

INNOVATIVE APPROACHES IN COACH EDUCATION PEDAGOGY¹

ABORDAGENS INOVADORAS NA PEDAGOGIA DE TÉCNICOS EDUCACIONAIS

*Kevin Morgan*²

*Robyn L. Jones*³

*David Gilbourne*⁴

*David Llewellyn*⁵

ABSTRACT: We know that coach education programmes continue to be criticized for their largely didactic methods of delivery and rather superficial engagement with the complex reality of practice and we understand that innovative approaches in coach education pedagogy means moving somewhat away from the competencies based approach and it has been increasingly argued that the aim of coach education should be to develop in practitioners a ‘quality of mind’ so that they are better equipped to deal with the problematic and dynamic nature of their work. The skills of coach educators in facilitating the learning of student coaches are crucial to the effectiveness of the pedagogies. Coach educators, therefore, must be committed to the approaches outlined in this article and invest the time and work necessary to learning new skills if they are to be successfully implemented. We found that teaching in this way resulted in a raised degree of responsibility on behalf of the tutors, not so much in relation to their content delivery, but for the subsequent student interaction and learning (JONES et al., 2011). In this sense tutors took greater care to listen and react to group interactions, recognising that their (non) interventions at (in) appropriate times could genuinely affect and frame ensuing students’ discussions and perceptions. A further area of research, therefore, could be to explore the issues surrounding the training and support of coach educators in implementing such pedagogical innovative approaches to coach education.

KEYWORDS: Innovative approaches; Coach education; Coach skills; Pedagogical practice.

RESUMO: Sabemos que os trabalhos de orientação de técnicos/professores são muito criticados por seus métodos pouco se aproximarem de práticas inovadoras. No entanto, práticas pedagógicas inovadoras devem se aproximar da realidade prática e avançar aos métodos tradicionais, considerando que uma pedagogia inovadora deve mover alguém do lugar onde se encontra para conhecer novas possibilidades. As habilidades dos técnicos/professores devem ser trabalhadas no sentido dos mesmos se constituírem facilitadores do processo de aprendizagem dos estudantes para se pensar numa pedagogia inovadora. Entendemos que uma concepção pedagógica construída nessa direção possibilita o desenvolvimento tanto de técnicos/professores, assim como os estudantes e pesquisas educacionais

¹ This paper is re-printed from a chapter in the ‘Handbook of Sports Coaching’ (2012; edited by Dr. P.Potrac et al., and published by Routledge). Hence, it is published here with their appreciated permission.

² Teacher Dr Cardiff Metropolitan University, Cardiff, Wales, UK. E-mail: kmorgan@cardiffmet.ac.uk

³ Teacher University of Hull, Hull, England UK. E-mail: rljones@cardiffmet.ac.uk

⁴ Teacher Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, England, UK. Email: dgilbourne@cardiffmet.ac.uk

⁵ Teacher Norwegian School of Sport Sciences, Oslo, Norway. E-mail: d.j.llewellyn@ljmu.ac.uk

devem caminhar nessa direção, tendo em vista a necessidade de transformação qualitativa dessa área de atuação.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Abordagens inovadoras; educação do técnico; habilidades do técnico; prática pedagógica.

INTRODUCTION

Thanks to a surge of research in the past decade, it has come to be generally acknowledged that the dynamic and intricate nature of coaching precludes any ‘paint by number’ plans that practitioners can easily follow (GILBERT; TRUDEL, 2004; JONES; WALLACE, 2005). Despite such recognition, coach education programmes continue to be criticized for their largely didactic methods of delivery and rather superficial engagement with the complex reality of practice (CHESTERFIELD et al, 2010; JONES; TURNER, 2006). The effect has been a very limited impact on coaches’ actions and behaviours, as such explicit knowledge is deemed far from the everyday reality of what coaches do. Clearly then, means must be found whereby coaches are allowed to better engage with both ‘cutting edge’ content inclusive of the nuance and complexity of context, and the learning process in general. Following from the above, the aims of this paper are three-fold. Firstly, to discuss recent developments in coach education pedagogy that we, as authors, have been variously engaged in and their relative merits in developing deeper coach learning. These include problem-based learning (PBL) (JONES; TURNER, 2006), action research (JONES; MORGAN; HARRIS, 2011) and ethno-drama (MORGAN; JONES, 2010; MORGAN, JONES, GILBOURNE; LLEWELLYN, s/d). Secondly, to outline a research agenda to help us better understand the impact of such pedagogies on coach education and coach learning; and, thirdly, to signal possible future methods which we believe hold considerable potential to better prepare coaches for the complexity of their everyday practice.

WHAT’S ALREADY OUT THERE: A PROBLEM-BASED LEARNING PEDAGOGY

In moving somewhat away from the competencies based approach, it has been increasingly argued that the aim of coach education should be to develop in practitioners a ‘quality of mind’ so that they are better equipped to deal with the problematic and dynamic nature of their work (JONES, 2000; CASSIDY et al, 2009). In an effort to do this, some years ago Jones and Turner (2006) experimented with a problem-based learning (PBL) approach to educate a class of final year under-graduate coaching students. PBL is an approach to teaching

and learning that uses realistic, problematic scenarios and facilitative tutor questioning, to challenge and instil in students critical ways of thinking (JONES; TURNER, 2006). In PBL, students work in groups and use ‘triggers’ from the scenarios to define their own learning objectives, and subsequently carry out independent, self directed research before returning to the group to discuss and refine their acquired knowledge . Thus, PBL is not just about problem solving; rather it uses problems to increase knowledge and understanding, and to facilitate learning.

PBL is based on the pragmatic philosophy of John Dewey, and aims to develop competencies such as a critical logic, an analytical approach to problems, decision making and self-evaluation (ENGEL, 1999). It is, therefore, a way of learning about how to be a capable professional (ENGEL, 1991). By promoting professional growth through ‘reflective conversations’ triggered by practice dilemmas (SCHÖN, 1987), the approach takes into consideration the constructivist nature of practitioner learning. Specific benefits claimed for PBL include: (a) improved abilities to make decisions and solve problems; (b) a raised awareness of the complexity of real world issues; (c) exposure to several bodies of knowledge; (d) increased abilities to extend learning beyond the presented problems and to think holistically across disciplines; (e) a heightened awareness of the integration of theory and practice; resulting in (f) individuals who are better able to learn effectively throughout their professional lives (BOUD; FELETTI, 1991; DRINAN, 1991; BARROWS, 2004).

Such claims prompted Jones and Turner (2006) to research PBL in a sports coaching context. In their study, PBL was presented as a way through which the goal of coaching holistically could be better aspired to. They defined holistic coaching, not as multi-disciplinary, comprising unconnected strands of differing content knowledges, but as interdisciplinary, where such knowledges meet, interconnect and dissect (JONES; TURNER, 2006). The aim of the PBL module, therefore, was to develop an ability in students to employ a flexible and holistic approach to coaching. The specific content to be discussed was structured around problematic scenarios which reflected the complex and integrated nature of coaching knowledge in real-life situations. The emphasis was student-centred, which brought an expectation that students would take an active part in planning, organizing and conducting their own learning within a group framework. To engage with the problem-based group work, the students also had to review their collective knowledge, identify the information they needed to solve a particular problem, research and learn that knowledge, and relate it to the problem. The problems, therefore, were designed to be challenging, complex, controversial

and not least, interesting for the students (ALLEN et al, 1996). In addition, the problems had to be reasonably open-ended in nature, so that students considered them in an integrated cross-discipline way with no single ‘right answer’, thus allowing them to explore their own and others’ points of view. The structure of the module involved groups of students working on a specific scenario over a 6 week period. Here, the students’ organised themselves into groups, and decided how to identify and research the main issues evident within their scenario. Over the subsequent weeks they were also subject to some interruptions which they had to address (see JONES; TURNER, 2006 for a detailed account of procedures here). They eventually shared their ‘solutions’ to the problematic scenarios with the class in the form of short group presentations.

Following some initial insecurities and anxieties, the students reported that they enjoyed the PBL approach as it provided them with an explicit opportunity to use theoretical knowledge in a practical situation for the first time. In relation to the learning outcomes of the module, the students reported that it had ‘opened their eyes to something new’. There was also some evidence that the student-coaches had started to think differently about their practice as a result of the PBL and had developed a better appreciation of the inherent complexities of coaching and the inter-disciplinary knowledge needed. Furthermore, there was a greater appreciation and recognition of the structural constraints upon coaches’ role fulfilment and the limits of their agency. Consequently, although mindful of what can be claimed from a small scale study with one group of students, the authors concluded that the approach holds the potential to help coaches towards the goals of transferable knowledge, and critical reflection among others.

Although encouraged by such early findings, we remain acutely aware that many and various other strands of research need to be engaged with to buttress our claims for the value of PBL to teach coaching. An example of this could be to explore the transformative claims of PBL; that is, the transformation by learners of the knowledge found or presented to them. According to Entwistle (2000), this knowledge transformation depends, in part, on students’ understanding of the concepts used within the teaching which have to resonate with everyday experience and be couched in accessible language, preferably with metaphorical associations. In this respect, to provoke critical reflection on practice, the teaching approach should possess a (high) degree of *pedagogical fertility* (ENTWISTLE, 1994). It is an aspiration which reflects Schön’s (1987, p. 25) belief that simply learning a theory (and even applying it to practice) is insufficient. Rather, what is required is for a quality of reflection

and interpretation which enables practitioners to construct “an integrated knowledge-in-action”. Through researching PBL’s transformative claims a little more then, we could develop a better understanding of exactly what and how students learn what they learn through the approach. This could be particularly in terms of developing coaches’ decision making and problem solving abilities, and to think holistically across disciplines (BOUD; FELETTI, 1991; DRINAN, 1991; BARROWS, 2004).

RECENT DEVELOPMENTS: USING ACTION RESEARCH WITHIN A ‘COMMUNITIES’ FRAMEWORK

In further searching for innovative and creative pedagogies through which to teach sports coaching, Jones, Morgan and Harris (2011) utilised an action-research based approach. Action research is a methodology which pursues outcomes of both action (change) and research (understanding). It involves cycles of reconnaissance, planning, action, reflection and interpretation (including the integration of theory), leading to improved understanding and learning (TSAI et al, 2004). Borrowing from Lewin (1946), action research was initially defined as “a method that enabled theories produced by the social sciences to be applied in practice and tested on the basis of their practical effectiveness” (CARR, 2006, p. 423). Drawing on Lewin’s vision, Dick (1997) suggested that the purpose of action research, through critical and considered reflection, was to allow both tacit and explicit knowledge to inform each other in order to recognize thorny practical issues as they arise and to devise pragmatic responses. Action research, therefore, allows us to cope with the kind of organized complexity facing our everyday lives in the 'real' world (ALLEN, 2001), and is often viewed in collaborative terms (CARR; KEMMIS, 1986). This is somewhat consistent with Wenger’s (1998) notion of a community of practice, which has been defined as “[...] a group of people who share a common concern, set of problems, or a passion about a topic, and who deepen their knowledge and expertise in this area by interacting on an ongoing basis” (WENGER, et al, 2002, p. 4). According to Wenger (1998), learning is essentially a social phenomenon, and in order to best support it he advocates bringing people together in common activities to discuss and deconstruct what they learn through their mutual engagement in those activities.

Consequently, a key characteristic of both action research and communities of practice relate to the quality of the collaboration between participants, a process which enables the development and acceleration of mutual understanding particularly in relation to developing action (OJA; SMULYAN, 1989). Both methods, therefore, can be seen as

cogenerating knowledge through collaborative communication, where the diversity of experiences within a group is viewed as a catalyst for enrichment (GREENWOOD; LEVIN, 2003). Both also recognize that people learn through the active adaptation of their existing knowledge in response to their contextual experiences, and the subsequent sharing of that knowledge. Such experiences may be through shared discussion with others or engagement with new explicit knowledge through theory. For most people, this experiential learning process is a natural one, but a structured pedagogy (e.g., action research) can help in providing a framework for formalising and making this process more effective (JONES et al, 2012). The collaborative aspect also provides the support required to make fundamental changes in individuals' practice which often endure beyond the life of any research project (OJA; SMULYAN, 1989). This point is particularly salient to the current debate about the change process in coaching (CASSIDY, 2010).

As stated at the beginning of this section, we recently applied an action research approach to a postgraduate coach education unit in order to address the practice-theory gap (JONES, et al, 2012). In principally drawing on elements from action research and student 'communities of practice' (WENGER, 1998), the curriculum was established around a set of theoretically driven practical experiences and discussion groups. The basic intent was to develop in students an integrated, realistic knowledge base of how theory can and should be reflected in practice. The unit involved students being introduced to a particular theoretical position with the expectation that they would integrate that theory into their practice in the upcoming week. The students then shared their experiences in structured discussion groups during the following class. It was considered that such an innovative pedagogy would allow students an opportunity to better engage in the process of their own learning, thus increasing the relevancy of the experience inclusive of an explicit nexus between theory and practice (JONES; TURNER, 2006). The eight theoretical perspectives given to the students included social orchestration which refers to how individuals manage others in a dynamic, fluid world (JONES; WALLACE, 2005, 2006), social role and impression management (GOFFMAN, 1959), virtue theory ,which is tied to notions of both moral (i.e., patience, courage and generosity) and intellectual (i.e., practical skill, intuition and resourcefulness) virtue (MCINTYRE, 1985), teaching styles as related to Mosston and Ashworth's (2002) spectrum, shared leadership or athlete empowerment (JONES; STANDAGE, 2006), developing a favourable motivational climate for learning (AMES, 1992), followership (RUSSELL, 2003) and social exchange (BLAU, 1986). In many ways, such a structure was inspired by Sfard's

(1998) dual metaphors of learning by acquisition and participation, and the dangers of choosing only one. The students were stimulated by, and positive about, the approach in terms of it better ordering the knowledge they had and in developing new insights about coaching practice. Similar to Cassidy et al.'s (2006) work, through progressive engagement with new theoretical concepts and each other's experiences, the student coaches within our project came to increasingly recognize the specificity and limitations of their own knowledge. According to Wenger (1998, p. 5), when new "light is shed on our world" in this way, our intuitions are pushed, deepening our understanding of familiar phenomena. This seemed to happen to our students, as they came to better problematise, deconstruct and subsequently order what they recognized as known practice, resulting in a sharpening of perceptions in relation to existing experiences (WENGER, 1998). The broad action research structure of the unit forced critical reflection on practice, giving credence to the students' existing coaching knowledge with the subsequent impact being an improved ability to conceptualize that knowledge (ELBAZ, 1983). This raised awareness of practice also helped the students to clarify personal philosophies by providing them with a means of reflecting methodically upon familiar experience and the previously vague notions about what they considered their individual philosophies to be. The students' critical reflection on their actions in light of previously unconsidered theoretical frameworks also provided them with new insights and a renewed sense of responsibility over their coaching delivery through the process of self-monitoring. The approach, therefore, gave the students a greater sense of empowerment encouraging them to inquire and self-regulate their own development (OLLIS; SPROULE, 2007); a central tenet of 'first person' action research (REASON; BRADBURY, 2001).

The students' experience on this unit also gave support to Wenger's (1998) belief that engagement in social practice is the fundamental process by which we learn. In Wenger's (1998) terminology then, the students colluded, collided, conspired and conformed in "making sense of situations, sharing new tricks and ideas" (WENGER, 1998, p. 47). This was reinforced through the action research approach which allowed progressive structured discussion on practiced concepts, and is consistent with the work of Cassidy et al (2006) where coaches considered conversations grounded in everyday issues with peers and colleagues as being vital for their professional development.

Although this pedagogical approach was considered critical and enjoyable by the students, their evaluations were not universally positive (JONES et al, 2012). For example, more time to engage with the theories given would have been beneficial, allowing

further exploration and subsequent reflection upon the nuances of each position. Additionally, there was some tension between the needs of the individual and the dominant voices of the group. Such issues, however, were focussed on structure, content and practical delivery as opposed to the unit's philosophy, or the realisation of the learning outcomes. The result here then, was a seeming convergence of practice and theory, which has obvious implications for coach development. These findings again echo Schön's (1987, p. 25) work and his call to develop "an integrated knowledge-in-action approach", much of which can be spontaneous, reflecting a 'professional artistry' in practice (SCHÖN, 1983). The findings also give weight to Ollis and Sproule's (2007) belief in the importance of challenge in development, although care has to be taken in relation to how that challenge is framed, and the support given to learners in dealing with it.

Similar to the use of PBL already mentioned, more work is needed on an action research (and/or a communities of practice) approach to teaching coaching before too much can be claimed on its behalf. A particular avenue here could relate to problematising the notion of learning through reflection; in that far from being an individual activity, reflective learning is communal in nature as it is "embedded in the institutionally structured context shared by a community of practitioners" (SCHÖN, 1987, p. 33). A particular issue to explore here could relate to the role of personal reflection both within and without a group structure in developing coaches' knowledge. This could be in relation to how coaches' exclusive reflections impact on learning developed both within a shared community and through individual coaching practice; an agenda which recognises both the structural or social and agential aspects of coach development (JONES et al, 2004). Further worthy issues to possibly investigate allied to this approach includes those of exposure, collaboration and/or power as involved in establishing an effective 'community', where coaches are open (or not) to sharing their ideas and practices with others.

A FUTURE AGENDA? USING ETHNO-DRAMA TO TEACH COACHING

Building on the aforementioned critical pedagogies, we have also experimented with ethno-drama as a potential means to better engage and educate sports coaches (MORGAN; JONES, 2010; MORGAN et al, in press). Ethnodrama has been promoted as a means of communicating the emotional and contextual complexities of lived experiences (GILBOURNE, 2007). It has also been described as 'a new form of theatre', that seeks to translate research into reflexive, reflective performances to effect meaningful change

(MIENCZAKOWSKI; MORGAN 2001). The aim is to promote empathetic understanding and learning by providing circumstances where individuals recognize themselves in the scenarios, and are confronted by the multiple interpretations and ramifications of those representations (MIENCZAKOWSKI; MORGAN, 2001). The theoretical focus of ethnodrama is based on nascency; embryonic moments of insight or enlightenment (SALDANA, 2005). The power of this form of theatre, therefore, lies in its presentation of “the detail and depth of human experience including the sub-texts of thought and emotion through vocal and physical pretence” (LLEWELLYN; GILBOURNE; TRIGGS, 2011). It is a form of theatre that has the responsibility to create entertainingly informative experiences that are emotionally evocative, aesthetically sound and intellectually rich (SALDANA, 2005). The performance allows text to ‘come-alive’ through voice, gesture and posture, making what might be challenging in written form even more powerful via the skills of actors and the prompting of the director. Consequently, using the foundational work of Gilbourne, Llewellyn and others (GILBOURNE; TRIGGS: 2006; GILBOURNE, 2007; GILBOURNE; LLEWELLYN, 2008), we tried to utilise ethnodrama as a pedagogical strategy to stimulate learning around real life issues encountered by sports coaches (MORGAN; JONES, 2010). The specific aims of the project were related to facilitating the learning and challenge the perspectives of sports coaching students by exploring the multi-layered coaching context through live visual ethnodrama scenarios.

The first stage of the process, involved writing the sports coaching scenarios. These were based on ethnographic research and ‘lived’ and ‘learned’ coaching experiences. The essential element here was to ensure the reality of the coaching scenes in order to engage the students in post performance interactions which informed, contested and promoted change in their perceptions and behaviours (MIENCZAKOWSKI; MORGAN, 2001). In the words of Denzin and Lincoln, (2005, p. xi), we wanted to privilege “the primacy of experience” and to turn “enquiry into spaces where democratic public discourse can take place.” The authenticity of the scenarios was, therefore, of paramount importance. The writing process was, not unnaturally, central to this. Here, as authors of the scenarios, we decided to seek each other’s advice and comments on various writing drafts. Whilst other writers may wish to work in isolation, we considered that collaboration could only assist in the development of authentic, detailed work; a process we found to be collectively enlightening.

The second step of the research project involved a theatre director and actors rehearsing the written scenarios in collaboration with one of the teaching team. This was followed by live performances of the scenes and their subsequent deconstruction by the coaching students. The discussion was facilitated by questions such as:

- What did you see in the scene(s)?
- What are the issues here?
- What has the coach got to deal with?
- Have you altered your perceptions? On the basis of what?
- What are your ‘solutions’? Why?
- What informs your thinking?
- What could further inform your thinking?

In subsequently evaluating the experience the student coaches universally agreed that the ethnodrama scenes were successful in depicting the multi-faceted complex nature of coaching. In the words of one;

[...] they certainly illustrated the holistic side of things. So much of coaching is about the interactions between people at a particular time, the behavioural issues that go on, the roles people play and the power struggles. In my experience, it happens all the time with parents, with players. You can't get the sense of that in written words, the visual is much more realistic. The presentation is still very strong in my mind, I can picture exactly what went on. It's the impact of interaction and body language that makes it real to me. (MIENCZAKOWSKI; MORGAN, 2001, p. 220).

The students then were supportive of the emotional engagement and the educational experience they had encountered, along with the approach's potential to effect meaningful change (MIENCZAKOWSKI; MORGAN, 2001). The characters, the situations and the action, combined with the intellectual stimulus of the live drama, led to significant post production analysis and debate. The students appeared to recognise the pedagogical efficacy of the ethnodrama, and readily engaged in interaction with each other through further sharing related and relevant incidents from their own practice. Although, again, we would not wish to over-claim a totally functional experience here, we nevertheless believe that, as with the other approaches already mentioned, the student evaluations were generally very positive and provided a catalyst for thinking about how we could develop the approach in future. For example, a possible future direction for the use of ethnodrama in coach education could be based around both the coaches' involvement in the script writing and the performances, in addition to their interactions with the actors. Mienczakowski and Morgan (2001) identify an informant led ethnodrama process in their work with health professionals, involving the

gathering of ethnographic accounts, participant observation and a grounded theory approach to dramatic performances. As an innovative future research project, a similar critical process could be adopted in sports coaching using coaches, performers, parents and support staff to inform the development of problematic scenarios. This could produce an insightful opportunity for ‘cutting edge’ coach education that deals with the ‘messy realities’ of the job whilst giving all informants “[...] a voice in the explanation of their lived realities” (MIENCZAKOWSKI; MORGAN, 2001, p. 220). That said, such a project would require a significant amount of time and resources, as well as close collaboration with a professional theatre company or such like in order to be successful.

In proposing such a research agenda, we are not claiming significant originality as such work builds on that of Telesco (2006) who used socio-drama in the training of US police officers. Here, the central situational scenes were based on actual incidents and set the context for the trainee audience to interact with the actors, who remained in character. The role of the facilitator/educator was to ‘freeze’ the scenes from time to time in order to guide discussion between the audience and the actors. Questions asked of both actors and audience included; ‘how are you feeling right now?’ and ‘what do you think would make your situation better?’ In order to answer these questions, the actors needed to be fully immersed in each character’s motivation and background, as well as the sub-culture of the context. The process also provided opportunities for members of the audience to step into the scenes, taking on the roles of the central characters and revealing what they would do. Again, such an approach is not without its shortcomings, not least of which include the training of the actors and the make up and dynamics of the groups which inevitably dictate the success, or otherwise, of such an educational experience.

The production of a DVD based resource of ethnodrama scenes is a further development that could be used for distance or e-learning packages for coach education forums. Such a resource would open up additional teaching and learning opportunities to enable on-line synchronous learning. Potential also exists to create international coach education forums using such a resource, which would be an exciting development for coach learning in perhaps generating a physically disparate, yet culturally-rich, coaches’ community of practice.

FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS AND CONCLUDING THOUGHTS

As touched upon earlier, the skills of coach educators in facilitating the learning of student coaches are crucial to the effectiveness of the pedagogies discussed in this chapter. Indeed, the success of PBL is generally considered to be dependent on the ability and willingness of the tutors to adopt the facilitative guiding role necessary (SAVIN-BADEN, 2003). Savin-Baden (2003) highlights the fact that a change away from long practiced reproductive pedagogies which have deep roots is not always easy, and can result in frustration and dissonance. Resistance from tutors to such changes then, particularly if they are imposed, is not uncommon, with many wanting to give more structure to the learning environment and to demonstrate their content expertise (DORNAN et al, 2005). Coach educators, therefore, must be committed to the approaches outlined in this chapter and to invest the time and work necessary to learning new skills if they are to be successfully implemented (SAVIN-BADEN, 2003). Such skills reflect the tutors' role as facilitators of learning, rather than transmitters of knowledge (DORNAN et al 2005) whilst demonstrating a commitment to modelling the principles of experiential learning (JONES; TURNER, 2006). We found that teaching in this way resulted in a raised degree of responsibility on behalf of the tutors, not so much in relation to their content delivery, but for the subsequent student interaction and learning (JONES et al, 2011). In this sense tutors took greater care to listen and react to group interactions, recognising that their (non) interventions at (in) appropriate times could genuinely affect and frame ensuing students' discussions and perceptions (JONES et al, 2011). A further area of research, therefore, could be to explore the issues surrounding the training and support of coach educators in implementing such constructivist pedagogical approaches to coach education.

What we are, of course, alluding to here is that the person of the coach educator, as opposed to merely what he or she says or does, plays an important role in the development and facilitation of coaching knowledge. This was an issue recently highlighted by Jones (2011), although in a more direct coaching context, in stating that to have influence over others, both credibility and the presentation of an authentic self are crucial. Here, he borrowed from both Agne's (1999) work in stating that students learn by absorbing 'who you are, not what you say', and Hamacheck (1999) who linked 'effectiveness' in terms of influencing others, into being fair, open and empathetic. Exactly how these and other attributes can and should be developed in coach educators (and coaches themselves) remains very much open to investigation.

Finally, all of the pedagogies discussed within this paper have emerged from usage outside the realm of sports coaching; such as education, the medical profession, organisational management, community development, agriculture and theatre. Nevertheless, we believe that the pedagogies promoted are means by which the goal of coaching holistically can be more realistically aspired to. They provide examples of innovative constructivist learning opportunities that enhance the nexus between theory and practice (LAVE; WENGER, 1991). It is considered that such cutting edge' pedagogies allow coaches the opportunities to better engage in the process of their own learning and with the dynamic intricacy of their subject matter, thus increasing the relevancy of their experience and possibly promoting change in their own practice. Much work, however, remains to be done to develop the full potential of the approaches discussed. The research questions dotted throughout this article mark possible ways forward for those with the interest and inclination to do so. We certainly think it is an area worth engaging with.

REFERENCES

ALLEN, D.; DUCH, D.; GROH, S. The power of problem-based learning in teaching introductory science courses. In: WILKERSON, L.; GIJSELAERS, W. (Ed.) *Bringing problem based learning to higher education: theory and practice*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, (1996), p. 43-52.

ALLEN, W. J. *Working together for environmental management: the role of information sharing and collaborative learning*. Unpublished PhD thesis, Massey University, New Zealand, 2001.

AMES, C. Achievement goals, motivational climate, and motivational processes. In: ROBERTS, G. C. (Ed.) *Motivation in sport and exercise* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics, 1992. p. 161-176.

BARROWS, H. *Generic problem-based learning essentials*. 2004. Available online at: http://www.pbli.org/pbl/generic_pbl.htm.

BLAU, P. *Exchange and power in social life*. Edison N.J: Transaction Publishers, 1986.

BOUD, D.; FELLETTI, G. (Ed.). *The challenge of problem based learning*. London: Kogan Page, 1991.

CARR, W. Philosophy, methodology and action research. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 40 (4), p. 421-435, 2006.

CARR, W.; KEMMIS, S. *Becoming critical: education, knowledge and action research*. Lewes, England: Falmer, 1986.

CASSIDY, T. Understanding the change process: valuing what it is that coaches do. *International Journal of Sport Science and Coaching*, 5 (2), p. 143-147, 2010.

CASSIDY, T.; JONES, R.L.; POTRAC, P. *Understanding sports coaching: the social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice*. London: Routledge, 2009.

CASSIDY, T.; POTRAC, P.; MCKENZIE, A. Evaluating and reflecting upon a coach education initiative: the code of rugby. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20, p. 145-161, 2006.

CHESTERFIELD, G.; JONES, R. L.; POTRAC, P. 'Studentship' and 'impression management': Coaches' experiences of an advanced soccer coach education award. *Sport, Education and Society*, 15 (3), p. 299-314, 2010.

DENZIN, K.; LINCOLN, S. Foreword. In: Saldana, J.. *Ethnodrama: an anthology of reality theatre*. Altamira, 2005.

DICK, B. *What is "action research"?* Occasional pieces in action research methodology, 2, 1997. [Available] <http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/arm/op002.html>.

DORNAN, T. et al. Clinical teachers and problem based learning: A phenomenological study. *Medical Education*, 39, p. 163-170, 2005.

DRINAN, J. The limits of problem based learning. In: D. BOUD, D.; FELLETTI, F. (Ed.). *The challenge of problem based learning*. London: Kogan Page, 1991. p. 315-321.

ELBAZ, F. *Teacher thinking: a study of practical knowledge*. London: Croom Helm, 1983.

ENGEL, C. (1991). Not just a method of teaching but a way of learning. In: D. BOUD, D.; FELLETTI, F. (Ed.). *The challenge of problem based learning*. London, Kogan Page, 1991. p. 23-33.

ENGEL, C. Problem based learning in medical education. In: LEACH, J.; MOON, B. (Ed.) *Learners and pedagogy*. London, Paul Chapman/Sage, 1999. p. 202-209.

GILBERT, W.; TRUDEL, P. Role of the coach: how model youth team sports coaches frame their roles, *The Sport Psychologist*, 18, p. 21-43, 2004.

GILBOURNE, D. Symposium: Narrative and its potential contribution to sport and health psychology. CHAIR, BRETT SMITH. Invited Presentation 'Self narrative: Illustrations of different genre and explorations of the underlying rationale for writing'. *FEPSAC Greece: (2007)*. Performed with David Llewellyn, Jamie Wells and Angela Simms: Liverpool John Moores University Drama.

GILBOURNE, D.; TRIGGS, C. *Your Breath in the Air*. Directed by Ros Merkin. Unity Theatre Liverpool. 2nd International Qualitative Research Conference, Liverpool, UK, 2006.

GILBOURNE, D.; LLEWELLYN, D. *Symposium: Making applied sport psychology come alive*. Liverpool John Moores Teaching and Learning Conference, Liverpool, 2007.

GILBOURNE, D.; LLEWELLYN, D. 'Fate Mates and Moments' Performance of 'Informed Fiction' In: Gilbourne (Organiser/Chair) Story Analysts and Story Tellers Conference: Wales Millennium Centre Cardiff, 2008.

GOFFMAN, E. *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Reading: Penguin Books, 1959.

GREENWOOD, D.; LEVIN, M. Reconstructing the relationship between universities and society through action research. In: DENZIN, N.; LINCOLN, Y. (ed.) *The landscape of qualitative research: Theories and issues* (2nd ed.), Thousand Oaks: Sage, 2003. p.131-166.

JONES, R. L. Towards a sociology of coaching. In: JONES, R. L.; ARMOUR, K. M. (ed.) *The Sociology of Sport: theory and practice*. London: Addison Wesley Longman, 2000.

JONES, R. L.; SANTOS, S. *Who is coaching? Understanding the person of the coach*. Keynote lecture given at the 'Sports and coaching; Pasts and futures' Conference, Manchester Metropolitan University, Cheshire, 25-26th June, 2011.

JONES, R. L.; MORGAN, K.; HARRIS, K. Developing coaching pedagogy: seeking a better integration of theory and practice. *Sport, Education and Society*, 17:3, p. 313-329, 2012.

JONES, R. L.; STANDAGE, M. First Among equals: Shared leadership in the coaching context. In: JONES, R. L. (Ed.) *The sports coach as educator: re-conceptualising sports coaching*. London: Routledge. 2006. p 65 -76.

JONES, R. L.; TURNER, P. Teaching coaches to coach holistically: the case for a Problem-Based Learning (PBL) approach. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 11(2), p. 181-202, 2006.

JONES, R. L.; WALLACE, M. Another bad day at the training ground: coping with ambiguity in the coaching context. *Sport, Education and Society*, 10 (1), p. 119-134, 2005.

JONES, R. L.; WALLACE, M. (2006). The coach as orchestrator. In: JONES, R. L. (Ed.). *The sports coach as educator: re-conceptualising sports coaching*. London: Routledge, 2006. p. 51-64.

KEMMIS, S. Action research. In: KEEVES, J. P. (ed.) *Educational research, methodology and measurement: an international handbook*. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1988. p. 173-179.

LEWIN, K. Action research and minority problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 2.4, p. 33-46, 1946.

LLEWELLYN, D.; GILBOURNE, D.; TRIGGS, C. Representing applied research experiences through performance: Extending beyond text. In: D. GILBOURNE, D.; ANDERSEN, M. B. (Ed.) *Critical Essays in Sport Psychology, Human Kinetics*, Champaign, IL, 2011.

MASTERS, J. The history of action research. In: HUGHES, I. (Ed.) *Action research electronic reader*. Sydney: University press, 1995. [Available on-line: <http://www.behs.cchs.usyd.edu.au/arow/Reader/rmasters.htm> (17.3.10)]

- MACINTYRE, A. *After Virtue*. London: Duckworth, 1985.
- MIENCZAKOWSKI, J.; MORGAN, S. Constructing participatory experiential and compelling action research: participative inquiry and practice. In: REASON, P.; BRADBURY, H. (Ed.) *Handbook of action research: participatory inquiry and practice*. London: Sage, 2001. p. 219-227.
- MORGAN, K.; JONES, R. *HEA/HLSTE Pedagogical research project: Ethno-drama in sports coaching*, 2010.
- MORGAN, K. et al Changing the face of coach education: Using ethno-drama to depict lived realities. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*. (in press).
- MOSSTON, M.; ASHWORTH, S. *Teaching Physical Education*, 5th Edition. Columbus, OH: Merrill, 2002.
- OJA, S.N.; SMULYAN, L. *Collaborative action research: A developmental approach*. London: The Falmer Press, 1989.
- OLLIS, S.; SPROULE, J. Constructivist coaching and expertise development as action research. *International Journal of Sport Science and Coaching*, 2, p. 1-14, 2007.
- REASON, P.; BRADBURY, H. *Handbook of action research*. Sage: London, 2001.
- RUSSELL, M. Leadership and followership as a relational process. *Educational Management and Administration*. 31(2), p. 145-57, 2003.
- SALDANA, J. *Ethnodrama: an anthology of reality theatre*. Altamira, 2005.
- SAVIN-BADEN, M. *Facilitating problem based learning*. Maidenhead: SRHE & Open University Press, 2003.
- SCHÖN, D. *The reflective practitioner: how professionals think in action*. New York: Basic books, 1983.
- _____. *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1987.
- SFARD, A. On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one. *Educational Researcher*, 27(2), p. 4-13, 1983.
- STAKE, R. *The art of case study research*. London: Sage, 1995.
- TELESCO, G. Using sociodrama for radical pedagogy: Methodology for education and change. *Radical Pedagogy*. 1-11, 2006.
- TSAI, S. D.; PAN, C-Y.; CHIANG, H-Q. Shifting the mental model and emerging innovative behaviour: Action research as a quality management system. *E:CO*, 6(4), p. 28-39, 2004.
- WENGER, E. *Communities of practice. Learning, meaning and identity*. Cambridge: University Press, 1998.

WENGER, E.; MCDERMOTT, A. A.; SNYDER, W. Cultivating communities of practice: a guide to managing knowledge. Harvard: Harvard Business School Press, 2002.

Recebido em agosto de 2012

Aprovado em dezembro de 2012