmatism is not faithful to any one system of philosophy or reality and the pragmatic researcher focuses on both the ‘what’ and ‘how’ of the research enquiry. Pragmatism places the research problem centrally and applies all approaches to understanding the problem (Creswell, 2003). With the research question as the central focus, data collection and analysis methods are then chosen as those most likely to provide insights into the question with no loyalty to any alternative philosophical paradigm. Giacobbi *et al.*, (2005) contended that pragmatists opt for methods and theories that are more useful to us within specific contexts (e.g., answers to practical problems), not those that reveal underlying truths about the nature of reality. Indeed Glasgow and Chambers (2012) explained that the overall goal of pragmatic research is to produce results that are rigorous but must be relevant to stakeholders (Glasgow and Chambers, 2012). These results need to be situated in the communities they support and be seen to have made a difference. Lloyd (2016) contends that the ideas and practices that this research produces should therefore be judged in terms of their usefulness, workability and practicality. As Bryant (2009) noted, the ultimate criterion of good, pragmatic research should be that it makes a practical difference.

Our research question centred around how high level coaches expressed their values within their professional practice. As such, methods that explored the existence, nature and operation of these values were selected. We intended to present inductive research to investigate coaching values in practice and therefore provide a model which makes a difference to high level coaches’ behaviour, thus our research philosophy falls directly into the pragmatic paradigm.

Research methods

In order to investigate the phenomenon of values in coaching a qualitative research design was chosen which was open, interactive and sensitive to social interpretations (Corbetta, 2003). It has the potential to provide ‘details about human behaviour, emotion, and personality characteristics that quantitative studies cannot match’ (Madrigal and McClain, 2012). The participants for this study were all practising high level sports coaches from a selection of sports; see figure 1 below. On average the coaches had 15 years coaching experience at a high level, most of the coaches were ex-professional athletes. All were qualified in their discipline at Level 3 or 4 equivalency, with the majority of them involved or previously involved in coaching athletes at international level.

Coach	Sport
C1	Athletics
C2	Cage Fighting and Mixed Marshal Arts
C3	Rugby League
C4	Golf
C5	Rugby Union
C6	Football
C7	Basketball
C8	Squash

Figure 1: Summary of participants for this study

Semi-structured interviews were conducted with each of the participants, lasting between 40 to 180 minutes (n=60). Semi-structured interviews were chosen as they enabled the opportunity to explore complex and at times, sensitive issues whilst, also enabling the chance to probe for more information (Barriball and While, 1994). In order to minimise interviewer bias, an interview guide was compiled for the semi-structured interviews using initial questions, secondary probes and then prompts if needed to clarify the question and gain a deeper understanding of the coaches’ values, see figure 2 transcript excerpt, relating to the question of, *how do you make judgements about your own coaching practice?*

Probes	Prompts
How have these factors evolved and changed over time? Can you offer me several examples of success that you as a coach have achieved?	Winning? Player retainment? Enjoyment? Getting the most out of individuals/the team? Spectator numbers. Increase revenue. Media attention. More players? More investment?
Is this influenced by internal and external pressures? If so why? Can you give me details?	Board, management, fans, media, competitors.
What changes have you put in place to ensure success? Can you offer me any examples?	Style of coaching changes i.e. autocratic, democratic, laissez-faire. Changes in environment, training partners, different roles and responsibilities, education, technology.
Can you give me specific examples of how you evaluate your own performance?	Winning, losing, effectiveness of set plays, behaviour of players/team, statistics i.e. league position, trophies won, players retained, media attention, interest from other clubs. Video analysis, reflective analysis e.g. through journals, keeping up with current literature, CPD.
Can you give me specific examples of how you evaluate your players’ performance?	Video analysis, match day performance, statistical analysis, behaviour, carry out instruction, confidence.

Figure 2: Interviews - probes and prompts table

All questions aimed at developing further insight into how coaches' values were shaped by their chosen sport; provided relative measures of success; influenced their coaching style; and underpinned their coaching philosophy. The questions focussed upon each of the categories identified by Grecic and Collins (2013) which defined the various elements of coach and player interaction in specific areas to highlighted philosophy in practice, for example, philosophy, relationships developed, goal setting employed, coaching methods, review player progress, planning process, (Grecic and Collins, 2013:155). All interviews took place at a time and a place convenient to the interviewee, were all recorded and transcribed verbatim. NVivo software was used in order to code the data and organise it into nodes of raw data. These were then compared with each other and arranged into clusters then built up into lower and higher order groupings. Member checking (Lincoln and Guba, 1985) was also conducted with all eight of the participants. The interview transcripts were agreed as accurate records and no changes were requested.

Results

In total 508 raw data units were created which were built up into a total of 45 emerging themes, 14 lower order themes and 5 higher order themes were identified. See figure 3:

Higher order themes	Lower order themes	Emerging themes
philosophical merit	Evolution Technical Focus Learning ownership	Life skills, Personal growth, Player development Building skills for life, Underpinning knowledge and skills, Technology Self-reflection, Goal setting.
life experiences	Childhood Playing history Coaches influence	Parents, Family values, School. Past playing involvement. Previous positive influences Negative influences /experiences.
external pressures	Expectations Organisational measures	Clients, Board, Fans, Parents, Media / social-media. Changes in management and organisational re-structure
success measures	Extrinsic rewards	Championships / medals, World ranking status, Players progression into first teams,

	Technical improvement Personal Growth	Win Loss record. Individual improvement, Technology, Statistics, Teaching. Life skills, Confidence, Self-reflection.
coaching practices	Athlete centred Fluid Strict guidelines	Player development, Problem solving, Individuality, Personal responsibility and growth, Minimal input, Coach observations. Allow sessions to flow, Let players problem solve, Environment, Relationships, Rapport. Rules, Targets, Team Working.

Figure 3: Thematic analysis of interviews

In summary all coaches interviewed demonstrated strong links between their personal values and their descriptions of their philosophy in action. A wide range of interesting areas emerged. Due to the limited scope of this paper however, and the desire to illustrate the impact and potential of a Values Based Coaching approach we will focus on three of the higher order themes in detail, those of; life experiences, success measures, and coaching practices.

i. Life experiences

There were various factors that impacted how a coaching philosophy had been created and shaped. It became apparent that all of the eight interviewees had played a variety of sports as youngsters, however not necessarily the sport or discipline that they currently worked within. Sport was therefore an influence and a feature from an early age. Interestingly, research undertaken by Rowe (2012) on behalf of Sport England revealed that more variation in the types of sports offered to young people can increase the probability of participation later in adulthood. Three out of eight of the interviewees cited their fathers as having a role in influencing them to take up sport and to progress into coaching. They noted that their fathers had had a huge influence on their professional practice and the views they held about it. C3’s father was, ‘a hard worker, a farmer, a builder, and a sports coach at football’, which he said, had ‘massive influence on where I ended up’. He stated that, as a youngster, he would follow his dad as he went about his businesses, which had a huge bearing on where he is today and that he believed he was destined to end up coaching and

managing either in sport or business. The influence of C3's father has impacted on his values and beliefs and therefore his philosophy. For example, C3 talked about his father's work ethic and management style rubbing off on him. According to Cote (1999) several studies have shown that dedicated individuals in various domains have parents who tend to promote values relating to the importance of achievement, hard work, success, and being active and persistent. C4 also discussed his father and how he had influenced him taking up his chosen sport and on how he has influenced his coaching style. As a youngster C4 noticed his father always had a very good rapport with children, treated them with respect and had encouraged C4 to do the same. When discussing his own coaching style, he touched upon his belief to 'always go the extra mile with the kids and build up a relationship... just because it is the right thing to do with kids, to treat them correctly'.

The research also highlighted previous coaches as being a huge influence on the interviewees' coaching styles and coaching philosophies. This supports Cropley, Neil, Wilson and Faull's (2011) research on reflecting back on previous experiences of being coached and its impact on coaching practice. Pelaez (2010) found that coaches' own moral values were influenced by their previous coaches and Kidman (2005) also argued that previous experience in sport as a participant and the philosophy of their coach strongly forms attitudes towards coaches' own future roles. C4 discusses the fact that he had previously been coached by somebody who had a very strong focus on the technical side of the sport, referring back to advanced video analysis, and giving him 'too many things to focus on'. This type of approach was overwhelming for C4 as he felt under pressure and this had influenced the way he now coaches. As a result of this experience C4 now keeps his coaching as simple as he can, dependant on the client's experience and playing ability. This approach is supported by Goldsmith (2012) who advised that sports coaches should focus on keeping it simple, as one of the biggest mistakes a coach can make, is to make their coaching too complicated. C5 also referred back to a previous coach as being a huge influence on his coaching style. He described his previous coach as having a style that was not dictatorial to players, but rather he asked the players to solve problems so that they learnt together as a team to understand challenges and how to overcome them. This is very much reflective of C5's own approach to coaching that he described during the interview process. There is a growing demand for allowing athletes to be accountable for their own learning and performance (Jones, Armour and Potrac, 2002). Athletes who take responsibility for their own learning are then enabled to make their own decisions with the aim of presenting opportunities to make choices, develop greater levels of motivation, and learn how to develop solutions (Kidman, 2005). C5 also highlighted previous experiences where coaches have focused only on the negative points, and he commented that as a result of this, he always tries to be encouraging to his players. C6 also gave an interesting example

of how his coach had influenced his current values and behaviours. He described himself being apprehensive of his own coach as a youngster,

When I was younger I had a coach that wouldn't speak to you, and it was just a case of get your head down. Because of this experience, I try to create a positive atmosphere and a good learning environment so the children actually feel like they can come to me for questions.

As a result of this experience, C6 ensures that the coaching environment he now creates is positive and open so that he is approachable to the children he coaches. This is the opposite of his experiences as a child and now follows a coaching style akin to that of an athlete-centred and humanistic approach. According to Kidman (2005) an athlete centred coaching style is when athletes take ownership of their learning, thereby increasing opportunities and aiming to strengthen their abilities to retain important skills and ideas. Robertson's (1987) research suggested that the coach is the most significant person to a young sports-person, and encouragement by the coach is received similar to that given by a parent. Therefore, these types of experiences, i.e. coach-centred, authoritarian (autocratic) or athlete-centred (democratic) coaching, at an early age can engrave themselves within the philosophy of that athlete, and undoubtedly have an impact upon their future coaching styles.

ii. Success measures

The interviewees were asked how they judge the impact of their own coaching. In response the coaches discussed the different ways you can measure success: world ranking, titles, medals, winning, growth in a person, happiness, confidence, enthusiasm, technical improvement in the game. Coach C8 stated that if you are technically competent you can pick the game up again later in life and uses squash as a way to enhance his players' personal growth. He gave an example of his success as a coach by talking about a youngster that he has been coaching who has developed his inter-personal skills as a result of playing squash. The player is now growing up and enjoying his life, has developed his self-confidence and independence. This is a success for C8 who stated that, 'what is really good is that I can see as a lad, he is enjoying his life, he is obviously becoming more of a man'. This focus on the development of players or individuals was the chief measure of success for all but one of the interviewees. This links back to the philosophy of Australian rugby league football coach Wayne Bennett, who is an advocate of developing life skills for players. When talking about his own philosophy Bennett, 'insisted that his players were there to learn and develop skills, knowledge and expertise not just in football, but also life' (Bennie and O'Connor, 2010:311). C6 also cited the importance of improving young players as people. He gave an example of a player that had coached, 'mentally and socially, which has impacted on him tactically and technically'. Interestingly this is the reverse of C8's view that if

you develop technical skills it can enhance personal growth but is most likely due to fact that C6 is a coach to younger players. C6 states,

The ultimate aim isn't winning on a Sunday, I don't play for points. Winning the game isn't the most important thing, although it is relatively important, the focus has got to be on the individual, to be working towards his own objectives.

C1 also stressed the development of players as a key measure of success and highlighted that even the individuals without the most talent can still make positive progress. C1 gave an example of a young girl who has improved 11 seconds in the 800 metres event over the last 12 months and even though she is well outside international level qualification times, her progress has been phenomenal and a success for C1 himself. When asked about his coaching philosophy, C1 reflected,

If I have a philosophy it's that everybody is an individual and they need to be treated that way... It is treating each individual individually and getting their specific needs and growing them as a human being and as a sports person as well.

This type of coaching view-point, or philosophy, is reflective of a guiding principle based on humanistic and holistic development, that is inclusive for all athletes. This links closely with Sports Coach UK's (2008) suggestion that a coach's guiding principles should include ensuring an environment that is inclusive for all. Therefore, although C1 trains elite level athletes who in some instances are world ranked, he also coaches amateurs, thus ensuring inclusivity for all within his coaching, and providing him with rewards other than the simply outcome targets being achieved. C7 meanwhile believes that he is using sport as a driver to really instil behaviours that are socially acceptable to make sure that his players are well-rounded and coachable. He gave the following example,

We are using basketball to drive forward life skills. It's not always about winning, the biggest victory I have won this year is having one of our guys being able to articulate himself because that is the skill that he will need most whether it's in a basketball context or just general life.

This type of coaching philosophy is reflective of that of retired American football legend and successful coach Louis Holtz (nd), who suggested that winning isn't everything. Also, Prouty, Panicucci and Rufus (2007) stressed the importance of embedding life skills whilst coaching, suggesting that these could include a positive identity, social skills, physical and thinking skills.

An aspect of player development that was regularly cited as a measure of success was player progress, i.e. to get their players into first teams, national squads etc. This was mentioned by C6, C7 and C5 and is reflective of the aims and objectives of the organisations for which they work. C6 works for a top Premier

League football club and he reinforced this view by stating, ‘ultimately success at the end is working to get players into first teams’. Both C7 and C5 are also under some pressure to demonstrate that they can develop players who can go on and play at the highest level. In these instances, the aims of the organisation, of the coach and of the player are one and the same, this congruence of stakeholder preferences being ideal for effective leadership (Chelladurai, 1978).

Winning or performance is also an emergent theme, with three out of the eight interviewees placing a focus on the end results as a measure of their own success. Both C8 and C7 say that, at the professional level, success is based on winning. This links back to Sports Coach UK’s (2012) statement that high performance coaches often display a philosophy that is driven by results. For C2, his measures of success are varied and wide ranging as he is coaching such a wide spectrum of fighters from amateurs to world champions. His methods are much more statistical and performance driven than the other interviewees. For example he would look at win-loss ratios, the finishing rate, how quickly they finish a fight, how well they do and the class of the opponent etc. Although these types of coaching methods are active in other sports, there does seem to be a strong emphasis on statistical observation in fighting. Delgado (2014) states that this is referred to as ‘big data analytics’ and there is a strong prominence from a coaching standpoint to extract data from the contest, e.g. punch connection ratios. This compares quite markedly to the other coaches who place the individual’s needs at the centre of their coaching interactions rather than reducing their performance down to objective data sets.

iii. Coaching practices

Another theme that emerged from the interview process was a similarity in the preferred coaching styles of the interviewees. An individual will have a preferred coaching style based on their values and experiences, but it may need to change depending on the age, level and ability of the players. Allen, Bell, Lynn, Taylor and Lavallee (2012) recognised the importance to be flexible to meet the demands of varying levels of athletes and changing situational demands. Whereas a coaching style may change, a coaching philosophy based on core values and beliefs will remain the same. According to Hanson (2013) ‘your style of play might change but how you direct and coach the kids, your core values and beliefs as a person should stay the same’.

All but two of the interviewees described themselves as having a democratic, athlete-centred approach to coaching, and most described fostering an environment that is open, relaxed and friendly. C8’s coaching style is based on building a good rapport and that his style changes with different players and with their different developmental stages and training phases. Overall however, he has a friendly style, is quite assertive and very technically based as, he believes, ‘you can see major

improvements in squash through good technical under-pinning which also reduces the likelihood of injuries'. One interesting area he tries to develop is the use of humour. As C8 explained,

I use humour, constant use of humour and fun and settling people down, and then incisive technical bits, looking at the rhythm of things, how to use more metaphors, how to be off court, how to be friendly but keep your distance. How to show real authority by never getting angry.

He gives examples of being flexible and fluid and using different styles with different individuals. For example, one player that he coaches is very thought-based, pre-meditated and likes to stick to an agreed plan; this is in contrast to another player he coaches who finds a plan too strict and rigid as he works on his instincts and if he thought too much about sticking to a plan he would struggle. For this individual, C8 describes how his instincts are his strong point and he tells C8 what he is going to do during the match, based on his feelings. This again, is very much an example of athlete-centred or laissez-faire coaching, where C8 lets his player take the lead and decide for themselves on the courses of action to take. C8 also describes how he adopts a different style with players depending on what phase they are in. He gives an example of a young player who he needed to change his approach with, from a friendly style, to a more forceful and controlled approach, in order to re-establish the boundaries, akin to a coach-centred or autocratic approach despite this not being his usual style of coaching. Such coaching behaviour is supported by Nami, Mansouri, Dehnavi and Bandali (2013) who stated the importance of ensuring that a coach uses an appropriate leadership style to engage players, because choosing an inappropriate one can lead to a reduction of productivity and efficiency. This coaching flexibility is reinforced by coach C7. He stated that he adopts a different coaching style dependent on the position of the player. He explained that in basketball, defence will win the game, but to learn defence you must first understand the offence. For offensive players he gives them a base to work on, but then gives minimal structure and encourages independent thinking. For defensive players he finds it necessary to be structured and organised, for the players to understand their position and to understand the sequence of the defence. Because defence in basketball is quite methodical, his style is more coach-centred, informed and evidence-based using facts and statistics. C7's coaching style is appropriate however to the technical and tactical training requirements for basketball players. Lyle (2002:167) referred to the technical/tactical model or offensive/defensive strategies as a philosophy about the sport, rather than a coaching philosophy. He conceded that there may be some overlap between sport performance models and more general values associated with a coaching philosophy.

Strong values and beliefs were however demonstrated from C2, who said he has ‘strict rules and strict guidelines to what fighters must do’. He specified his coaching style would differ from fighter to fighter according to how they react to certain things, but his rules apply to everyone. He gave an example of how he had enforced his rules when he stopped a fight from occurring six weeks before it was due to start.







Just recently we had a guy ready to fight, the fight wasn’t for 6 weeks. However, he turned up for training and I found out that he had gone out and partied over the weekend, so I pulled the fight straight away. People said you have still got 6 weeks, and I said well that’s not the point. If we have said we are doing 10 weeks of hard graft to fight then you are doing 10 weeks or don’t do it at all.

C2’s coaching philosophy aided his decision by sticking to his values and beliefs and demonstrating honesty from the coach and commitment to the cause, even when under external pressure to do something different. This is an example of Burton and Raedeke’s (2008) recommendation that your philosophy should make your decision quicker and easier. C2 also stated, ‘whatever I ask of them I would be willing to do myself or I have done myself’. This reinforces his own values and beliefs, by showing his fighters that he is committed to their development. Using Tutko and Richards’ (1971) categorisation of coaching styles, C2 is describing personal qualities that would lend himself to being an autocratic coach, where discipline, punishment, rigid schedules, distance from performers and organised, well planned sessions are the norm. C2 dominates his fighters when he shouts instructions from outside the cage so that his fighters can react very quickly to changes that he can see are necessary, but he also describes himself as, ‘quite a caring coach when my fighters lose or win, I feel both’.

Discussion

Previous studies have highlighted coaches’ *chain* of actions originating from their own philosophies, influencing their thoughts and behaviours both; directed internally (planning, reflection) and projected externally (relationship management, coaching methods) onto their athletes and those athletes’ social networks (Collins, Collins and Grecic, 2013; Grecic, MacNamara and Collins, 2013). These studies focussed upon the coaches’ beliefs and attitudes to learning and knowledge as the mediating factor. The results from this current study however suggests that the coaches interviewed had deep-held personal values which could be just as important in directing philosophy to action. Taking the pragmatic research philosophy as our driver, a coaching Chain of Actions figure 4, presents 2 archetypes as exaggerated images creating a template against which observed practises can be compared. Using data from our interviews two extreme positions of coaches who exhibit Humanistic vs Mechanistic coaching values have been identified. Whilst it is understood that coaches will vary their professional practice to meet the changing demands of the

coaching environment (Bowes and Jones, 2006) we propose that a VB Coaching approach operates as a continuum ranging from one extreme to the other. The positions are delineated as follows:

Humanistic Values Athlete focused coach Selfless / altruistic outlook	Sports Coaching Values Chain	Mechanistic Values Outcome focused coach Selfish / egotistic outlook
<p>Holistic player development – altruistic, focus on player well-being, enjoyment, learning, sharing of knowledge which evolves in partnership, is created, does not reside in any one individual. Internal gratification based on supporting players become as good as they can be.</p>	<p>Philosophy</p> 	<p>Importance of Winning, external gratification, Promotes players' success but for reflected glory. Knowledge is owned by the coach. Expert self-perception and need to continually reinforce this claim. Deluded self-image, Ego focused.</p>
<p>Learning environment created, player is challenged to solve problems, explore solutions by trial and error.</p>	<p>Environment</p> 	<p>Player is given the coach's model, preferred technique or tactics to learn and perform without question</p>
<p>Trusting, caring, supportive relationship developed with player, friends and family. Mentorship, critical friend, co-teacher on the developmental journey.</p>	<p>Relationship built</p> 	<p>Player is pressurized, dictated to, and whose needs are superfluous to the task of improving their athletic performance in order to achieve the coach's desired outcome and results</p>
<p>Two way discussion as equals to establish the player's own goals and targets. Holistic focus on all round development – physical, cognitive, affective and social domains.</p>	<p>Goal setting</p> 	<p>The coach initiates a review to re-establish authority over the player, and sets short, medium and long term goals for the player. Goals are outcome based – results focused and align to coach / team needs rather than player developmental needs.</p>
<p>Player discusses and selects methods best suited to own perceived needs, These methods, practices are determined by the player but still 'guided' by the coach to maximise their positive impact. Coaching styles more inclusive, constructivist and cooperative. Use of praise and positive reinforcement preferred to model behaviour over error detection and punishments. More creative, innovative and experimentation practices explored.</p>	<p>Methods</p> 	<p>Coach prescribes practice schedule and roles of any support staff. Typically behaviourist, directive, command coaching styles. Use of tried and trusted coaching drills, practices and games. If players fail to comply they are told that their methods are incorrect. Remedial action then prescribed which the coach will dictate. This may include penal sanctions until the desired behaviours are achieved.</p>
<p>Coach encourages players to reflect against their own internal targets and agreed goals.</p>	<p>Judgements made</p> 	<p>The coach makes a subjective judgement on the player's performance against the coach's own set of criteria, own outcome KPIs – trophies,</p>


		championships, win loss ratio, league position, player squad promotions etc.
Coach asks players to decide on next course of action and provides a framework for discussion. Coach understands own role in player development and potential need to ‘pass player on’ to new coach.	Future direction 	Coach sets a new cycle of coaching to be adhered to and monitored by themselves.

Figure 4: Humanistic vs Mechanistic coaching values

A humanistic values-based coaching approach

In this model the coach is a selfless individual who is dedicated to all players’ humanistic needs. These coaches focus on the holistic development of each person that they interact with. Their normal preference is to prioritise and support the processes underpinning physical, social, cognitive and emotional development. They see outcome goals as something that will naturally occur over time if these processes are nurtured. These coaches take time to foster positive relationships with key stakeholders in the players’ lives and always prioritise the players’ needs over their own. Success and future actions are assessed by the personal development of the player rather than on quantitative performance data.

A mechanistic values-based coaching approach

In direct contrast with the model above, this coach is driven by the need for tangible performance outcomes, exhibiting controlling behaviour desiring power and affirmation over their players. The players’ well-being is subservient to their own needs and players’ compliance and acceptance is constantly demanded. Here the coach operates tried and tested methods which must be adhered to for judgements of success to be achieved. They then assess ‘what is best’ for their players and implement the next stage of their method or plan. Interestingly most coaches in this study would be categorised more towards the humanistic end of this framework’s spectrum but still some of their coaching practices seemed very mechanistic and outcome focussed. These variations within the data seemed to be linked to the life experiences of the coach which in turn might be shaped by their parents or previous coaches, or whether our sample had been socialised into expected roles due to the culture of each individual sport. When describing their own coaching practices some participants appeared confused and gave responses which contradicted their previously stated values. This cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957) should not be unexpected within the arena of high level sport. Here the external pressure to succeed is intense and conflict is always likely to occur (Lyle, 2002). Further exploration of the drivers behind this conflict would be another area where our framework is of merit exposing not only the Values Based Coaching approach of the social actors but also of the organisations that employ them.

Summary and future directions

Most of the previously conducted studies on coaching philosophies focus on the importance of having a coaching philosophy, its origins, and how it is operationalised. One specific element that seems to have been overlooked within this area of research is the link between the coaches values and how this impacts upon their philosophies in action. This paper has presented the case for coaches to consider the role and impact that their personal values exert upon their over-arching philosophy and therefore in all elements of their professional practice. We have presented a reflective framework based on a VB Coaching approach, and we have created two extreme archetypes from our research to comprehend those reflections.

The pragmatic implications of this paper are that firstly, we support previous studies that call for the whole area of coaching philosophy to be embedded within both initial and on-going coach education (Collins, Abraham and Collins, 2012; Jenkins, 2010; Lyle, 1999; Mallet, 2010; Nash and Sproule, 2009) but we would add emphasis on exploring the meaning and operation of a VB Coaching Approach. Indeed, although many National Governing Bodies (NGBs) promote the importance of values within their strategic documents there is little examination of what these look like in practice for their active coaches (England Golf, 2014; England Hockey, 2014; The FA, 2016; RFU, 2016). This situation is starting to change however with the English Football Association exploring how their values should impact upon ‘who we are’ and ‘how we coach’ within their Future Game / England DNA strategy. They are currently formulating their coaching values ‘DNA’ which will be used to guide their coach education processes and awards (The FA, 2016). A second pragmatic outcome of this paper relates to coach recruitment and promotion. As noted above more NGBs are starting to articulate and promote their values. These strategic statements could be coupled with further soul-searching using the Values Chain as a guide helping to identify essential characteristics to base their selection policies upon. In this way, our framework not only promotes a VB Coaching Approach in sport but also becomes an enabler of sports coaching VB recruitment.

Within this research we hope that we have provided models, concepts and results that are meaningful to coaches (Glasgow and Chambers, 2012). We accept however that the merits of our work will be judged through the future dialogue, application and reflections of the coaching community (Giacobbi *et al.*, 2005). Future research into this interesting topic must therefore develop our ideas into workable and useful solutions to practical coaching problems (Lloyd, 2016). This study had a multi-sport focus as we were interested to see if there was merit in adopting a VB Coaching approach in this general domain. Repeat studies in single sport settings would be a good follow up to see if common coaching values are evident and explicit within individual sport domains. If this were the case it would

then be of great interest to compare each sport's values to explore why such differences present themselves. If each sport did exhibit their own bespoke values (as the FA are trying to articulate) there may be interesting contrasts between these sports' organisational values with their coaches' personal values and then to assess the level of alignment and unpick any areas where conflict occurs, potentially improving the overall coaching experiences for both players and coaches.

In the spirit of promoting the value of pragmatic studies to support theory production and exploration (see Jayanti (2011) on the induction, abduction and deduction cycle for pragmatic research) we propose that future studies could also be used to flesh out the VB Coaching archetypes presented in our framework. The use of narrative and creative fiction could expose powerful stereotypes to novice coaches alerting them to the impact of their personal values and beliefs, further strengthening the pragmatic research focus being taken.

References

- Abraham, A. and Collins, D. (2011) Taking the next step: ways forward for coaching science. *Quest*, 63, 4, 366-384.
- Allen, J., Bell, A., Lynn, A., Taylor, J. and Lavalley, D. (2012) *Identifying excellent coaching practice along the sporting pathway*. Sports Coach UK [online]. Available at: <http://www.sportscoachuk.org/sites/default/files/Identifying-Excellent-Coaching-Practice-Report-May2012.pdf> (Accessed 1st August 2014).
- Alston, W.P. (1989) *Epistemic justification: essays in the theory of knowledge*. Ithaca, Cornell University Press, New York.
- Baker, E. and Esherwick, E. (2013) *Fundamentals of Sport Management*. Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL. USA.
- Barriball, K.L. and While, K. (1994) Collecting data using a semi-structured interview: a discussion paper. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 19, 328-335.
- Bennie, A. and O'Conner, D. (2010) Coaching philosophies: perceptions from professional cricket, rugby league and rugby union players and coaches in Australia. *International Journal of Sports Science*, 5, 2, 309-320.
- Bompa, T. (1999) *Total training for young champions*. Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL.
- Bowes, I. and Jones, R. (2006) Working at the edge of chaos: understanding head coaching as a complex interpersonal system. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20, 235-245.
- Brown, M., Treviño, L. and Harrison, D. (2005) Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97, 117-134.
- Bryant, A. (2009). Grounded theory and pragmatism: The curious case of Anselm Strauss. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 10, 3, article 2.
- Burton, D. and Raedeke, T.D. (2008) *Sport psychology for coaches*. Human Kinetics, Champagne, Illinois, USA.

- Carless, D. and Douglas, K. (2011) Stories as personal coaching philosophy. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 6, 1, 1-12.
- Chelladurai, P. (1978) *A contingency model of leadership in athletics*. Unpublished Doctoral thesis, University of Waterloo, Canada.
- Collins, D., Abraham, A. and Collins, R. (2012) On vampires and wolves: exposing and exploring reasons for the differential impact of coach education. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 43, 1-17.
- Collins, L., Collins, D. and Grecic, D. (2013) The epistemological chain in high level adventure sports coaches. *Quest*, 1-15.
- Copeland, M. (2009) *The impact of authentic, ethical, transformational leadership on leader effectiveness*. 2009 Proceedings Publication, Southern Management Association. USA.
- Copeland, M.K. (2014) The emerging significance of values based leadership: a literature review. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 8, 2, 129.
- Corbetta, P. (2003) *Social research: theory, methods and techniques*. Sage, London.
- Creswell, J.W. (2003) *Research design: qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Sage, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Cropley, B., Neil, R., Wilson K. and Faull A. (2011) Reflective practice: does it really work? *The Sport and Exercise Scientist*, 29, 6-17.
- Cushion, C. and Lyle, J. (2010) Conceptual development in sports coaching (pp.1-14). In, Lyle, J. and Cushion C.J. (Eds.) *Sport coaching: professionalisation and practice*. Churchill Livingstone London.
- Delgado, R. (2014). The big time possibilities between boxing and big data Sporttechie [online]. Available at: <http://www.sporttechie.com/2014/04/12/the-big-time-possibilities-between-boxing-and-big-data/> (Accessed 1st August 2014).
- Dewey, J. (1931) The development of pragmatism (pp. 23-40). In, Thayer, H.S. (Ed.) *Pragmatism: The classic writings*. Hackett. Indianapolis, IN.
- Dewey, J. (2008) How we think (pp. 105-353). In, Boydston J. (Ed.) *The middle works of John Dewey 1899-1924* (Vol. 11). Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, USA.
- Dieffenbach, K.D., Lauer, L. and Johnson, D.A. (2010) One step at a time: building coach ethics from the ground up. *Journal of Coaching Education*, 3, 2, 84-105.
- England Golf (2014) *Raising the Game England Golf Strategic Plan 2014-2017*. E. Golf.
- England Hockey (2014) *A nation where hockey matters. England Hockey Strategic Plan 2013-2017*. England Hockey.
- Festinger, L. (1957) *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford University Press, CA. USA.
- Football Association (2014) *The FA coaching philosophy and vision - developing your game through education and training* [online]. Available at: www.thefa.com/~media/9028ED74DB8C466192089690C445BC48.ashx (Acc. 1.8.2014).
- Gearity, B. (2009) *Athletes' experience of poor coaching*. Unpublished thesis, University of Tennessee. Knoxville USA.
- Giacobbi, P.R., Poczwardowski, A. and Hager, P.F. (2005) A pragmatic research philosophy for sport psychology. *Sport Psychologist*, 19, 1, 18-31.
- Glasgow, R.E. (2013) What does it mean to be pragmatic? pragmatic methods, measures, and models to facilitate research translation. *Health Education and Behavior* 40, 3, 257-265.

- Glasgow, R.E. and Chambers, D. (2012) Developing robust, sustainable, implementation systems using rigorous, rapid, relevant science. *Clinical and Translational Science*, 5, 48-55.
- Grecic, D. and Collins, D. (2012) A qualitative investigation of elite golf coaches knowledge the epistemological chain. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Sport Studies*, 6, 1, 141-161.
- Grecic, D. and Collins, D. (2013) The epistemological chain: practical applications in sports, *Quest*, 65, 2, 151-168.
- Grecic, D., MacNamara, A., Collins, D. (2013) The epistemological chain in action: coaching in high level golf. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Sports Studies*, 7, 1, 103-126.
- Grecic, D. and Palmer, C. (2013) Tales from the tee: A narrative accounts of being coached in golf. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Sports Studies*, 7, 1, 127-152.
- Grecic, D. (2015) *Learning to make the right decisions - the epistemological chain in action: an investigation and guide for elite golf practice*. PhD Thesis, University Central Lancashire.
- Goldsmith, W. (2012) Coach Education- some ideas for improvement. *High Performance Rowing* [online]. Available at: <http://highperformancerowing.net/journal/2012/1/9/coach-education-some-ideas-for-improvement.html> (Accessed 5th August 2014).
- Graber, D. and Kilpatrick, A. (2008) Establishing values-based leadership and value systems in healthcare organizations. *Journal of Health and Human Services Administration*, 179-197.
- Hannula, D. (2003) *Coaching swimming successfully*. Human Kinetics, Illinois, USA.
- Hanson, B. (2013) A coaching philosophy. *The Coach Diary* [online]. Available at <http://www.thecoachdiary.com/a-coaching-philosophy/> (Accessed 5th August 2014).
- Hardman, A. and Jones, C. (2013) Philosophy for coaches (pp. 99-101). In, Jones R.L. and Kingston K. (Eds.) *An introduction to sports coaching: connecting theory to practice*. Routledge, Abingdon, Oxfordshire.
- Hogue, R.J. (2011) *Axiology: what do you value in research?* [online]. Available at: <http://rjh.goingeast.ca/2011/11/17/axiology-what-do-you-value-in-research/> (Acc. 1.3.2014).
- Holtz, L. (nd) Sports quotes *Josephson Institute Centre of Sports Ethics* [online]. Available at: http://josephsoninstitute.org/pdf/sports_quotes.pdf (Accessed 27th August 2014).
- James, W. (1907) *Pragmatism: A new name for some old ways of thinking*. Longmans, NY.
- Jayanti, E.B. (2011) Toward pragmatic criteria for evaluating HRD research. *Human Resource Development Review*, 10, 4, 431-450.
- Jenkins, S. (2010) Coaching philosophy (pp.233-242). In, Lyle J. and Cushion C.J. (Eds.) *Sport coaching: professionalisation and practice*. Churchill Livingstone. London.
- Jenkins, S. (2011) Coaching philosophy, eclecticism and positivism. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching* 7, 1, 1-27.
- Jenny, S.E. and Hushman, G.F. (2014) A case study of a successful men's NCAA Division I distance running coach: to what extent is decision-making humanistic? *The Sports Journal* [online]. Available at: <http://thesportjournal.org/article/a-case-study-of-a-successful-mens-ncaa-division-i-distance-running-coach-to-what-extent-is-decision-making-humanistic/> (Accessed 20th September 2016).
- Jones, R.L., Armour, K.M. and Potrac, P. (2002) Understanding the coaching process: A framework for social analysis. *Quest*, 54, 1, 34-48.
- Jones, R.L., Armour, K.M. and Potrac, P. (2003) Constructing expert knowledge - a case study of a top-level professional soccer coach. *Sport, Education and Society*, 8, 2, 213-229.

- Kidman, L. (2005) *Athlete-centred coaching: developing inspired and inspiring people*. Innovative Print Communication, Christchurch, New Zealand.
- Kidman, L. and Hanrahan, S. (1997) *The coaching process: a practical guide to improving your effectiveness*. Dunmore Publishing Limited, Wellington, New Zealand.
- Kidman, L. and Hanrahan, S. (2011) *The coaching process: a practical guide to becoming an effective sports coach*. Routledge, Abingdon, Oxfordshire.
- Lawson, T. (2004) *A conception of ontology* [online]. Available at: http://www.csog.group.cam.ac.uk/A_Conception_of_Ontology.pdf (Accessed 27.5.2014)
- Lincoln, Y.S. and Guba, E.G. (1985) *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage, Newbury Park, CA.
- Lloyd, M.S. (2016) Theory and research in construction education: the case for pragmatism. *Construction Management and Economics*, 34, 7-8, 552-560.
- Lyle, J. (1999) Coaching philosophy and coaching behaviour. In, Cross N. and Lyle J. (Eds.) *The coaching process: principles and practice for sport*. Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
- Lyle, J. (2002) *Sports coaching concepts: framework for coaches' behaviour*. Routledge, UK
- Madrigal, D. and McClain, B. (2012) *Strengths and weaknesses of quantitative and qualitative research*. Available at: <http://www.uxmatters.com/mt/archives/2012/09/strengths-and-weaknesses-of-quantitative-and-qualitative-research.php> (Accessed 3rd August 2014).
- Martens, R. (2005) *Successful coaching* (5th ed.). Human Kinetics. Champaign, IL. USA
- Martens, R. (2012) *Successful Coaching – the most authoritative guide on coaching principles*. Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL, USA.
- McCallister, S.G., Blinde, E.M. and Weiss W.M. (2000) Teaching values and implementing philosophies: dilemmas of the coach. *Physical Educator*, 57, 1, 35-45.
- Nami, A., Mansouri, M. Dehnavi M. and Bandali E. (2013) Relationships between coaches leadership styles and athletic stress in team sports. *European Journal of Experimental Biology*, 3, 2, 48-53.
- Nash, C. and Sproule, J. (2009) Career development of expert coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 4, 1, 121-138.
- Parkin, D. (2003) *Coaching philosophy*. Cited in: Bennie, A. and O'Conner, D. (2010) Coaching philosophies: perceptions from professional cricket, rugby league and rugby union players and coaches in Australia. *International Journal of Sports Science*, 5, 2, 309-320.
- Partington, M. and Cushion, C. (2011) An investigation of the practice activities and coach behaviours of professional top-level youth soccer coaches. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sport*, 1-13.
- Pelaez, S. (2010) *The coach as a moral influence*. Unpublished Doctoral thesis, Concordia University Montreal, Quebec, Canada [online]. Available at: http://spectrum.library.concordia.ca/7400/1/Pelaez_PhD_S2011.pdf (Accessed 3.8. 2014).
- Prouty, D., Panuicci, J. and Rufus, C. (2007) *Adventure education – theory and application*. Human Kinetics, Champaign, IL, USA.
- RFU (2016) *Defining our core values* Rugby Football Union [online]. Available at: <http://www.englandrugby.com/my-rugby/players/core-values/> (Accessed 2nd May 2016)
- Robertson, I. (1987) *The coach and the drop out*. College of Education, South Australia.
- Rotella, R.J. (1990) Providing sport psychologist consulting services to professional athletes. *The Sport Psychologist*, 4, 409-417.

Rowe, N. (2012) *Review of the research evidence on young people and sport*. Sport England [online]. Available at: <https://www.sportengland.org/.../review-of-se-research-on-yp-what-do-we-know.docx> (Accessed 29th July 2014).

Sports Coach UK (2008) *The UK Coaching Framework* [online]. Available at: <http://www.sportscoachuk.org/sites/default/files/UK%20Coaching%20Framework.pdf> (Accessed 12th September 2015).

Sports Coach UK (2012) *Identifying excellent coaching practice along the sporting pathway* [online]. Available at: http://www.sportscoachuk.org/sites/default/files/Excellent-Coaching-Practice-High-Performance-Coaching-Environment_0.pdf (Accessed 17th July 2014).

Stewart, C. (1993) Coaching behaviours: the way you were, or the way you wished you were. *The Physical Educator*, 50, 23-50.

The FA (2016) *Our culture our values – England DNA* [online]. Available at: https://community.thefa.com/england_dna/p/fundamentals (Accessed 2nd April 2016).

Tutko, T. and Richards J. (1971) *Psychology of coaching*. Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

Wilcox, S. and Trudel, P. (1998) Constructing the coaching principles and beliefs of a youth ice hockey coach. *Avante*, 4, 3, 39-66.

JQRSS Author Profiles

David Grecic¹ is a Principal Lecturer at UCLan whose research focusses on how theories of teaching and learning impact upon decision making and professional practice in elite sport and Physical Education. He aspires to provide support and guidance for developing coaches and teachers wishing to develop their professional philosophy in terms of values, pedagogy, critical reflection and decision making skills. Contact: DGrecic1@uclan.ac.uk

Andrew Grundy² graduated with a 1st BA (hons) in Sports Coaching from the University of Central Lancashire. This was followed by a PGCE and then an MA in Physical Education and School Sport also through UCLan. Andrew currently works at Myerscough College as Rugby Programme Leader and Head of Rugby League. His academic interests include coaching philosophies and their impact in sport. Contact: agrundy@myerscough.ac.uk

Reviewer Comments

Sport is a form of entertainment, principally for those who play or compete and probably for those who spectate. Either way, fragile human sensitivities are at the centre of this socially constructed act that we call sport. Therefore, researching the personal and professional values of sports people may be an effective means to becoming person-centred in the practice of coaching. Assuming that sports people are not machines, a recognition of the archetypal mechanistic and entirely results-driven coach may be a diagnosis of not only poor coaching, but possibly a wrong fit of personality type with this social role. Whilst winning in sport is still of vital importance, this study of humanistic practice that generates theory to inform coach education programmes, is an important step towards valuing people in sport. Accolades, titles, medals and records are not factory products, they are won and lost by people; therein an aspect of social competency that NGBs seemingly overlook.