

Conte, L.; Moreno-Murcia, J. A.; Pérez, G. e Iglesias, D. (2013) Comparación metodología tradicional y comprensiva en la práctica del baloncesto / Comparison of traditional and understanding methodology in the practice of basketball. Revista Internacional de Medicina y Ciencias de la Actividad Física y el Deporte vol. 13 (51) pp. 507-523. [Http://cdeporte.rediris.es/revista/revista51/artensenanza392.htm](http://cdeporte.rediris.es/revista/revista51/artensenanza392.htm)

## ORIGINAL

# COMPARISON OF TRADITIONAL AND UNDERSTANDING METHODOLOGY IN THE PRACTICE OF BASKETBALL

## COMPARACIÓN METODOLOGÍA TRADICIONAL Y COMPRENSIVA EN LA PRÁCTICA DEL BALONCESTO

Conte, L. <sup>1</sup>; Moreno-Murcia, J.A. <sup>2</sup>; Pérez, G. <sup>3</sup> e Iglesias, D. <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> conte@um.es Facultad de Ciencias del Deporte, Universidad de Murcia, España

<sup>2</sup> j.moreno@umh.es Centro de Investigación del Deporte, Facultad de Ciencias Sociosanitarias, Universidad Miguel Hernández, España

<sup>3</sup> gabinope1@gmail.com Unidad de Investigación en Educación Física y Deportes, Universidad de Murcia. España

<sup>4</sup> diglesia@unex.es Facultad de Ciencias del Deporte, Universidad de Extremadura, España

**Código UNESCO / UNESCO code:** 6104.01. Psicopedagogía. Procesos cognitivos / Psychopedagogy. Cognitive processes

**Clasificación Consejo de Europa / Classification Council of Europe:** 15. Psicología del deporte / Sport Psychology

**Recibido** 15 de junio de 2011 **Received** June 15, 2011

**Aceptado** 20 de octubre de 2011 **Accepted** October 20, 2011

## **ABSTRACT**

The aim of this study was to compare the teaching of basketball by means of an understanding methodology and a traditional one with regard to ball control, decision-making and execution in a real game situation in the field of shooting, dribbling and passing. The sample consisted of 24 subjects aged between 8 and 11 years with one year's experience in basketball, across a control group and an experimental group. To assess performance in a real game situation, we used the protocol developed by French and Thomas (1987). A MANOVA was conducted to check if there were differences between groups and an ANOVA of repeated measures to see if there were changes in the dependent variables after intervention. The understanding education group performed better than the traditional teaching group in the three analysed variables.

**KEY WORDS:** basketball, teaching, cognitive process, decision-making.

## RESUMEN

El objetivo de este estudio ha sido comparar la enseñanza del baloncesto según una metodología comprensiva y otra tradicional, sobre control del balón, toma de decisiones y la ejecución en situación real de juego, de las acciones de lanzamiento, bote y pase. La muestra era de 24 sujetos entre 8 y 11 años, con un año de experiencia en baloncesto y distribuidos en grupo control y experimental. Para valorar el rendimiento en situación real de juego se utilizó el protocolo desarrollado por French y Thomas (1987). Se realizó un MANOVA para comprobar si existían diferencias entre los grupos y una ANOVA de medidas repetidas para conocer si había cambios en las variables dependientes tras la intervención. El grupo de enseñanza comprensiva obtuvo mejores resultados que el de enseñanza tradicional en las tres variables analizadas.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** baloncesto, enseñanza, procesos cognitivos, toma decisiones.

## INTRODUCTION

The sport has great complexity since the motor response can be varied widely and depends on factors such as time, speed of processing and external perception for execution, these being fully significant in this process. There are two very important factors to explain this (Thomas and Thomas, 1994). First, the cognitive processing required by sports activities that have a high time pressure in team sports where players have to make quick decisions on their performance. Secondly, knowing how to solve a particular game situation does not necessarily imply knowing how to carry it out in a real game situation; it is what we call the "knowing when" and "how" sporting tasks. A player can have high levels of specific knowledge to solve a situation, but not a correct grasp of the skills needed to implement it. (McPherson & French, 1991; McPherson and Kernodle, 2003). Therefore, the quality of decision-making in a game situation is as important as the execution of motor skills, both being crucial to the output of the game (Blompvist, Luhtanen, and Laakso, 2001; Thomas, 1994).

In the last two decades, lines of research have been developed that have led to educational programmes for analysing and trying to understand the cognitive processes used in games and sports. The origin of this line of research is found in the work of Bunker and Thorpe (1982) and the Teaching Games for Understanding (TGFU), which has continued in the work of Alison and Thorpe (1997), Light and Fawns (2003) and Webb and Pearson (2008). Other variations of this research are "Game Sense" (ASC, 1999), "Play Practice" (Lauder, 2001), "Games concept approach" (Wright, Fry, McNeill, Tan, Tan & Schemp, 2001, cited in Light, 2003) and most recently "Playing for Life" (ASC, 2005). The TGFU indicates that the key is to put the player in a situation where tactics, decision-making and problem solving are the most important. The understanding of the game is the determining factor in this approach (Bailey and Almond, 1983), and being a good performer is not the only condition required in order to be effective in the game, but it is essential to understand how, when and where to use the technique. Understanding the game should lead the player to consider the "why" do something before the "how" (Hopper and Kruisselbrink, 2001).

Teaching players to make correct decisions when playing is a complex task (Turner & Martinek, 1995). There is empirical evidence that shows that knowledge is an indicator of skill directly connected to tactical behaviour (Iglesias, Moreno, Santos-Rosa, Cervelló, & del Villar, 2005; McPherson & Thomas, 1989; Ruiz & Arruza, 2005). Recently, there have also been studies that demonstrate that it is possible to intervene in this factor in situations unconnected to the game and achieve improvement in the actual competition situation (Brooker, Kirk, Braiuka y Bransgrove, 2000; Iglesias, 2006; de la Vega, del Valle, Maldonado, & Moreno, 2008). However, mastery of technique is necessary to implement strategies in the game (Rink, 1996, 2001), but Thorpe, Bunker and Almond (1986) and Webb and Pearson (2008) suggest that

evaluation and understanding of the game and tactical knowledge development must precede the development of motor skills of the game. This approach to teaching for understanding, according to the TGFU research, emphasizes the role of knowledge and understanding (Bunker and Thorpe, 1982; Light and Fawns, 2003).

With this model, the teaching focuses on the practice of modified games that contain the basic features of the game. General strategies are introduced with the aim of developing tactical knowledge of the game and decision-making ability concerning “*why*”, “*how*” and “*what to do*”. Skill execution is only started once the player shows that he is ready and knows a specific strategy.

Therefore, emphasis is laid on practical learning in real game situations (Hastie, 1998; Webb y Pearson, 2008). With this methodology, the subject performs a more important role in determining what is processed, how it is processed, and, therefore, how he learns, leading to more adaptive results (Morgan, Kingston, & Sproule, 2005). Studies under TGFU do not confront methodology focused on technique as opposed to studies focused on understanding. The key according to Hopper and Kruisselbrink (2001) is knowing how to separate learning the techniques from learning the tactics, because in many cases to solve a tactical situation takes a few technical resources (Rink, French, and Graham, 1996). According to these authors there are some vital aspects to be considered in all investigations on this subject: the skills and strategies are linked, tactical ideas are acquired through play, the initial level of the game has to be cooperative and the sport has its own strategies and is very contextual.

Consequently, the coach’s purpose in this context is to design learning activities and experiences that encourage players to discover principles and concepts by themselves, so that these concepts can be transferred to other situations where they can be applied (Iglesias, Cárdenas, & Alarcón, 2007; Méndez, 1999, 2005). However, Chandler and Mitchell (1991), and McMorris (1998) observed that there was not enough empirical evidence to support the idea that a focus on games for understanding was more effective than other methods.

Longitudinal studies have been performed in this research area in which different methodological teaching models have been compared with the aim of solving one of the major enigmas in sport coaching: what is the best way of teaching sport? Different types of sports have been studied in this paradigm: net and wall sports (French, Werner, Rink, Taylor, & Hussey, 1996; Gabriele & Maxwell, 1995; Griffin, Oslin, & Mitchell, 1995; Harrison, Blakemore, Richards, Oliver, Wilkinson, & Fellingham, 1998) and invasion sports (García y Ruiz, 2003; Tallir, Musch, Lenoir, y Valcke, 2003; Brooker, Kirk, Braiuka, y Bransgrove, 2000), field sports and batting sports (Butler, Griffin, Lombardo and Nastasi, 2003) and finally white or target sports (Webb, Pearson and Forrest, 2006). These sports have different operating structures, and formal relationships that make it very difficult to make comparisons on transfers and comprehensive learning.

However, the results of this research have been inconsistent. Turner and Martinek (1992), in their study of field hockey, did not discover any significant differences in either declarative and procedural knowledge or in the development of technical skills when applying and comparing the traditional teaching model with the understanding model. By contrast, Griffin et al. (1995) in volleyball, Turner (1996) in field hockey and García and Ruiz (2003) in handball found that declarative knowledge was significantly higher in the understanding group when they compared it with the control and the traditional teaching groups. None of these studies (García & Ruiz, 2003; Griffin et al., 1995; Turner, 1996; Turner & Martinek, 1999) found significant differences between the technical and understanding groups in terms of performance in specific skill tests and in game execution. On the other hand, McPherson and French (1991) showed that technical improvement was much influenced by direct instruction. In their study, tennis players improved their execution technique only after receiving direct instruction on the technique. Other research found advantages in favour of the tactical group for the decision-making component (Allison & Thorpe, 1997; Gabriele & Maxwell, 1995; Griffin et al., 1995; Mitchell et al., 1995). In every piece of research the difference in relation to the enjoyment of the participants in the understanding-orientated group is very significant (Brooker et al., 2000, Webb et al., 2006).

In accordance with Rink, French, and Tjeerdsma (1996), inconsistencies in the results found in the specific bibliography can be explained, in part, by the difference in the research designs. The various sports in which the studies took place, the participants' different ages, the differences in the length and nature of intervention and the selection of different variables for the research are the reasons that make direct and valid comparison among the studies difficult.

Therefore, research performed on methodological sport coaching models indicates that the current status of the issue is clearly controversial (Doods, Griffin, & Placek, 2001; Griffin & Butler, 2005), making it necessary to carry out further studies to help clarify this data. The purpose of this study was to compare the technical or traditional model with the understanding model in teaching basketball, with regard to the effect caused in game performance, categorised on the basis of ball control, decision-making and execution variables for the actions of shooting, passing and dribbling according to the French and Thomas instrument (1987).

## **METHOD**

### *Participants*

The sample consisted of a total of 24 basketball players aged between 8 and 11 years, when the process of psychological maturation begins ( $M = 9.1$  years,  $SD = 1.2$ ), divided into two groups: understanding ( $n = 13$ ) and traditional ( $n = 11$ ). All players started with one year's experience in federated official competition,

all observed matches were federated and training took place three days per week.

The different ages of the participants in the research is an important variable to relate results. Tests by Rink et al., (1996) indicate that 12 is the most suitable age to handle abstract concepts of tactics in sports. At this point in our research we used youth aged between 8 and 11 years with the limitations which that entails.

### *Instruments*

*Observation protocol of the player's individual performance in possession of the ball in an actual game situation.* Given that the sample used was in the initial stages of basketball, the instrument by French and Thomas (1987) was used to measure the basketball player's performance in possession of the ball in a real competition situation. The authors propose three categories for the assessment of individual performance: total, correct and incorrect ball control, decision-making and execution with regard to passing, dribbling and shooting. The observation took place during basketball matches in federate competition, thirty-five sessions lasting an hour, in normal conditions with individual defence from midcourt. The first ten minutes of each player's game were analysed according to the instrument protocol used (García & Ruiz, 2003; Turner & Martinek, 1999). The analysis was performed using a video recording of the match to facilitate identification of the different aspects to be recorded.

The collaborators chosen for the programme had prior experience of over five years coaching with training groups in official competitions with groups of similar age and characteristics (Graham, French, & Woods, 1993) and were national coaches, trained to level III. They were coached prior to the intervention to identify the most relevant categories and their assessment in the coaching sessions. A sample of 10 minutes of footage was used during five coaching sessions that did not form part of the intervention for that purpose. During the observations, model situations were identified for every category and the items they consisted of. Next, segments of this practice were observed and coded independently, until they attained an interobserver concordance level of 90% in each segment. The recordings were made in every one of the groups at both the beginning and the end. Some good results were obtained in the intracoder ( $r = .89, p > .05$ ) and intercoder ( $r = .92, p > .05$ ) reliability and validity tests.

*Coach's Behaviour.* In order to examine the coach's verbal interaction with the players in the understanding and traditional teaching groups, an applied programme session was filmed and the coach's verbal behaviour was transcribed. The observations were filmed during the session before applying the second take match (post-test). The coach's verbal behaviour was coded using an adaptation of the Coaching Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) by Smith, Smoll, and Hunt (1977). The instrument was adapted to measure 12 categories of the coach's behaviour organised into two large dimensions: (a) the

coach's initial general behaviour and (b) the coach's behaviour when he responded to the player's performance. The first dimension included teaching technique, organisation, general communication and encouragement. The second dimension involved the responses of consolidation and non-consolidation when performances were correct, and reaction to mistakes, including reinforcements, instruction technique, penalties and lack of response. Previous research (Goudas, Biddle, Fox, & Underwood, 1995; Wallhead & Ntoumanis, 2004) on teaching styles, selection of tasks and students' motivation had already used the CBAS to measure the consistency of the coach's behaviour in different intervention programmes.

The transcription of the footage was coded by the researcher and another person, a second researcher who did not know the purpose of the study. The second researcher was trained prior to the intervention to identify the most relevant categories of the coach's behaviour in the adaptation of the CBAS. A sample of 10 minutes of footage was used during five coaching episodes that did not form part of the intervention. During the observations of the first two coaching episodes, model situations were also identified for every category in the coach's behaviour. Next, coaching segments were observed and coded independently, up to an interobserver concordance level of 90% in each segment. After this criterion was obtained, every intervention example was coded independently. The coach had to use positive reinforcements, encouragement, feedback, control maintenance, general instructions and organisation for the intervention to be teaching for understanding. While in the traditional teaching model the coach gave feedback by means of negative comments, inappropriate exclamations and lost control at times. The reliability was .79 for the intervention programme in teaching for understanding, and .82 for traditional teaching.

### *Design*

A quasi-experimental pre-post design was implemented with two experimental groups in thirty-five sessions lasting an hour each (three months of intervention). Similar basic learning contents were implemented in these groups using the two models proposed. Pre-treatment and post-treatment assessment was performed. The independent variable was formed by the different intervention programmes that were administered, whilst basic sport competence in basketball (ball control, decision-making and technical execution in passing, dribbling and shooting) was measured for the dependent variable.

*Traditional teaching model.* This model was based on the use of exercises and game play, which began with the simple execution of a technical move in decontextualized game situations until a complex move was attained (analytical strategy). The coach was responsible for offering correct execution models (through demonstrations) and answers to any problems that arose (corrections).

*Teaching for understanding model.* It was based on a proposal focused on understanding the tactics of basketball actions through similar games, according to the methodology Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU) developed by Bunker and Thorpe (1982) and active learning through indirect strategies of tactical and technical aspects of basketball by means of investigation. Several questions were raised in the sessions about the contents of basketball and requirements connected to the techniques needed to solve the game's problems, with the players themselves having to find answers and solutions. A mixed programme was used (guided discovery and problem solving). Sometimes, there was a more appropriate response and other times there could be different responses for the same problem. In guided discovery, the coach's aim was for the players to find the most effective response to the different questions (e.g. the most suitable pass in a play situation or the most correct decision by a player in possession of the ball). In the problem solving programme there were different responses that could solve the problem raised (e.g. different types of passes or shots).

### Data Analysis

The independent operational variable was the conveyance of basketball coaching using a teaching for understanding model and another based on a traditional model. The dependent variables were ball control, decision-making and shooting, passing and dribbling execution. A MANOVA was performed with Take 1 to check the homogenisation of the groups. After the intervention, a MANOVA was performed with the data from Take 2, to check whether there were any differences between the groups. A repeated measures ANOVA was also performed to see if there had been any changes in the dependent variables after the intervention.

## RESULTS

### Preliminary Analysis

A one-way between-groups MANOVA was performed with Take 1 (Table 1), considering ball control, decision-making and passing, dribbling and shooting execution as the dependent variables. No significant differences were found (Wilks' Lambda = .61,  $F(22, 50) = .70$ ,  $p > .05$ ).

**Table 1.** Mean, Standard Deviation and P-value of the Variables of Ball control, Execution and Decision-making, Dribbling and Shooting in Initial Observation.

	Understandin Traditional				
	g		g		p
	M	DT	M	DT	
Ball control					
Total	12.69	7.22	14.72	13.34	.875
On target shots	11.07	7.94	13.45	12.69	.823
Incorrect control	1.61	1.66	1.27	1.00	.836

Decision-making, dribbling and shooting	<i>M</i>	<i>DT</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>DT</i>	<i>p</i>
Total passing	10.38	4.64	10.36	8.30	.989
Correct passing	7.38	3.79	7.45	6.68	.985
Incorrect passing	3.00	1.73	2.90	2.50	.994
Total dribbling	6.30	5.94	7.36	7.95	.685
Correct dribbling	4.61	5.00	6.00	6.88	.601
Incorrect dribbling	1.69	1.88	1.36	1.62	.766
Total shooting	3.07	3.32	6.36	8.34	.304
Correct shooting	2.38	2.50	4.90	6.72	.295
Incorrect shooting	.69	.94	1.45	2.11	.436
Execution of passing, dribbling and shooting	<i>M</i>	<i>DT</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>DT</i>	<i>p</i>
Total passing	10.38	4.64	10.36	8.30	.989
Correct passing	7.38	3.88	6.81	5.86	.954
Incorrect passing	3.00	1.29	3.54	2.69	.796
Total dribbling	6.30	5.94	7.36	7.95	.654
Correct dribbling	3.92	4.23	5.36	6.65	.613
Incorrect dribbling	2.38	2.46	2.00	2.49	.664
Total shooting	3.07	3.32	6.36	8.34	.304
Correct shooting	1.53	1.80	3.90	5.52	.235
Incorrect shooting	1.53	1.76	2.45	3.17	.590

### *Effects of the Intervention*

The one-way between-groups MANOVA with Take 2 (Table 2) revealed significant differences in ball control (Wilks' Lambda = .79,  $F(4, 68) = 2.02$ ,  $p < .05$ ), decision-making (Wilks' Lambda = .53,  $F(12, 60) = 1.81$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and execution (Wilks' Lambda = .55,  $F(12, 60) = 1.69$ ,  $p < .05$ ). In the ball control variable, the groups offered significant differences in total ball control measures ( $F(2, 35) = 3.71$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and correct ball controls ( $F(2, 35) = 3.17$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The differences found between the groups were favourably inclined towards the teaching for understanding group rather than the traditional group. With respect to final decision-making, significant differences were found in the total passing decision-making variable ( $F(2, 35) = 3.53$ ,  $p < .05$ ), correct passing decision-making ( $F(2, 35) = 3.59$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and in the correct shooting decision-making variable ( $F(2, 35) = 3.92$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The values were always higher in the teaching for understanding group than in the traditional teaching group. Regarding technical execution, significant differences were found in the total passing execution variable ( $F(2, 35) = 3.53$ ,  $p < .05$ ) and correct passing executions ( $F(2, 35) = 3.36$ ,  $p < .05$ ). The differences found between the groups were always in favour of the teaching for understanding group.

**Table 2.** Mean, Standard Deviation and P-value of the Variables of Ball control, Execution and Decision-making, Dribbling and Shooting in Final Observation.

	Understanding Traditional				
	<i>M</i>	<i>DT</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>DT</i>	<i>p</i>
<b>Ball control</b>					
Total	17.61	9.52	10.54	5.55	.034
On target shots	16.30	9.96	9.72	5.69	.050
Incorrect control	1.30	1.31	.81	1.53	.666
<b>Decision-making, dribbling and shooting</b>	<i>M</i>	<i>DT</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>DT</i>	<i>p</i>
Total passing	11.69	7.56	7.36	4.27	.040
Correct passing	9.00	6.15	5.36	3.35	.038
Incorrect passing	2.69	2.01	2.00	1.89	.248
Total dribbling	8.69	7.28	6.81	5.86	.699
Correct dribbling	7.23	6.82	4.27	4.69	.402
Incorrect dribbling	1.46	1.33	2.54	1.80	.301
Total shooting	6.69	4.30	3.54	2.97	.212
Correct shooting	5.23	3.78	1.90	2.84	.029
Incorrect shooting	1.46	1.05	1.63	1.43	.947
<b>Execution of passing, dribbling and shooting</b>	<i>M</i>	<i>DT</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>DT</i>	<i>p</i>
Total passing	11.69	7.56	7.36	4.27	.040
Correct passing	8.23	5.67	5.09	2.91	.046
Incorrect passing	3.46	2.53	2.27	2.05	.162
Total dribbling	8.69	7.28	6.81	5.86	.699
Correct dribbling	7.30	6.83	4.45	4.94	.465
Incorrect dribbling	1.38	1.38	2.36	1.68	.301
Total shooting	6.69	4.30	3.54	2.97	.121
Correct shooting	3.38	3.20	1.54	2.11	.228
Incorrect shooting	3.30	1.75	2.00	1.78	.180

## DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to establish a comparative analysis of the effects caused in coaching basketball using an understanding methodology and a traditional one, on ball control, decision-making and passing, dribbling and shooting execution. Some authors suggest that more ball control leads to better performance in later decision-making (French, Werner, Rink et al., 1996; French, Werner, Taylor et al., 1996; Turner & Martinek, 1992, 1999). Initially, in the first observation of the actual game played, there were no significant differences between the research groups in the ball control variables. After the intervention, significant differences were attained in favour of the group based on teaching for understanding in the total ball control and correct ball control

variables. Furthermore, this same group made more progress in its percentage of baskets, whilst the traditional group's values were the same as its initial ones. Due to the results obtained in ball control in an actual game, our conclusions coincide with the idea put forward by other authors (French, Werner, Rink et al., 1996; French, Werner, Taylor et al., 1996; García & Ruiz, 2003; Turner & Martinek, 1992, 1999), where the tactic-orientated group has more and better ball control and has better performance in decision-making.

As with other studies, (Allison & Thorpe, 1997; Gabrielle & Maxwell, 1995; Mitchell et al., 1995; Stuart & Thorpe, 1997; Turner & Martinek, 1995), we found there are significant differences in (total and correct) passing decision-making and correct shooting decision-making in favour of the group focused on teaching for understanding. Previous research in which the same measurement instrument was used (García & Ruiz, 2003; Turner, 1996; Turner & Martinek, 1999) shows that the trend is always in favour of the group focused on teaching for understanding when making decisions in the various variables analysed, although, on the other hand, this trend does not usually indicate major differences between the groups (Mitchell et al., 1995), or they are only significant in an isolated aspect (Turner & Martinek, 1999). In other similar research, differences concerning decision-making were not sufficiently evidenced when such intervention programmes lasted less than three months (Méndez, 1999). In any event, some experiences did not find any significant differences between the decisions made by one or the other group (French, Werner, Rink et al., 1996; García & Ruiz, 2003; McPherson & French, 1991; Rink, French, & Werner, 1991; Turner & Martinek, 1992).

After the intervention period, significant differences were found in total pass execution and correct pass execution in favour of the group focused on teaching for understanding compared with the group focused on traditional teaching. Up to the age of eleven or twelve, our capacity for learning is global, and analytical learning experiences have an added difficulty, so, unlike other research in older players (French, Werner, Taylor et al., 1996; Turner, 1993, Turner & Martinek, 1992, 1995), this expected equality in technical execution in an actual game situation becomes more difficult. In this respect, the technical contents were never worked on directly in the teaching for understanding group, but it seems that they were developed as a need to respond to problems faced when playing. According to Devís and Sánchez (1996), although there is an emphasis on progress from tactics to technique, "*from why to what*", this does not mean that technique is ignored. As some authors point out (Cárdenas, 2003; Castejón & López, 2003; Read, 1988), this is a model that integrates technique whilst modified games are being played, and momentarily pays particular attention to a fundamental aspect to continue with the game. Therefore, it is observed that the teaching for understanding group progresses more in variables related to the execution of technical contents in an actual game. This trend in favour of the teaching for understanding group in game execution can also be seen in other research in the passing execution variable (Gabrielle & Maxwell, 1995; Turner & Martinek, 1999).

Research of this kind, as we have pointed out before, is very complex and does not manage to explain all the processes that occur due to the great difficulty in controlling the variables and their interrelation (Rink, French & Graham, 1996). The participants in this study, players aged between 8 and 11, have some biological and psychological maturation processes typical of their age, and it may be difficult to extrapolate the results of similar studies with different age groups. Procedural knowledge can affect speed in decision-making and condition later actions, so it may be interesting to focus studies on other age levels and other team games, with more possibilities of conducting longitudinal studies and being able to verify procedural changes over a longer period of time. Therefore, the field of study needs to be extended to technique, tactics and attack and defence actions, with an analysis in actual game situations. The challenge for the future is to find a study model and an instrument of technical and tactical ability that can be applied to various populations and learning stages.

The main conclusions are that, after the intervention of 30 sessions, significant differences were perceived in favour of the teaching for understanding group in the variables of ball control and accurate ball controls. The understanding group made the most progress in its on target shooting percentage and experienced better performance in decision-making. There is a tendency in favour of the group oriented towards teaching for understanding when making decisions on the different variables analysed, although without significant differences between groups.

## REFERENCES

- Allison, S., y Thorpe, R. (1997). A comparison of the effectiveness of two approaches to teaching games with Physical education. A skill approach versus a Games for Understanding approach. *The British Journal of Physical Education, Autumn*, 9-13.
- Australian Sports Commission. (1999). *Game Sense Card*. Canberra: ASC.
- Australian Sports Commission. (2005). *Active after-school communities-Community coach training program*. Canberra: ASC.
- Bailey, L., y Almond, L. (1983). Creating change: By creating games? En L. Spackman (Ed.), *Teaching games for understanding* (pp. 56-59). Cheltenham, England: The College of St. Paul and St. Mary.
- Blomqvist, M., Luhtanen, P., y Laakso, L. (2001). Comparison of two types of instruction in bádminton. *European Journal of Physical Education*, 6, 139-155.
- Brooker, R., Kirk, D., Braiuka, S., y Bransgrove, A. (2000). Implementing a game sense approach to teaching junior high school basketball in a naturalistic setting. *European Physical Education Review*, 6(1), 7-26.
- Bunker, D., y Thorpe, R. (1982). A model for the teaching of games in secondary schools. *Bulletin of Physical Education*, 18(1), 5-8.
- Butler, J., Griffin, L., Lombardo, B. y Nastasi, R. (Ed.). (2003). *Teaching Games for Understanding in Physical Education and Sport*. Reston (VA): NASPE.
- Cárdenas, D. (2003). El proceso de formación táctica colectiva desde una perspectiva constructivista. En A. López, C. Jiménez y R. Aguado (Eds.), *Didáctica del baloncesto en las etapas de formación* (pp.179-209). Madrid: Fundación Real Madrid-INEF.
- Castejón, F. J., y López, V. (2003). El tratamiento de la táctica en la enseñanza del baloncesto. En A. López, C. Jiménez, y R. Aguado (Eds.), *Curso de didáctica del baloncesto en las etapas de iniciación* (pp. 210-221). Madrid: INEF.
- Chandler, T., y Mitchell, S. (1991). Reflections on models of games education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 61 (6), 19-21.
- De la Vega, R., Del Valle, S., Maldonado, A., y Moreno, A. (2008). Una nueva herramienta para la comprensión táctica del fútbol. *Revista Internacional de Medicina y Ciencias de la Actividad Física y el Deporte*. 8, 30, 130-145. Tomado el 2 de junio de 2008 en <http://cdeporte.rediris.es/revista/revista30/arttactica72.htm>.
- Devís, J., y Sánchez, R. (1996). Modelos iniciales y alternativos de la enseñanza deportiva. En J. A. Moreno y P. L. Rodríguez (Eds.), *Aprendizaje deportivo* (pp. 159-181). Murcia: Universidad de Murcia.
- Doods, P., Griffin, L. L., y Placek. (2001). A selected review of the literature on development of learners' domain-specific knowledge. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 20, 301-313.

- French, K. E., y Thomas, J. R. (1987). The relations of knowledge development to children's basketball performance. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, 9, 15-32.
- French, K. E., Werner, P., Rink, J., Taylor, K., y Hussey, K. (1996). The effects of a 3-week unit of tactical, skill, or combined tactical and skill instruction on badminton performance of ninth-grade students. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 15, 418-438.
- French, K. E., Werner, P., Taylor, K., Hussey, K., y Jones, J. (1996). The effects of a 6-week unit of tactical, skill, or combined tactical and skill instruction on badminton performance of ninth-grade students. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 15, 439-463.
- Gabrielle, T., y Maxwell, T. (1995). Direct versus Indirect Methods of squash instruction. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 66, 3-63.
- García, J. A., y Ruiz, L. M. (2003). Análisis comparativo de dos modelos de intervención en el aprendizaje del balonmano. *Revista de Psicología del Deporte*, 12(1), 55-66.
- Graham, K. C., French, K. E., y Woods, A. M. (1993). Observing and interpreting teaching-learning processes: Novice PETE students, experienced PETE students, and expert teacher educators. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 13, 46-61.
- Goudas, M., Biddle, S. J. H., Fox, K. R., y Underwood, M. (1995). It ain't what you do, it's the way that you do it! Teaching style affects children motivation in track and field lessons. *The Sport Psychologist*, 9, 254-264.
- Griffin, L. L., y Butler, J. I. (Eds.). (2005). *Teaching games for understanding: Theory, research and practice*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Griffin, L. L., Oslin, J. L., y Mitchell, S. A. (1995). An analysis of two instructional approaches to teaching net games. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 66 (Suppl.); A-64.
- Harrison, J. M., Blackmore, C. L., Richards, R. P., Oliver, J., Wilkinson, C., y Fellingham, G. W. (1998). The effects of two instructional models -tactical and skill teaching- on skill development, knowledge, self-efficacy, game play and student perceptions in volleyball. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, March supplement: A-93-94.
- Hastie, P. A. (1998). Skill and tactical development during a sport education season. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 69(4), 368-379.
- Hopper, T., y Kruisselbrink, D. (2001). Teaching Games for Understanding: What does it look like and how does it influence student skill acquisition and game performance? *Journal of Teaching Physical Education*. 12, 2-29.
- Iglesias, D. (2006). *Efecto de un protocolo de supervisión reflexiva sobre el conocimiento procedimental, la toma de decisiones y la ejecución, en jugadores jóvenes de baloncesto*. Tesis doctoral. Universidad de Extremadura.
- Iglesias, D., Cárdenas, D., y Alarcón, F. (2007). La comunicación durante la intervención didáctica del entrenador. Consideraciones para el desarrollo

- del conocimiento táctico y la mejora en la toma de decisiones en baloncesto. *Cultura, Ciencia y Deporte*, 3 (7), 43-50.
- Iglesias, D., Moreno, M. P., Santos-Rosa, E. M., Cervelló, E., y Del Villar, F. (2005). Cognitive expertise in sport: Relationship between procedural knowledge, experience and performance in youth basketball. *Journal of Human Movement Studies*, 49, 65-76.
- Jiménez, A. C., y Ruiz, L. M. (2006). Análisis de las tomas de decisión en la fase de ataque de las jugadoras aleros de baloncesto. *Revista Internacional de Ciencias del Deporte*, 4(2), 26-46. Tomado el 15 de septiembre de 2008 en <http://www.cafyd.com/REVISTA/art3n4a06.pdf>
- Kermarrec, G., Todorovich, J., y Fleming, D. (2004). An investigation of the self-regulation components students employ in the physical education setting. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 23, 123-142.
- Lauder, G. (2001). *Play practice: The games approach to teaching and coaching sports*. Illinois: Human Kinetics.
- Lawton, J. (1989). Comparison of two teaching methods in games. *Bulletin of Physical Education*, 25 (1), 35-38.
- Light, R. (2003). The joy of learning: Emotion and learning in games through TGfU. *Journal of Physical Education New Zealand*, 36(1), 93-99.
- Light, R., Fawns, R. (2003). Knowing the game: integrating speech and action in games teaching through TGfU. *Quest*, 55, 161-176.
- McMorris, T. (1998). Teaching games for understanding to the knowledge of skill acquisition from a motor learning perspective. *European Journal of Physical Education*, 3 (1), 65-75.
- McPherson, S. L., y French, K. E. (1991). Changes in cognitive strategies and motor skill in tennis. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 13, 26-41.
- McPherson, S. L., y Kernodle, M. W. (2003). Tactics, the neglected attribute of expertise: problem representations and performance skills in tennis. En J. L. Starkes y K. A. Ericsson (Eds.), *Expert performance in sports: Advances in research on sport expertise* (pp. 137-167). Champaign, IL.: Human Kinetics.
- McPherson, S. L., y Thomas, J. R. (1989). Relation of knowledge and performance in boys' tennis: age and expertise. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 48, 190-211.
- Méndez, A. (1999). *Análisis comparativo de las técnicas de enseñanza en la iniciación a dos deportes de invasión: el floorball patines y el baloncesto*. Tesis doctoral. Universidad de Granada y Universidad de Oviedo.
- Méndez, A. (2005). *Técnicas de enseñanza en la iniciación al baloncesto*. Barcelona: Inde.
- Mitchell, S. A., Griffin, L., y Oslin, J. (1995). An analysis of two instructional approaches to teaching invasion games. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 66, 31-65.
- Morgan, K., Kingston, K., y Sproule, J. (2005). Effects of different teaching styles on the teacher behaviours that influence motivational climate and pupils' motivation in physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 11(3), 257-285.

- Rink, J. E. (1996). Tactical and skill approaches to teaching sport and games: introduction. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 15, 397-398.
- Rink, J. E. (2001). Investigating the assumptions of pedagogy. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 15, 112-128.
- Rink, J. E., French, K. E., y Graham, K. C. (1996). Implications for practise and research. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 15, 490-502.
- Rink, J., French, K. E. y Werner, P. (1991) *Tactical awareness as the focus for ninth grade badminton*. Higher Education World Congress. Congreso Mundial de Atlanta. International Association for Physical Education (AIESEP). Georgia.
- Rink, J. E., French, K. E., y Tjeerdsma, B. (1996). Foundations for the learning and instruction of sport and games. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 15, 399-417.
- Ruiz, L. M., y Arruza, J. (2005). *EL proceso de toma de decisiones en el deporte. Clave de la eficiencia y el rendimiento óptimo*. Barcelona: Paidós Ibérica.
- Smith R. E., Smoll, F. L., y Hunt, E. B. (1977). A system for the behavioral assessment of athletic coaches. *Research Quarterly*, 48, 401-407.
- Tallir, I., Musch, E., Lenoir, M., y Valcke, M. (2003). Assessment of game play in basketball. *Conferencia presentada en el 2nd International Conference for Sport and Understanding, Melbourne*.
- Thomas, K. T. (1994). The development of sport expertise: From leads to MVP legend. *Quest*, 46, 211-222.
- Thomas, K. T., y Thomas, J. R. (1994). Developing expertise in sport: The relation of knowledge and performance. *Internacional Journal of Sport Psychology*, 25, 295-312.
- Thorpe, R., Bunker, D., y Almond, L. (1986). *Rethinking games teaching*. Loughborough, U. K.: University of Tecnology, Departament of Physical Education and Sport Science.
- Turner, A. P. (1993). *A model for working with students with varying knowledge structures*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance, Washington, DC.
- Turner, A. P. (1996). Teaching for understanding: Myth or reality? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance*, 67(4), 46-48/55.
- Turner, A. P., y Martinek, T. J. (1992). A comparative analysis of two model for teaching games-technique approach and game-centered (tactical focus) approach. *Internacional Journal of Physical Education*, 29(4), 15-31.
- Turner, A. P., y Martinek, T. J. (1995). Teaching for understanding: a model for improving decision making during game play. *Quest*, 47(1), 44-63.
- Turner, A. P., y Martinek, T. J. (1999). An investigation into teaching games for understanding: Effects on skill, knowledge, and game play. *Research Quarterly for Excercise and Sport*, 70(3), 286-296.
- Webb, P., Pearson, P. (2008). *An integrated approach to teaching games for understanding (TGfU)*. Ponencia presentada en 1st Asia Pacific Sport in

- Education Conference: Ngunyawaiendi Yerthoappendi Play to Educate, Adelaide, 21 January 2008. <http://ro.uow.edu.au/edupapers/52>
- Webb, P., Pearson, P., y Forrest, G. (2006). Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU) in primary and secondary physical education. Ponencia presentada en ICHPER- SD International Conference for Health, Physical Education Recreation, Sport and Dance, 1st Oceanic Congress Wellington, New Zealand, 2006 (1-4 October).
- Wallhead, T. L., y Ntoumanis, N. (2004). Effects of a sport Education intervention on students motivational responses in physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 23, 4-18.

**Número de citas totales / Total references:** 63 (100%)

**Número de citas propias de la revista / Journal's own references:** 1 (1,59%)

## APPENDIX

### Performance observation categories in a real play situation

	Correct		Incorrect			
Ball control	The player receives or catches the ball with one or two hands in order to subsequently play it (dribble, pass, shoot).		The player does not manage to retain the ball and it escapes from his hands.			
	Passing		Dribbling		Shooting	
	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect	Correct	Incorrect
Decision-making	The player tries to pass to an unmarked team-mate.	The player tries to pass to a marked team-mate or to a defender positioned on the pass line. The player tries to pass to a part of the court where there is no team-mate. The player passes to a team-mate when it is more appropriate to shoot at goal.	Take the ball to the field of attack dodging opponents. Effect an appropriate penetration. Effect an appropriate change of direction (that is, out of reach of the defence) towards a free area or break through the defence.	Dribble to an attacking defender. Dribble without advancing towards the basket or move away from it, without pressure from a defender. Dribble backwards causing a retreat. Dribble outside the field of play. Misuse of dribbling when it would have been more appropriate to pass to an unmarked team-mate or shoot at goal.	Shoot at goal from inside or near to the restricted zone when unmarked or not under pressure.	Shoot at long range from the restricted area. Shoot whilst attacking (committing fouls in attack) or whilst off balance. Shoot when a defender makes a pressured marking. Shoot when it is more suitable to pass to an unmarked team-mate or forward. Not to attempt a shot when unmarked or within the zone.
Execution	The ball reaches the unmarked team-mate with suitable speed and height.	The pass goes too high or low, too far, backwards or forwards or outside the limits of the field of play. Making a pass that violates the rules.	Progress with the controlled ball and without infringement.	Lose control of the ball. Lose control of the ball due to a legal action by an opponent. Make an infringement (steps, doubles or foul in attack).	The ball enters the basket, touches the ring or the small box on the board.	The ball does not enter the basket, does not touch the ring or the small box. The shot is blocked by an opponent. Making a shot that violates the rules.