

Developing a Community of Practice in Coaching Research Some “Nice Questions”

Dave Collins

Director - Institute of Coaching & Performance
Grey Matters Performance

What are WE for? The 3 Ages of an Applied Science

1. Science through COACHING



2. Science of COACHING



3. Science for COACHING

Some Implications

- It's inevitable that these 'ages' will co-exist....
BUT...

- Unless we are very clear, the ages and consequent roles will become mixed

AT LEAST in the minds of our client base

- For example – “What is the primary concern of a coaching science researcher?”

Impact OR Impact factor?!

cf. Bob Christina on motor control

Application OR aggrandisement

How about the research we publish?

- Do we (should we?) have a clear, consistent focus on COACH EFFICACY?



- Do we integrate well enough with, and work through, coaches?

- Or are we merely indulging in academic autoeroticism/ onanism/ the “M” word?



Scienciness and Policy

- Scienciness (Bailey & Collins, 2010) is based on Truthiness (Colbert, 2005)

“The conviction that something is true, despite there being absolutely no evidence in favour of it”

- Examples from coaching...

The Performance-Participation ‘Twin-Track’ at young ages?

The Deliberate Play-Sampling-Development Equivalence??

MANY underpinnings to coach education ???

Scienciness – Coaching systems based on Success

- Note “Hume’s Law”

The imperative attributed to the Scottish philosopher David Hume that we should not infer an *ought* from an *is*

- And yet “cycling does....” is the driving force behind a substantial amount of guidance in UK elite sport
- Which is just the same as “s/he’s a champion so everything the coach does **MUST** be right”
- So **WHO** asks the tough questions?

Key features of effective CoPs

- Common vocabulary
- Open and accepted disagreement
- Shared expertise
 - Everyone brings....
 - If you don't, don't!!
- Shared purpose
 - DO we have one?
- Perceived equitable rewards
 - Can we achieve this?