

## Video Self-Reflection and Coach Development in New Zealand

Journal:	<i>Asia-Pacific Journal of Health, Sport &amp; Physical Education</i>
Manuscript ID	RASP-2015-0026
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	Coaching, Self-reflection, Coach Development, Video
Abstract:	<p>Drawing on data from semi-structured interviews with New Zealand coaches (N = 6) this study examined how video self-reflection (VSR) was perceived as a tool for learning within 'on-going' coach development. This study also looked to determine the potential barriers experienced by coaches before engaging in VSR. Each participant was a Performance coach (as identified by the NZ Coach Development Framework) with 5+ years coaching experience and had recently (in the previous 12 months) participated in a coach development programme that aligned with Sport NZ's Coach Development Framework. Five main themes emerged from the data, coaches had a positive perception of the benefits of VSR, a desire to engage in VSR but did not prioritise the time, logistical concerns, a fear of self confrontation, and evidence of knowledge for 'modern' coaching development. Findings indicated that coaches valued VSR as a tool for learning however, the lack of exposure and experience in the process meant coaches did not value the practise enough to dedicate specific time towards it. This study provides an evidence-base that can be used to support National Governing Bodies coach development frameworks, and the modification of content to encourage the use of VSR as a tool for learning.</p>

**Abstract**

Drawing on data from semi-structured interviews with New Zealand coaches (N = 6) this study examined how video self-reflection (VSR) was perceived as a tool for learning within ‘on-going’ coach development. This study also looked to determine the potential barriers experienced by coaches before engaging in VSR. Each participant was a Performance coach (as identified by the NZ Coach Development Framework) with 5+ years coaching experience and had recently (in the previous 12 months) participated in a coach development programme that aligned with Sport NZ’s Coach Development Framework. Five main themes emerged from the data, coaches had a positive perception of the benefits of VSR, a desire to engage in VSR but did not prioritise the time, logistical concerns, a fear of self confrontation, and evidence of knowledge for ‘modern’ coaching development. Findings indicated that coaches valued VSR as a tool for learning however, the lack of exposure and experience in the process meant coaches did not value the practise enough to dedicate specific time towards it. This study provides an evidence-base that can be used to support National Governing Bodies coach development frameworks, and the modification of content to encourage the use of VSR as a tool for learning.

**Keywords**

Coaching, Self-reflection, Coach Development, Video

**Introduction**

The nature of coach learning has become an increasingly subject of research (Cassidy, Jones & Potrac, 2009; Cushion, Armor & Jones, 2003; Cushion, Nelson, Armour, Lyle, Jones, Sandford & O’Callaghan, 2010; Lyle, 2002). Formal coach education has traditionally been a primary vehicle for ‘learning’ and raising the standard of coaching practice with a subsequent increase in the level of investment and delivery of coach development programmes in western nations such as Australia, UK and Canada (Cassidy, Potrac, & McKenzie 2006; Cushion et al., 2003; Nelson, Cushion & Potrac, 2013; Trudel & Gilbert, 2006). However, learning can happen through a number of means, including informal environments such as observation, discussion with ‘others’ and self-reflection of practical experience. (Cushion et al., 2003; Irwin, Hanton & Kerwin, 2004; Nelson & Cushion, 2006; Nelson et al., 2013).

In attempts to better prepare coaches, national bodies responsible for coach education have

started to embrace the value of informal approaches to learning and development (Werthner & Trudel, 2009). Informal learning is a learning experience without a prescribed curriculum, including self-learning, interactions with other coaches, on the job learning, seminars and conferences (Sport NZ, 2012). This call for a broader emphasis on informal learning (Cushion et al., 2010) has led to, theoretically informed, pedagogical approaches in the design of coach education curricula, learning and on-going development (Cassidy et al., 2006; Lyle, 2007). Such approaches have included the utilisation of reflective practice (Schön, 1983; 1987), competency-based programmes (Demers, Woodburn & Savard, 2006), issue based learning (Trudel & Gilbert, 2006), problem based learning (Jones & Turner, 2006), mentoring schemes (Cushion et al., 2003), and communities of practice (Culver & Trudel 2006; Kidman & Penny, 2014).

Over the past decade the focus on coaches becoming reflective practitioners has gained popularity (Cassidy et al., 2009, Dixon, Lee & Ghaye, 2014). Literature highlights that reflection is a proven and valuable tool in understanding coaches' long-term learning (Cassidy et al., 2009; Cushion, 2006; Cushion et. al., 2003; Gilbert & Trudel, 2001). Reflective practice is particularly relevant for coach education as it empowers coaches to take ownership of their learning (Kidman, 2001), and enables the linkage between practical and theoretical knowledge gained from various sources (e.g. coach professional experience, coaching observations, coaching theory and coach education) (Nelson & Cushion, 2006). In an attempt to be world leaders Sport NZ is one national body that has adopted self-reflection and on-going learning as an underpinning element to their coach development framework.

To enhance the self-reflection process the use of video has been suggested as a tool that could enable coaches to review their coaching, without the reliance on memory for in-depth analysis (Carson, 2008). Recent advances in technology have meant that video analysis is already widely accepted as an integral part of team/player development (O'Conner, 2012). Tablets, smartphones and wireless recording devices are now all considered habitual coaching tools (Sport UK, 2014). Furthermore, within the education sector video self-reflection (VSR) has already become an integral part of professional development to student teachers, and has been shown to significantly increase their level of reflective thought and self-awareness (Freese, 1999; Sherin & Van Es, 2005; Trip & Rich, 2014).

Video analysis technology coupled with reflective practice could enable the complexity of

coaching behaviours to be captured and assist in taking significant steps towards guiding coaches to useful pedagogical practices (Cushion et al., 2012). However, while reflective practice and VSR is becoming widely recognised as a key element to coach learning, there are a number of logistical challenges (for example obtaining high quality video and sound) that to need to be overcome (Carson, 2008). Furthermore, reflection is often undertaken in a superficial way, and there is limited understanding of how to best implement and fully evaluate the impact of reflective practice on coach learning and development (Cropley et al., 2012; Cushion, 2011; Cushion et al., 2010, Dixon et al., 2013).

With the inclusion of self-reflection as a component of Sports NZ’s coach development framework, and the increased use of video analysis technology, the focus of this study was to qualitatively determine how NZ coaches currently perceive VSR as a tool for learning, how it is incorporated as part of their development process and the key barriers to its implementation. By exploring how coaches perceive VSR as a tool for learning, national coaching bodies such as Sport NZ can better understand how to apply self-reflection and VSR into coach development.

**Method**

In attempts to capture the lived experiences and perceptions of the six participants a qualitative descriptive study design was employed in this study (Sandelowski, 2000). The philosophical underpinning origins of this qualitative research placed emphasis on the significance of understanding how coaches think and practise, including “the social-cultural context of social interaction” (Patton, 1997, p.20), that is how to empathically understand the participants and their connections between their behaviours and personal insight of VSR. This Studies methodology is situated within the post-positivist paradigm (Grant & Giddings, 2002), based on the notion that we cannot be ‘absolutely positive’ about our claims of knowledge when studying the behaviour and actions of coaches (Creswell, 2013). This paradigm holds a deterministic philosophy, factors in the unpredictable and contradictory nature of human experience (Creswell, 2013) and is built upon the belief that reality is socially and culturally constructed and researcher objectivity is impossible (Giddings & Grant, 2007).

Inline with previous coach education and development studies researching self-reflection,

(Burt and Morgan 2014; Cropley, et al., 2012) this study utilised the method of semi-structured interviews. This allowed for a more in-depth understanding of coaches' perceptions compared to other qualitative methods such as survey and questionnaires. Thematic analysis was used to analysis the data because it is an independent and reliable qualitative approach. (Vaismoradi, Turunen & Bondas, 2013).

### ***Participants***

Amateur coaches (N=6) coaching at the performance level in New Zealand took part in the study. Coaches (24-44 years) (rugby, basketball, football and netball) all had coached for over five years and had recently (in the previous 12 months) participated in a coach development programme that aligned with the Sport NZ's Coach Development Framework. Participants were all coaching a provincial or representative age group team (15-19yrs) and half were also coaching a senior club team. Purposive sampling was employed enabling the researchers to enhance the depth and richness of the data (Sandelowski, 2000). Pseudonyms were used throughout this study.

### ***Data Collection***

Semi-structured interviews were asked in a systematic order and audio recorded and transcribed (Patton, 1997; Berg, 2009). During the interviews, introductory statements, definitions, and the purpose of the study were explained, along with the participants' rights and declaration of confidentiality. In some instances the order of the questions varied, in accordance with the answers and flow of the interview, this allowed participants to express themselves in their preferred manner while still retaining the systematic nature of data collection (Patton, 1997). Each participant was different in the way they interacted, however as the interviews progressed every participant was keen to share their experiences and perceptions. Interviews were used as a primary source of data collection, allowing for a greater depth of meaning and understanding compared to alternate data collection methods such as survey and written questionnaires (Bryman, 2012). The interviews lasted between 30-60 minutes. Once the interviews were complete, they were transcribed by a third party, then were checked by myself and the participants to confirm they were accurate and true.

### ***Pilot Study***

Prior to the interview process a guide was created and tested with two coaches who met the selection criteria of the study. Their data was not included in the final study. The 30-45min interviews comprised a 5-stage structure:

Stage 1: introduction- interviewee relaxed, spoke about their situation and set the scene.

Stage 2: Coach Development. Questions related to their coach education pathway and their formal and informal coach development.

Stage 3: Self-reflection. The interviewee was asked to explain their self-reflection strategies they currently use.

Stage 4: Video self-reflection. Interviewee was asked how they perceive using video self-reflection as a tool for on-going development and whether they have had any experience of using video as a source of feedback.

Stage 5: Barriers to self-reflection. Interviewee was asked if there were any barriers that would stop them undergoing meaningful video self-reflection.

**Data Analysis**

Braun and Clarke’s (2006) six phases of thematic analysis was utilised to examine the transcribed interview data. Initially, transcripts were repeatedly read and listened to, in order to ensure a familiarity. Systematic coding then began by working through the entire data set. Common words and quotes were identified and these quotes then became the raw data for the thematic analysis. These different codes were then placed into potential themes. Once all relevant codes were collated each section was read separately (for example all quotes with the category of ‘barriers’) to determine if the quotes were correctly categorised. Themes were then reviewed checking that the themes ‘word’ related to both the coded extracts and the full data set. Finally, themes were defined and named producing a ‘thematic map’. This process allowed meaningful themes and categories to be defined until all common links were identified.

**Findings and Discussion**

All participants expressed a positive perception about the utilisation of VSR as a tool for learning. However, none currently use it as part of their ‘on-going’ development.

In analysing the data, five common themes were found: (1) ‘Positive perception’ towards VSR. (2) A ‘desire to engage but do not prioritise the time’. (3) ‘Logisites’. (4) ‘self confrontation’ and (5) ‘Modern day vs old school coaches’ perception’.

### Positive Perception

All participants spoke positively about VSR as a tool for on going coach development. They all engaged in some form of written self-reflection strategy, regularly used video as a in the development of their players, had used VSR in other areas of their lives and valued the self-reflection process. These culminating factors meant that all participants felt that VSR was an effective tool for self-learning, increasing self-awareness and creating the opportunity for self-modification of their coaching behaviour.

All participants commented that they currently used written self-reflection as part of their on-going coach development. Half of the participants said they used a systematic and structured process for evaluating coaching practice such as the Gibb's cycle (Gibb's, 1988):

*I definitely use the GIBB cycle, both for my year five team and for my under 17's and I used it last year for my premier team as well I find it quite useful. (Fiona)*

The others did not use such a structure. Their reflection was based around journal writing and making general notes on what they saw and how they felt.

*I journal all the time (laugh) I keep notes on my phone, like my notes is full of things like I might come away from you tonight and you've said something and I'll keep that...after I reflect and more so with journaling because they're my own thoughts and my own words I then try and take what I've learnt out of that and find some resource about what I'm struggling with and that just puts it into perspective for me. (Anna)*

While it is important to note that reflective models and journal writing are beneficial, it is unclear to the degree the participants used written self-reflection to critically analyse their coaching. Dixon et al. (2013) suggested that there is an over-reliance on paper and pencil reflective practice. One of the problems of reflective writing can be that individuals may only focus on negative aspects and 'search for problems'. The consequence when problems are the focus of sport coaching is: 1) coaches see improving performance as problem-fixing and therefore construct a world in which problems are central, and 2) coaches grow in the direction in which they ask questions and therefore grow in a deficit-reduction direction (Dixon et al., 2013). Nevertheless, it appeared that this engagement in written reflection and its habitual use provided the foundation for their positive perception towards video as a tool to reflect on their coaching practice.

Another key factor that formed participants' positive perception of video reflection was that it was regularly used as a tool for player development. Participants frequently used tablets and



smart phone cameras to provide video feedback to their players:

*I just take the iPad which is brilliant because I can show them straight away after the game and go this is what was happening...I definitely know my players find that beneficial. (Sally)*

Participants stated passionately about the joy their players expressed when analysing their own performance using video. They suggested that using video feedback benefits a player's learning and helps them view performance from their own perspective. They highlighted how all players learn differently and video helps players gain a greater understanding through self-analysis.

*Yeah they love it [the iPad], they love seeing themselves....they come round and they have a look and they really enjoy it cause they all learn differently, learn by doing and for some of them it actually reinforces that something, it actually highlights and makes them look at it and go, oh wow, I do, I do that and now I see where you're coming from. (Teresa)*

Their comments supported the literature, suggesting that video analysis is now widely accepted as an integral part of team/player development (O'Conner, 2012). It is this regular use of video feedback and participants' familiarity of using these video recording devices that provides another avenue for coaches to view VSR positively.

The majority of participants had also experienced using VSR as a learning tool in other areas of their lives. Fiona used it in her role as a gym instructor: "I have done it as a fitness instructor, videoed myself for that". Teresa used it at school in her teaching and coaching role: "I got filmed teaching, God that was a long time ago. We got filmed as trainer teachers and got made to watch it". Tom had used it as part of his work as a sales rep: "I do a lot of camera stuff for work... I get all cameras and stuff through work, so part of my job for work is doing camera stuff and doing video presentations". It appeared that VSR was used in a number of different contexts to enhance the learning process and further contributes to participant's positive perception towards it.

The participants further emphasised their positive perception of VSR by discussing the value they see in it even though none are currently engaged in it. Participants described video as a tool that could increase their self-awareness, and reducing their reliance on memory. It was also described as a tool that could allow them to 'observe' and 'hear' themselves from an external perspective i.e., more akin to how the players observe and hear them.

*Looking at body language, especially when I'm outside, 'cause like I said I don't like*



*the cold, so I quite often stand sort of cuddled up and I guess that can come across as stand offish or unsure, so there would be a lot of benefit in looking at my body language and how my presence is around my players. (Fiona)*

*I think you'd pick up little things like you know, um's and ah's and all that kind of stuff that puts a bit of doubt potentially into the boys' mind...How you address the guys, your tone, even just how outwardly emotional you are. (Tom).*

The participants' comments supported previous research that using video in the self-reflective process enabled coaches to be more self-aware of their verbal and non-verbal behaviour and provide a greater opportunity to change coach behaviour (Carson, 2008; Cushion et al., 2012; More & Franks, 2004; O'Conner, 2012). For change to take place, coaches must first be aware of the issue or behaviour, before a new behaviour patterns are adopted (Cassidy et al., 2009). Vivian highlighted in her comment below how VSR enabled her self-awareness to change her side-line feedback during games:

*During the course they recorded us during games and played back some stuff it was really cool to see how much we talk on the side-line and what affect that could have on our players, since then I have been working with more key words and things like that. So I really took that on board and have noticed that I have reduced the chatter from the side-line to just key stuff now. So that was really beneficial, getting that sort of observation, which I didn't realise that was happening. (Vivian)*

The participants also mentioned the ability to review verbal and non-verbal communication, without having to recall it from memory:

*I think it would highlight the things that I don't realise I'm doing or saying...like the amount I might converse, that's been something that I've been working on the whole less is more... getting the questioning out there and letting them think for it a bit more. (Fiona)*

By not having to rely on memory VSR can increase the reflective capacity of coaches and move them towards a more critical analysis of their coaching (Carson 2008; Marsh & Mitchell, 2014). Furthermore, VSR has the ability to reduce the discrepancy between perceived and actual behaviour when compared to written reflection. Anna commented on how she felt video captures everything and could reduce the reliance on her memory:

*I could tie it in with what I was writing, then you see it, you know because I mean you learn by seeing, watching, we learn every day by using our eyes alone...if what I was thinking and noting and then what I'm seeing are too different things we've got a problem you know...It would be beneficial because you're capturing. (Anna)*

Education literature has highlighted videos taken during lessons in teaching practice, allowed teachers to make post lesson self-reflection that was grounded in the actual recordings, rather than uncertain recollections (Freese, 1999; Sherin & Van Es, 2005; Tripp & Rich, 2012). By

only relying on memory written-reflection may actually be detrimental by fictionalising events that did not happen and therefore weakening coach's emotional awareness (Dixon et al., 2013). The findings suggested that participants have a positive perception of VSR as a tool for learning. This positive perception was formed by the participants having a clear understanding of the benefits of incorporating VSR into their coach development, their habitual use of written reflection, the use of video feedback in player development and in other areas of participants' lives.

*Desire to engage but don't prioritise the time*

While participants had a positive perception towards VSR, they did not appear to be motivated to practice VSR within on-going coach development outside of expectations in learning environments in professional development opportunities. All study participants were classified as performance coaches and five out of six of them had an ambition to coach at a High Performance level. Because of this ambition they all expressed a strong desire to engage in VSR.

*..14 years from now I wanna be coaching at the World Cup, not for New Zealand but for Georgia, Russia, Spain...if someone started a business that was filming people coaching I'd be all over it. I'd pay to see myself coach (Tom).*

Participants appeared to be motivated to become a better a coaches, yet despite all this 'drive' and 'desire to improve', participants were not motivated to dedicate specific time towards VSR as part of their on going coach development.

*Probably time would be a big factor because obviously you've just had an hour and a half training and so then to sit down and re-watch that hour and a half, trying to fit that into your busy week already would be quite hard. (Fiona)*

Busy lives and managing the balance between work, family and coaching commitments were suggested as primary reasons for why coaches do not prioritize time to undergo VSR:

*yeah I think probably time...given the sort of work, the home life, the coaching life sort of three way balance, it's getting the time to actually see how I could implement that. I would say that's the biggest sort of stumbling block for me. (Sally)*

*Definitely time, yeah and having two children, so a nine year old and an eight month old so whenever I do get a bit of down time I'm trying to spend it with them or my husband or I'm busy planning for the next session. (Teresa)*

Participants comments support previous studies that found similar demands such as work and family were primary reasons why the required time to undergo written reflection was seen as

a key barrier (Brut & Morgan, 2014; Cropley et al., 2012). Driscoll and Teh (2001) suggested that when life gets busy, reflective practice is the first thing to be dropped and tossed aside. Interestingly, coaches already dedicate specific time towards written reflection suggesting that time did not appear as an issue.

*journaling's my main one, like I ask a lot of other coaches who I trust, so I communicate with them a lot videoing was probably coming in to it...I'm not really into videoing myself at the moment. (Anna)*

The findings suggested that 'time' itself is not the barrier to self-reflection, it is instead the prioritisation of specific time dedicated to VSR. It comes down to a question of personal motivation. This is highlighted in Tom's comment below:

*I mean time but you make time I think that's the thing. I mean if you want to be a decent coach and progress then you find time. It's not just me but all the guys that are trying to progress are spending the hours and hours. I mean it's all Tuesday all Thursday all Saturday then it's like Monday night planning and review then it goes on so yeh another hour is no big deal. (Tom)*

Motivation in itself is a complex subject and an in-depth discussion is beyond the scope of this project. However, it could be argued that the reason why coaches are not motivated to video reflect compared to written reflection is because VSR has less of a 'value proposition'. Value proposition in the context of sport, is defined as the benefits a coach will 'receive' (accuracy, non-verbal feedback,) compared to the 'costs' (time, organisation, quality of output). The concept of 'value proposition' has previously occurred in studies when 'written self-reflection' was first introduced to the coaching environment and was not undertaken (Brut & Morgan, 2014; Cropley et al., 2012). Cropley et al. claimed in his study "those reporting low motivation to reflect may have done so because they were not able to elicit the benefits" (p.21). Brut and Morgan argued, "the reason why coaches are not motivated to reflect is because they do not understand the benefits of it. Incentive Theory would suggest that coaches have not seen the benefits to be gained from reflection" (p.9). If the participants perceived an increased effort is required for VSR compared to that required for written reflection, yet do not see the immediate increased benefits of VSR, then this would reduce the likelihood of them undertaking it.

Teacher education in contrast, exposes novice teachers to actively engage in VSR very early in their training. VSR has been used as a compulsory tool in teacher training domain for a number of years (Fuller & Manning, 1973; Tripp & Rich, 2012). Teachers are not only

exposed to using VSR, but are engaged in meaningful in-depth reflective discussions around it with teacher educators, mentors and fellow teachers as part of their education (Freese, 1999; Marsh & Mitchell, 2014; Sherin & Van Es 2005; Tripp & Rich, 2012). The use of video in collaboration between a trainee teacher and mentor has been seen as critical in the development of teachers changing their practice (Marsh & Mitchell, 2014; Tripp & Rich, 2012). It is these meaningful discussions and the absence of video feedback in mediated and structured environments that appeared to be lacking in the development of the participants.

As indicated prior, the participants stated that they value VSR and were actively engaged in written reflective activity. Therefore the reason they were not allocating the time to incorporate VSR suggested that the performance benefits might not currently be truly recognised/acknowledged by them or that the motivation is lower than even they believe. Nevertheless, by providing coaches with practical experience using VSR in a mediated setting similar to the education sector, opportunities would be created for dialogue and shared learning to take place which may begin to increase the value they give to VSR. While this increase in exposure and experience can address the value coach's place on VSR, it still may not be enough to overcome some of the logistical barriers faced.

*Logistics*

Participants highlighted that the logistics of getting the video footage for VSR was a key issue. Participants discussed the need to be able to both 'see' and 'hear' themselves in order to use VSR effectively.

*Its more than just having a tripod set up...the thing is that you're moving around on court so much that it's getting it in the right position where you can hear myself and you can see what you're doing because you're moving up and down court all the time.*  
(Fiona)

Having both video and audio are essential elements to VSR (Cushion et al., 2012). Having one without the other would limit the quality of the coach reflection. The participants described how the camera needed to be close enough to hear the coach's instructions, while still being positioned far enough away to capture the coach's nonverbal communication.

*It's not just a case of somebody standing with an iPad on a balcony because yeah you can get set up, which is great, but can you hear the information? So if you can't hear the information then you can't really look at that sort of thing so you need the resource to sort of be up close and personal* (Sally)

Participants suggested that acquiring video of a high enough quality to undergo VSR effectively cannot currently be achieved through placing a stationary camera on a tripod

alone. While camera technology is rapidly advancing and drones, robotic cameras and wireless microphones are currently available on the market, the majority of these devices are expensive and out of most coaches resource ability. Therefore, coaches need to rely on a human resource.

*...it's just about having somebody there available all the time and able to film really, because we only got this iPad because of netball for the stats, for the girls, things like that because it's such a great tool. So I've got it there so I might as well use it (Vivian)*

Using a human resource will solve a number of the logistical problems, however the concept of 'needing a camera operator' draws attention to the challenges associated with finding individuals to record coaching sessions.

*I think resource is gonna be the issue, not only the cost of the equipment but just someone to actually stand there and film you. I think that's gonna be the biggest issue. (Tom)*

*I mean we've got a camera at home so getting a camera to get the footage wouldn't be difficult but it's getting it set up so and finding someone that's happy to sit there for the hour and a half and solely video (Fiona)*

Although not all participants shared this view, half of them states that finding a camera person would not be an issue:

*...there's always a place to video in the gyms ...there's always a parent or an assistant coach or someone that if I needed to take 20 minutes of myself coaching they, they would. So there are no barriers there (Anna)*

*I think that would be an easy one for me, um I could have done it Tuesday night with regards to me delivering and head coach videoing. We have the resource, we've also got team manager that could potentially pick that up as well. (Sally)*

Nevertheless coaches must still acquire high quality video and sound in order to undergo VSR effectively. This is support by Carson (2008) who stated that the primary concern to using VSR was related to the video and sound quality (unclear, too quiet, too much interference). The findings suggest that logistically, VSR is challenging to administer without a camera person. This could explain why written self-reflection is completed because it is simple and can be achieved on your own with little pre-planning or support required (Cushion et al., 2010). Seeking out technological solutions or trying and find an appropriate support person means VSR is considered too difficult to administer.

*Confrontation/Low self-confidence*

Participants expressed a ‘feeling of vulnerability’ or ‘just being uncomfortable’ when talking about using VSR. All five female participants did not like seeing or hearing themselves on camera. Anna commented: “*I don’t like watching it (laugh) personally I don’t like seeing myself*”, whereas Teresa commented: “*Just don’t like the way you sound, you start getting all picky, oh do I really sound like that*”. Female coaches in this study seemed to have low self-confidence when related to seeing themselves on camera. Fiona effectively summed up this hesitation in her comment below:

*I probably would be hesitant just ‘cause it’s one of those things you never really wanna watch yourself and hear yourself being recorded.... Probably just self-confidence of how you look and how you sound, um, yeah I think that’s probably it you know just having that confidence to go right, I’m gonna do it. I’m actually going to sit down and watch it because it’s easy enough to do it but it’s probably sitting down and watching yourself is gonna be the hard part, watching the playback (Fiona)*

Anna talks about the feeling of insecurity when thinking about watching herself on video:

*...when I think video reflection I’m like insecurity, the word insecurity comes straight to mind you know and that, so, because you can’t hide anything at all...I don’t know if it’s a girl thing, it’s an image thing, like I kind of mentioned before I don’t know like I wanna look good... you see yourself and you just, you lose the whole point, I’m thinking I would lose the whole point of why I’m doing it. You know, that insecurity is a real self-centred position. (Anna)*

Several authors have commented that reflective practice is likely to lead to feelings of discomfort and vulnerability, as reflection directs us to challenge habitual knowledge, physical appearance and practice (Anderson, Knowles & Gilbourne, 2004; Cash, Theriault & Annis, 2004). The comments above are examples of feelings of vulnerability. Vulnerability is described as uncertainty, risk and emotional exposure (Brown, 2012). It appeared that participants had the perception that vulnerability is a weakness especially when they are totally exposed on camera. However, as Brown (2012) also explains ‘vulnerability is the birth place of love belonging, joy, courage, empathy and creativity’ (p.28). The more confident coaches are in undergoing VSR the less these psychological issues will be barriers that stop them engaging in it.

VSR brings one’s self-representation to the forefront. As Sally’s comment highlights below, if coaches think they are good at what they do then they are not going to put that at risk:

*...I also think there’s a bit of confidence there as well you know, as human beings perception is massive across all walks of life and I think your perception of you is generally positive and everything’s good and there’s nothing wrong. I think it’s the*



*confidence to actually watch that and to have the ability to constructively criticise what's going on and to reflect on what you're seeing... we have a perception of ourselves and we don't want to ruin that perception if it's rosy and all good. (Sally)*

This notion of not wanting to see or hear yourself may be also due to a feeling of susceptibility to negative self-conscious emotions (Tracy & Robins, 2004). VSR as a self-processes make it possible for self-evaluations, and therefore self-conscious emotions such as pride and shame to occur (Tracy & Robins, 2004). If coaches have a positive perception of themselves they are unlikely to want to put that at risk by becoming aware that they may not have lived up to what they expected.

What is interesting is that the one male participant (Tom) in my study did not have the same issue *"I think if I could be videoed for every single training and every single game, especially my trainings, then it would be awesome"*. It is important to note that this study only had one male participant compared to five female participants. It is therefore very difficult to make a fair comparison between the two comments further research between male and female coaches is recommended.

#### *Modern day vs. old school coaches*

The participants interviewed in this study perceived that there are two types of coaches, 'modern day' and 'old school' who express a contradicting mind-set towards VSR. The participants suggested that there were many coaches within their current coaching environment who held what they described as an 'old school' view towards the practice of coaching, self reflection and on-going coach development. The participants defined old school coaches as having an, 'I know what's best attitude', preferring a coach-centred approach, and appearing to had a reluctance to critically reflect and seek out new coaching strategies as part of their on-going development:

*I think because they (old school coaches) think they know it all, and there is a big train of them and they think they know what's best...this is how you do it, this is the right way and a lot of them have been around a long time and so they think that this is the only way to do it so they are quite guarded. Whereas actually they could do with having some time out and reflecting on their coaching and actually know there are other ways. It's not that their way is the wrong way there's just other ways of doing things. (Teresa)*

They explained that this is a contrasting perception to their own 'modern day' view. Similar to themselves modern day coaches were characterised as younger, more progressive and more



open to innovative ways of learning. They also perceived that other modern day coaches had a similar view.

*...I think there's a lot of modern day coaches that will (search for new ideas and self-reflect), I think those older style coaches won't purely because they have the experience, they have the knowledge and they know what should be delivered. (Sally)*

*I think the ones that are coming through, the younger ones are coming through and they get involved in something like [coach development programme] they'll get educated and they'll see the importance of it (self-reflection and on-going development) but you've got some (old school) coaches that are just stuck in the middle that will never change. (Teresa)*

It is vitally important to understand that that this study has come from a modern day perspective due to the Sport NZ's CDF and its application to continued modernisation of coach development. The comments made are only the perception of the coaches interviewed.

Unlike themselves the participants perceived that old school coaches within their current coaching environment had a very different perspective of self-reflection and VSR. They described old school coaches as unaware of their behaviour and do not value the importance of critically reviewing their coaching.

*I don't think the old-school coaches would necessarily sort of critique their delivery and I think that's why we still have coaches at the side of the parks, ranting and raving. (Sally).*

*I think a lot of old school coaches don't think to reflect...They don't sort of think of it actually as being a really important part, they just think oh well just do a quick, you know, think back of what happened and note it down and that's it. (Teresa)*

Bourdieu (1977) argued that the body is a site of social memory and characterised this as habitus (Brubaker, 1995; Wacquant, 1998). Coaches thus come to see and interpret future coaching events and observations on the basis of their early experiential foundation (Cushion, 2010; Jones, Armor & Potrac, 2004). Such formative experiences carry far into a coach's career and provide a continuing influence over perspectives, beliefs and behaviours. Old school coaches have most likely experienced a formal accreditation system to coach education where there was little emphasis on on-going coach development. If these old school coaches had an unsatisfactory experience while attending these courses and there was little emphasis on on-going learning then there would be a strong reluctance to engage in future on-going coach development opportunities. In other words due to habitus and poor experiences

of coach development courses old school coaches may not value on going coach development opportunities in the same way modern day coaches do. It is this reluctance that seems to underpin old school coach's perception of self-reflection and VSR.

The findings of this study suggested that the participants perceived modern day coaches (similar to themselves) to have a 'progressive view' of written self-reflection and on-going coach development compared to the views of old school coaches, who they perceive to have a reluctance to seek on-going development opportunities. Kidman and Penny (2013) explained that any learning that is developed is dependent on the individual's mental model. Coaches' learning therefore is dependent on their motivation to learn and to see relevance in relation to their own coaching and is based around their own social constructed learning experiences. Knowles, Gilbourne, Borrie & Nevill, (2001) acknowledged that "coach educators cannot therefore assume that the development of reflective skills will be naturally occurring phenomena that runs parallel in increasing coaching experience" (p.204).

Even though Sport NZ has adopted an 'on-going learning' environment, the participants perceived, within their current coaching environment, there were a number of coaches who have not been exposed to and indeed do not value this philosophy. The finding suggest that the participants perceive that there are some old school coaches in their current environment that may have minimal understanding of how VSR could enhance their learning and personal development as a coach and thus will be harder to get 'buy-in' from them. To build a greater understanding of how VSR fits within on-going coach development in New Zealand, it is crucial to recognise and understand the existence of this old school mentality.

### **Limitations and implications**

There were several limitations in the present study. The first limiting factor of this study was the number of participants who took part. However, the purpose of a qualitative study is not to generate findings which are generalisable to a wider population, rather the focus is more on depth of the data provided (Patton, 1997). Secondly, the demographic range of participants was rather narrow. All participants considered themselves modern day coaches and are all relatively young (under the age of 40). There is potential for further development looking at these old school coaches the participants refer to in more depth. Future research can explore if there are any similarities or differences between how the participants perceived school coaches view VSR compared to their actual perception. Thirdly, all participants came from coaching team sports. Only four sports were selected as part of this study (rugby, netball, football and basketball). Future research could look to compare perceptions and barrier

between coaches of teams and individuals. Finally a potential area for future research is to look at gender differences in coaching. This study had one male and five female coaches. One female participant discussed female insecurity in watching herself. It would be interesting to see if there are differences in female and male coaches and the barriers that they see in performing VSR.

**Conclusion**

The aim of this study was to explore how VSR as a tool for learning could enhance coach development in New Zealand. By understanding how performance coaches perceived VSR as a tool for on-going coach development, and any barriers that would stop their engagement the results of my research could be used to enhance future coach development strategies in New Zealand and beyond.

It was clear that all participants initially had a very positive perception about the benefits of VSR and its ability to enhance the reflection process. However, while participants shared a common desire to better themselves as a coach, several barriers meant that VSR is not currently used as part of their on-going development. Factors such as time, logistics, and self-confrontation are the specific areas that warrant further attention. Furthermore, participants perceived that within their current coaching environment there are a number of old school coaches who may have a contrasting negative perception of self-reflection.

While Sport NZ’s coach development framework promotes the use of self-reflection, participants were engaged in written reflective strategies and were aware of the benefits of VSR, however the barriers reported meant that none of the participants are engaged in VSR as part of their coach development. A summary of the key issues to the engagement of VSR are: 1) coaches do not value VSR enough to pursue it over and above written reflection; 2) coaches do not prioritize VSR in their weekly schedule claiming lack of time; 3) VSR is considered to difficult to administer due to the challenges of getting high quality footage through a tripod and/or finding someone to film; 4) some coaches do not like watching themselves as it creates a sense of vulnerability and/or self-confrontation; and 5) modern day coaches perceive that old school coaches do not value the self-reflection process due to their habitual nature.

This study answered its research question suggesting that performance coaches have a positive perception of VSR as a tool for learning, however this perception did not translate to

prioritisation of time. The barriers listed above need to be addressed before VSR can become a habit and part of everyday coaching practice. It is therefore up to National Governing Bodies (NGB's) and NSO's to address these issues. In summary, it is clear that regular use of VSR in coach development can enhance the value coach's place on the process, leading to more coaches using VSR more frequently. Thus increasing the quality of performance coaching in New Zealand and around the world.

## References

- Berg, B. (2009). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. London, England: Cambridge University Press.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Brown, B. (2012). *Daring Greatly*. London, England: Penguin
- Brubaker, R. (1995). Social theory as habitus. In C. Calhoun, E. LiPuma, & M. Postone (Eds.), *Bourdieu: Critical perspectives*, (pp. 212-234). Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Brut, E., & Morgan, P. (2014). Barriers to systematic reflective practice as perceived by UKCC level 1 and level 2 qualified rugby union coaches. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 15(2), 468-480. doi:10.1080/14623943.2014.900016
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Carson, F. (2008). Utilizing video to facilitate reflective practice: developing sports coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 3(3), 381-390. doi:10.1260/174795408786238515
- Cash, T., Theriault, J., & Annis, N. (2004). Body image in an interpersonal context: adult attachment, fear of intimacy, and social anxiety. *Journal of social and clinical psychology*, 23 (1), 89-103.
- Cassidy, T., Jones, R. & Potrac, P. (2009). *Understanding sports coaching: the social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice*. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cassidy, T., Potrac, P. & McKenzie, A. (2006). Evaluating and reflecting upon a coach education initiative: The CoDe1 of rugby. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20(2), 145-161.
- Creswell, J. (2013) *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). London, England: Sage.
- Cropley, B., Miles, A. & Peel, J. (2012). *Reflective Practice: Value of, Issues, and Developments within Sports Coaching*. Sport Coach UK.
- Culver, D., & Trudel, P. (2006). Cultivating coaches' communities of practice: developing the potential for learning through interactions. In: R. Jones, (Ed), *The Sports Coach as Educator: Re-Conceptualising Sports Coaching*. (pp. 97-112). London, England: Routledge.
- Cushion, C. (2006). Mentoring: Harnessing the power of experience. in R. Jones (Eds.), *The sports coach as educator: reconceptualising sports coaching* (pp. 128-144). London, England: Routledge.
- Cushion, C. (2010). Coach behaviour. In J. Lyle & C.J. Cushion (Eds.), *Sports coaching professionalization and practice*, (pp. 243-253). London, England: Routledge.

- Cushion, C. (2011) 'Coaches' learning and development. In R. Bailey and I. Stafford (Eds.) *Coaching Children in Sport*, Abingdon, England: Routledge
- Cushion, C., Armour, K., & Jones, R. (2003) Coach education and continuing professional development: experience and learning to coach, *Quest*, 55, 215-230.
- Cushion, C., Nelson, L., Armour, K., Lyle, J., Jones, R., Sandford, R., & O'Callaghan, C. (2010). *Coach learning and development: A review of literature*. Leeds, England: Sports Coach UK.
- Demers, G., Woodburn, A., & Savard, C. (2006). The development of an undergraduate competency-based coach education program. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20, 162-173.
- Dixon, M., Lee, S. & Ghaye, T. (2013). Reflective practices for better sports coaches and coach education: shifting from a pedagogy of scarcity to abundance in the run-up to Rio 2016. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 14(5), 585-599.
- Driscoll, J., & Teh, B. (2001). The potential of reflective practice to individual orthopaedic nurse practitioners and their practice. *Journal of Orthopaedic Nursing*, 5, 95-103.
- Freese, A. (1999). The role of reflection on pre-service teachers' development in the context of a professional school. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 15(8), 895-909.
- Fuller, F. & Manning, B. (1973). Self-confrontation reviewed: a conceptualization for video playback in teacher education. *Review of Educational Research*, 43(4), 469-528.
- Gibbs, G. (1988). *Learning by Doing: A Guide to Teaching and Learning Methods*. Oxford: Further Educational Unit, Oxford Polytechnic.
- Gilbert, W., & Trudel, P. (2001). Learning to coach through experience: reflection in model youth sport coaches. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 21, 16-34.
- Grant, B., & Giddings, L. (2002). Making sense of methodologies: A paradigm framework for the novice researcher. *Contemporary Nurse*, 13(1), 10-28.
- Irwin, G., Hanton, S., & Kerwin, D. G. (2004). Reflective practice and the origins of elite coaching knowledge. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 5(3) 425-442.
- Jones, R. Armour, K., & Potrac, P. (2004). *Sport coaching cultures: from practice to theory*. London, England: Routledge.
- Jones, R., & Turner, P. (2006). Teaching coaches to coach holistically: can Problem Based Learning (PBL) help? *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 11(2), 181-202.
- Kidman, L. (2001). *Developing Decision Makers: An Empowerment Approach to Coaching*. Christchurch, New Zealand: Innovative Print Communications.



Kidman, L., & Penny, D. (2013, July 31) Coach Development: Never stop learning! *New Zealand Coach* Retrieved November 1, 2013, from <http://www.coachmag.org.nz/2013/07/31/coach-development-never-stop-learning/>

Kidman L., & Penny, D. (2014). Promoting and supporting coaches' professional learning: Developing a Community of Practice, *Journal of Athlete Centred Coaching*, 1(1), 6-13.

Knowles, Z., Gilbourne, D., Borrie, A., & Nevill, A. (2001). Developing the reflective Sports Coach: A study exploring the processes of reflective practice within a higher education coaching program. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, 2(2), 185-207.

Lyle, J. (2002). *Sports coaching concepts: a framework for coaches' behaviour*. London, England: Routledge.

Lyle, J. (2007). A review of the research evidence for the impact of coach education. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 1(1), 17-34.

Marsh, B., & Mitchell, N. (2014). The role of video in teacher professional development. *Teacher Development*, 18(3), 403-417, doi:10.1080/13664530.2014.938106

More, K., & Franks, I. (2004). Measuring coaching effectiveness. In: M. Hughes & I. Franks (Eds), *Notional Analysis of Sport*. (pp. 243-256). London, England: Routledge

O'Conner, D. (2012). Coaching practice: turning the camera on yourself. In: H. Nunome, B. Dust & B. Dawson (Eds), *Science and Football VII – The Proceedings of the Seventh World Congress on Science and Football* (pp.397-408). London, England: Routledge

Patton, M. (1997). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Sandelowski, M. (2000). Focus on research methods: Whatever happened to qualitative description? *Research in Nursing & Health*, 23, 334-330.

Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professional think in action*. New York, NY: Basic Books.

Schön, D. (1987) *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Josey Bass.

Sherin, M., & van Es, E. (2005). Using video to support teachers' ability to notice classroom interactions. *Journal of Technology and Teacher Education*, 13(3), 475-491.

Sport NZ. (2012). *Framework program materials*. Retrieved October 1<sup>st</sup> 2013, from <http://www.sportnz.org.nz/en-nz/communities-and-clubs/Coaching/Coach-Development--Education/Framework-programme-materials/>

Sports Coach UK. (2014). *Coaching Media and New Technology*. Retrieved from <http://www.sportscoachuk.org/sites/default/files/Coaches%20and%20their%20use%20of%20online%20technology.pdf>

Tracy, J., & Robins, R. (2004). Putting the self into self-conscious Emotions: A theoretical model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(2), 103-125.



- 1  
2  
3  
4 Tripp, T. & Rich, P. (2012). Using video to analyse one's own teaching. *British Journal of*  
5 *Educational Technology*, 43(4), 678-704. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2011.01234.x  
6  
7 Trudel, P. Gilbert, W. (2006) Coaching and coach education. In D. Kirk, D. Macdonald and M.  
8 O'Sullivan (Eds.). *The Handbook of Physical Education*. London, England: Sage.  
9  
10 Wacquant, L. (1998). Pierre Bourdieu. In R. Stones (Ed.), *Key sociological thinkers* (pp. 215-  
11 229). London, England: Macmillan Press.  
12  
13 Werthner, P. & Trudel, P. (2009). Investigating the idiosyncratic learning paths of elite  
14 Canadian coaches. *International Journal of Sport Science and Coaching*, 4(3), 433-449.  
15  
16 Vaismoradi, M., Turunen, H., & Bondas, T. (2013). Content analysis and thematic analysis:  
17 Implications for conducting a qualitative descriptive study. *Nurse Health Science*, 15(3),  
18 398-405.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60