Coach Profile Director Guide

Coaching preferences personality traits and practical development

Use this guide to score coaching preferences and personality traits, then examine their possible interaction in actual coaching. Build a development plan from the coach's examples, observed actions, and player responses.

The case for executive directors

A director needs a usable picture of how each coach thinks and teaches, where that coach is effective, and what would improve their work. This process makes those judgments explicit and connects them to examples, an individual plan, and a follow-up review.

The need for outside help should be established within the club. This version does not demonstrate that most directors lack the capability, and staff differences alone do not demonstrate poor coaching.

Five questions a director should be able to answer

- What does each coach tend to notice first and what might they overlook in this context?
- Can each coach connect a game concept to collective roles and individual choices?
- What evidence identifies the next development priority for each coach?
- What support is being provided and who is responsible for delivering it?
- What changed in actual coaching and player behavior after that support?

How consulting helps

The consultant supplies structured observation, careful interpretation, practical coach development, and a review routine the director can sustain. For a small community club, use a short shared framework and manageable coaching cycles. Preserve the club's identity and adapt the method to its ages, staffing, and resources.

A credible initial offer is an eight week supported pilot, followed by a report on observed changes, remaining needs, and the director's capacity to continue the process.

Pilot version 2 developed for Brent Chase | November 2026

Administration and evidence

Set the conditions for useful answers

Explain that preferences describe a starting tendency, not a quality rating. Identify the designated reviewer and access to individual responses before coaches complete the form. Give the coach their own report. Use summarized club themes for staff planning and obtain agreement before using a named example in a workshop.

Use the same four week reference period for coaching habits at baseline and follow-up. Personality items ask about the person generally across everyday situations. Record unusual circumstances; use changes in observed coaching behavior to review development.

Gather evidence before interpreting a gap

Source	What it contributes
Questionnaire	Self-reported coaching preferences, personality traits, habits, and context
Scenario discussion	What the coach attends to, considers, chooses, and would review
Session plan	Connection between the game problem, objective, activities, and player choices
Field observation	Actual actions, their timing, and the resulting player response
Coach debrief	Purpose, alternative explanations, practical constraints, and reflection

As a practical pilot starting point, observe two sessions and one match segment per coach. Choose relevant learning moments rather than judging an entire coach from one intervention. Where practical, record observations before viewing the self-report to reduce expectation effects. This observation schedule is a proposed workflow, not a validated sampling requirement.

Separate a preference from a development need

A system-first coach may teach concepts very well. A player-led coach may organize a team very well. A low habit response may reflect lack of opportunity, resources, or deliberate judgment. Confirm the situation, examine repeated examples, and hear the coach's explanation before proposing a priority.

Treat disagreement between self-report and observation as a question to investigate. Personality and coaching scores describe different things. Use the profile for a voluntary development conversation, with agreed access to individual answers.

Scoring coaching preferences

Part A uses 16 items to describe four proposed coaching preferences. Scores summarize how this coach answered these items; the dimensions have not been empirically established as independent personality traits.

Preference	Score 1 end	Score 5 end	Items
Attention	Individual actions	Team relationships	1 5R 9 13R
Reasoning	Concept first	System first	2 6R 10 14R
Guidance	Coach direction	Player exploration	3 7R 11 15R
Planning	Prepared sequence	Responsive adjustment	4 8R 12 16R

Calculate each descriptive average

For an item marked R, reverse the response using 6 minus the response. A response of 1 becomes 5, 2 becomes 4, 3 stays 3, 4 becomes 2, and 5 becomes 1. Leave the other items unchanged. Add the four keyed responses in the row and divide by four.

If an item is unanswered, do not replace it with 0 or 3. Average the available keyed responses only when at least three of the four items are answered, and report the count. Otherwise report insufficient responses. This minimum is a practical completeness rule, not a validated threshold.

Report averages and an optional coaching type

Keep each raw 1 to 5 coaching average and response count. Use the unrounded mean for a provisional code: below 3 selects I, C, D, or P; above 3 selects T, S, E, or A in the corresponding row. The catalogue at the end lists the 16 proposed names.

An exact mean of 3 leaves that preference unresolved. Show compatible types rather than forcing one label. A mean of 2.75 or 3.25 is only a slight lean. Retain the raw profile; type names and these interpretation rules are provisional, with no established predictive validity.

Worked example

Attention responses: item 1 = 2, item 5 = 4, item 9 = 1, item 13 = 5. Keyed responses are 2, 2, 1, and 1. Their sum is 6; 6 divided by 4 = 1.5. Report an individual-action starting tendency in these answers and check team-awareness habits independently.

These averages describe preferences only. They are not competence scores.

Scoring personality traits

Part A2 uses all 20 Mini-IPIP items with their original wording. Each of five traits has four items. The original study examined this short measure across five studies. The coaching interpretation below remains a proposed application.

Trait	Items in this questionnaire
Extraversion	P01 P06R P11 P16R
Agreeableness	P02 P07R P12 P17R
Conscientiousness	P03 P08R P13 P18R
Emotional reactivity	P04 P09R P14 P19R
Intellect and imagination	P05 P10R P15R P20R

Calculate five separate scores

For an item marked R, use 6 minus the response. Keep other responses unchanged. Add the four keyed values for a trait to obtain its total from 4 to 20. Divide by four to show a 1 to 5 mean, rounded to one decimal. A larger mean indicates more endorsement of that trait after keying.

Require all four valid responses for a personality score in this version. If an item is missing, report incomplete and invite completion. Do not replace it with 0 or 3, or apply the coaching section's three-response rule. This completeness rule is an administrative choice.

Use precise trait descriptions

Emotional reactivity is the reader-facing label for Mini-IPIP Neuroticism: higher scores reflect greater reported negative emotionality; lower scores reflect greater reported emotional stability. It is not a diagnosis. Intellect and imagination is the source scale name, often associated with openness; it is not a measure of intelligence or proof of tactical creativity.

Report the five means and the underlying answers. Do not apply invented high or low cutoffs, percentiles, a single personality type, or a total personality score. Four items per trait provide limited detail. They do not assess every facet, communication skill, or ability to coach under pressure.

Personality sources

Donnellan et al. (2006). The Mini-IPIP scales. Psychological Assessment, 18, 192-203. https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.18.2.192

Official item key: https://ipip.ori.org/MiniIPIPKey.htm
Scoring: https://ipip.ori.org/newScoringInstructions.htm
Public-domain permission: https://ipip.ori.org/newPermission.htm

Combining personality and coaching profiles

Show the provisional coaching type beside all five personality scores. Use a plain description of the person's reported tendencies as the personality summary. The two profiles generate questions; observed coaching and the coach's explanation establish whether a strength or development need is present.

What to include in each report

Record the coaching code, four coaching means, five personality means, and response completeness. Add a strength supported by an example, one possible watch-out, the evidence that would confirm or challenge it, and one behavior to practice. Keep personality scores out of any overall coach rating.

Example one A prepared discovery approach

Fictional results: TCEP, The Learning Architect; extraversion 2.0, agreeableness 4.0, conscientiousness 4.5, emotional reactivity 2.5, intellect and imagination 4.5.

The coaching preference and reported order and imagination suggest exploring a strength in purposeful discovery tasks. Check whether preparation helps players solve the intended problem. A possible watch-out is tasks becoming more elaborate than players need. These are hypotheses to test in coaching.

Check the plan, explanation length, and players' decisions after the rules are reduced. If the task is too complex, practice one clear objective and ask two players to explain the choice before restarting.

Example two A vocal response to changing play

Fictional results: TCDA, The Game Interpreter; extraversion 4.5, agreeableness 3.0, conscientiousness 3.5, emotional reactivity 4.0, intellect and imagination 4.0.

The responsive coaching preference and reported sociability suggest exploring how the coach explains changing team problems. Reported emotional reactivity adds a question about messages after setbacks. Check whether instructions become more frequent or urgent, and what players do next.

If observations confirm that pattern, agree a brief pause, one actionable cue, and time to observe the next response. Review whether players can recognize the next adjustment independently.

Evidence can change the interpretation

A reserved coach may communicate clearly and enthusiastically. A highly sociable coach may listen carefully. A preference for order may coexist with flexible sessions. Agreeableness alone cannot establish conflict skill, and emotional reactivity alone cannot establish sideline behavior. Use the report to explore these questions with the coach.

Scoring development habits

Part B reports the frequency of six proposed groups of development habits across the most recent four weeks. All items are keyed in their original direction. These groups are a working framework, not validated subscales.

Habit group	Items	Development question
Observe	17 18 19 20	Does the coach gather enough relevant information?
Interpret	21 22 23 24	Does the explanation fit the observed evidence?
Design	25 26 27 28	Does the practice connect understanding, roles, and choices?
Guide	29 30 31 32	Does the intervention help the player learn?
Adapt	33 34 35 36	Does the coach adjust to player responses and context?
Review	37 38 39 40	Does the coach examine learning and test transfer?

Average the valid numeric responses within each group. Exclude NA and unanswered items. Report a group average only with at least three of four numeric responses, and show the number answered. Otherwise record insufficient evidence and discuss the opportunity or missing response. Never code NA as zero.

Keep the raw 1 to 5 average rounded to one decimal. It describes reported frequency, not a validated level of skill. Do not add the six averages into an overall coach score or infer that every habit should occur in every situation.

Choose priorities using evidence

Begin with item-level examples. A less frequent habit becomes a development candidate when it was relevant, usable, and likely to help in this coach's context. A frequently reported habit also needs examples of quality and effectiveness. Confirm or revise the candidate through observation and discussion.

Ask whether the barrier involves knowledge, interpretation, execution, confidence, resources, or expectations. A coach who knows what to do but has no planning time needs different support from a coach who cannot yet recognize the game problem.

Worked example with missing opportunity

Observe responses of 2, NA, 4, and 3 give a reported average of 3.0 across three answered items. The NA remains unscored. Ask what limited that opportunity before planning support. Two numeric responses would be insufficient to report an average under this pilot rule.

Turning preferences into development questions

Use each tendency to generate a question, then test it. These are possible extensions of a strength, not automatic gaps. Review opposite-pole items and the coach's examples before drawing a conclusion.

Attention

An individual-action starting point can support detailed technical feedback. Check whether the coach also sees off-ball support and collective causes. A team-relationship starting point can support coordination. Check whether the coach can identify the specific perception, decision, or execution need of an individual.

Reasoning

A concept-first starting point can make understanding transferable. Check whether the coach turns an idea into clear roles and coordinated relationships. A system-first starting point can give players useful references. Check whether players understand the purpose and recognize when to change the route.

Guidance

Clear direction can provide a useful starting model. Check whether players later choose effectively without a prompt. Exploration can create useful opportunities to solve problems. Check whether the coach supplies enough support when players lack the understanding or skill to progress.

Planning

A prepared sequence can support continuity. Check whether the coach changes it when player responses justify a change. Responsive adjustment can address emerging needs. Check whether the coach keeps a clear objective and returns to priorities over time.

An example of integrating the two approaches

For switching play, identify the concept of finding useful space away from pressure. Establish the team relationships that make a switch possible. Leave the route and timing open to the player's reading of the opponent. Review whether the player recognizes when switching helps, then change the opponent's behavior and observe again.

A profile should end with one practical expansion of the coach's range, supported by examples. It should preserve an effective strength and name a behavior the coach can practice.

Discussing the scenarios

Part C has no single answer key or total score. Use the same prompts for each coach. Record evidence present, follow-up needed, or not observed for each relevant habit group. An incomplete written answer may require an oral follow-up; it does not establish inability.

S1 A midfielder keeps losing possession

Look for attention to pressure, receiving information, and teammates' support as well as execution. Ask which observation supports the explanation and what would distinguish alternative causes. A useful action can address either the individual or the surrounding relationships, depending on the evidence.

Main discussion focus Observe and Interpret

S2 An inventive action changes the team shape

Look for separation of the decision from its execution and consideration of team support after the wingback moves. Ask how the coach would preserve useful initiative while maintaining width and balance. Either a clearer starting reference or a different supporting movement can be reasonable.

Main discussion focus Design Guide and Adapt

S3 A practice rule changes the decisions

Look for recognition that the rule may be changing decisions in an unhelpful way. Ask how the coach would preserve the learning objective while changing or removing the rule. Check whether the coach would examine play after the restriction is reduced.

Main discussion focus Design and Adapt

S4 A good result hides a learning question

Look for separation of match result, game context, and the learning objective. Direct attacks may have been appropriate. Ask how the coach would gather evidence of midfield recognition against another defensive arrangement, and what would inform the next teaching decision.

Main discussion focus Review and Interpret

A consistent debrief

Ask the coach to name the first observation, explain their initial interpretation, offer an alternative explanation, and connect the next action to a learning purpose. Then ask what player behavior would change their view. Record the reasoning rather than awarding points for preferred vocabulary.

Field observation and interpretation

Record what happened before making a judgment. Capture a short passage before and after the intervention. Ask for the coach's purpose in the debrief. Use more than one example and note the age, objective, constraints, and learning opportunity.

Time and context	Observed action	Coach explanation	Player response
_____ _____	_____ _____	_____ _____	_____ _____
_____ _____	_____ _____	_____ _____	_____ _____
_____ _____	_____ _____	_____ _____	_____ _____
_____ _____	_____ _____	_____ _____	_____ _____

Look across the six habit groups

- Observe: What did the coach watch and what relevant information was available?
- Interpret: How did the coach distinguish the observation from a possible cause?
- Design: Did the task create the intended game problem and meaningful choices?
- Guide: What did the intervention ask the player to understand or do?
- Adapt: How did the coach respond to the next player actions?
- Review: Was learning checked again when prompts or restrictions changed?

Agree on an evidence based priority

A useful priority connects a repeated situation, the coach's reasoning, an observed effect on learning, and a feasible behavior to practice. Record uncertainty. Where evidence is missing or contradictory, gather another example before making a confident claim.

If two observers review a segment, compare their descriptions and interpretations. Resolve differences using the footage, context, and coach explanation. Do not treat agreement between observers as proof that the questionnaire itself is valid.

Individual coach development record

Complete this record with the coach. Keep coaching preferences, personality traits, habit frequencies, and observed evidence separate. Choose one priority for the first development cycle.

Coach reviewer date and review period

_____

Four coaching averages and five personality averages with response counts

_____

_____

Six habit averages with response counts and relevant opportunities

_____

_____

Strength to preserve and the evidence supporting it

_____

_____

Priority behavior and the examples that justify it

_____

_____

Support action owner and practice opportunities

_____

_____

Observable learning evidence and next review date

_____

_____

Fictional example

A coach reports a system-first preference. In two sessions, players reproduce a build-up sequence but struggle when the opposition changes its press. The coach explains the roles clearly. The agreed priority is to teach the cues for changing the route. Support consists of joint planning and one observed session with varied opposition. Review checks players' choices in a later segment without prompts. The priority comes from the examples, not the preference score.

An eight week club pilot

Use a small initial group that includes different coaching approaches. Agree the objective, observation definitions, access to reports, staff time, and success criteria before collecting responses. This is a local development pilot, not a validation study.

When	Work	Evidence retained
Week 1	Questionnaire, director's existing development priorities, and baseline observations	Item responses, context, plans, and time-stamped examples
Week 2	Individual debrief and one agreed priority per coach	Development record and support owner
Weeks 3 to 6	Co-planning, supported practice, and brief reviews	Support delivered and examples of changed actions
Weeks 7 to 8	Comparable observations and follow-up conversation	Learning examples, changed habits, and unresolved questions

Report the evidence that matters to a director

Measure	What to record
Individual support	Coaches with an evidence-based plan and a completed review out of coaches participating
Coaching behavior	Examples of the agreed behavior at baseline and follow-up with relevant opportunity counts
Player learning	A defined decision or action in comparable situations with and without prompts
Club consistency	Connections between stated principles, session objectives, and observed coaching
Director capacity	Reviews completed by club staff without consultant delivery and time required

For small counts, report the numerator and denominator, such as 5 of 7 relevant opportunities. Distinguish decision quality from technical execution. Keep footage length and situation definitions comparable, and note opponent, attendance, fatigue, and other changes.

Self-report increases alone do not prove better coaching. Before-and-after examples can support a local decision but cannot isolate the consultant's causal effect. Where feasible, stagger support across groups and compare similar periods. Report costs and staff time directly; do not infer financial return from profile scores.

Development of the tool and supporting sources

What this version can support

The original coaching sections and combined interpretation can structure reflection and generate questions to examine. The personality module uses the Mini-IPIP. Evidence for that measure does not validate the coaching dimensions, type labels, or combined predictions.

What still needs testing

Before marketing the profile as a validated assessment, obtain independent coaching and measurement expertise. Review whether the proposed dimensions make sense, whether items are clear and relevant across contexts, and whether reported scores support the intended interpretation.

Begin with usability interviews across different ages, experience levels, and coaching approaches. Ask coaches to explain how they understood each item. Examine missing responses and ceiling effects, revise ambiguous wording, and pilot observation and reporting procedures. This small pilot establishes usability information, not psychometric validity.

A larger planned study would then examine score reliability, the proposed internal structure, relationships with independent observations, and fairness across relevant groups. A measurement specialist should determine the design and sample requirements. Do not invent norms, validated cutoffs, predictive claims, or error estimates.

Supporting sources

These sources inform the coaching development approach. The coaching items and pilot procedures are original proposals. The added personality items and key come from the Mini-IPIP sources cited in its scoring section.

Taylor MacNamara and Collins 2023 The 3Ps A tool for coach observation

Supports examining coaching judgment, planning, and context through observation and debrief. The study involved 10 experienced coach developers; it does not establish the validity of this tool.

https://doi.org/10.3389/fspor.2022.1066378

FIFA 2024 Scales of the game

Connects team and unit organization with individual understanding and adaptable solutions.

https://www.fifatrainingcentre.com/en/practice/talent-coach-programme/training-framework/scales-of-the-game.php

FIFA 2026 The importance of targets and rules

Discusses purposeful practice design and the effect of excessive constraints on player choices.

https://www.fifatrainingcentre.com/en/practice/training-perspectives/designing-games-for-development/the-importance-of-targets-and-rules.php

AERA APA and NCME 2014 Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing

Provides the basis for requiring evidence for intended score interpretations and uses.

https://www.testingstandards.net/open-access-files.html

Proposed coaching type catalogue

The four-letter code summarizes the direction of four coaching preferences. Use it as a discussion aid alongside the actual means and responses. Personality is reported separately as five scores, so coaches with the same coaching code can have different personality profiles.

I = Individual; T = Team. C = Concept; S = System. D = Direction; E = Exploration. P = Planned; A = Adaptive.

Code	Proposed coaching type
ICDP	The Player Educator
ICDA	The Responsive Mentor
ICEP	The Discovery Designer
ICEA	The Player Explorer
ISDP	The Role Teacher
ISDA	The Role Adapter
ISEP	The Role Experimenter
ISEA	The Situational Guide
TCDP	The Game Educator
TCDA	The Game Interpreter
TCEP	The Learning Architect
TCEA	The Collective Explorer
TSDP	The Team Organizer
TSDA	The Tactical Adapter
TSEP	The System Designer
TSEA	The Adaptive Collaborator

Use the exact midpoint and slight-lean rules on the coaching scoring page. Unresolved preferences remain visible. Names describe a reported starting approach; they do not establish expertise, an ideal coaching style, or suitability for a team.