Twitter Thread by Daniel Abrahams



Daniel Abrahams
@DanAbrahams77

A (long) thread on why Andrew is correct but ultimately incorrect…

Andrew is correct at the neurological level. The cognitive and ecological explanations of the brain and behaviour are completely different. Saying you're an eclectic coach at this level is like saying you

> Many coaches advocate for picking and choosing methods from a variety of theoretical camps, on the premise that which is best \u2018depends\u2019 on the player, the coach, etc and you want the biggest toolkit you can get.
>
> I think this is an error, which I will now attempt to defend
>
> — Andrew D Wilson (@PsychScientists) November 27, 2020

believe the earth is round and flat. It's simply not possible.

You CANNOT say that in one activity you are helping players build representations/memory (cognitive) and in another activity you're helping players attune to specifying information in the environment (ecological).

No matter how much we scream eclecticism, at the neurological level Andrew is correct. But after this Andrew is incorrect.

He is basing his critique of an 'it depends' stance at a neurological 'representations vs information' level (see his thread). But this isn't the level that

'it depends' functions (in a coaching context). 'It depends' exists at the behavioural level (certainly not the neurological level). 'It depends' relates to decision making around individual and group differences, as well as context. Coaching, by and large, is about helping

people manage and change behaviour – how a coach does this will 'depend' on a number of individual, group and contextual factors. That is the most important level of coaching and we don't have to go to the neurological level to deliver efficaciously and effectively

(the most well-known coaches in the world who are brilliant at changing behaviour don't!). Essentially, what I'm referring to here is the skill of coaching.

Further, Andrew mentions that picking and choosing coaching methods that ‘come from both camps’ is an incoherent idea for

eco types. Fine! But that’s a massive limitation for them – one that a cognitive approach isn’t restricted by. I’ll explain:

As a constructivist (cognitive) I can use social constructionist (ecological) methods. And I do! I’m trained in SFBT (a social constructionist therapy)

and use tools from SFBT in order to help people change. And I can use SFBT (ecological) alongside mental skill training (cognitive) proficiently, without confusion (it just takes a bit of experience and skill!)

In summary, coaches can use any method they so choose for their

delivery (to manage and change behaviour) without being concerned of a conflict at the neurological level. They don’t have to be concerned about this deeper level if they don’t want to be – it won’t damage their coaching. Coaches CAN be eclectic in their approach.

Ultimately,

Andrew is wrong in his thesis (respectfully).