

Coach-to-Athlete Communication in Badminton: A Scoping Review of Content, Delivery, and Context

INPLASY202690011
doi: 10.37766/inplasy2026.9.0011
Received: 2 September 2026
Published: 2 September 2026

Manunyanon, S; Hareebin, Y; Eden, C; Tawanwongsri, W.

Corresponding author:
Weeratian Tawanwongsri
weeratian.ta@gmail.com

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Support - No support.
Review Stage at time of this submission - Preliminary searches.
Conflicts of interest - None declared.
INPLASY registration number: INPLASY202690011

Author Affiliation:
Walailak University.

Amendments - This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 2 September 2026 and was last updated on 2 September 2026.

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective Review question: What is known about the content, delivery characteristics, and contexts of human coach-to-athlete communication in badminton?
Objective: This scoping review aims to map the existing evidence on what badminton coaches communicate to athletes, how such communication is delivered, and the contexts in which communication occurs, and to identify gaps relevant to coach-to-athlete communication during competitive match intervals.

Background Coach-to-athlete communication is an important component of sports coaching because coaches provide athletes with technical, tactical, psychological, motivational, and performance-related information that may influence learning, decision-making, confidence, and competitive performance. In badminton, communication may occur across multiple contexts, including routine training, skill

development, precompetition preparation, competition, official in-match intervals, between-game intervals, and postcompetition feedback. The content and delivery of communication may differ substantially according to these contexts and the needs of individual athletes. Existing badminton research has examined several related aspects of coaching communication, including corrective feedback, instructional information, coaching behaviors, athlete preferences, interpersonal communication, and communication during competition. However, this evidence appears to be dispersed across different study designs, populations, competitive levels, and coaching settings. Some studies have focused primarily on what information is provided, whereas others have examined feedback methods, interpersonal behaviors, or athlete perceptions. Consequently, the overall evidence concerning both the content of coach-to-athlete communication and how such communication is delivered has not been systematically mapped. This gap is particularly relevant during competitive match intervals, where coaches have limited time

to communicate potentially important technical, tactical, psychological, and game-management information. A comprehensive mapping of the existing badminton-specific evidence is therefore needed to clarify what has been studied, identify areas of consistency and variation, and highlight underexplored aspects of communication that may inform future research and coaching practice.

Rationale Existing evidence on coach-to-athlete communication in badminton is heterogeneous and fragmented across studies examining instructional feedback, coaching behaviors, interpersonal communication, athlete preferences, and competition-related coaching information. These studies vary in design, participant characteristics, competitive level, and coaching context, and they do not provide a consolidated overview of what coaches communicate, how communication is delivered, and where and when such communication occurs.

A scoping review is therefore appropriate to systematically map the breadth and characteristics of this evidence, identify the communication content and delivery features that have been investigated, and determine which coaching contexts are well represented or underexplored. Particular attention will be given to competitive match intervals because communication opportunities are time-limited and may require coaches to prioritize technical, tactical, psychological, motivational, and game-management information. Mapping the existing evidence will help identify knowledge gaps, clarify priorities for future badminton-specific research, and provide a foundation for subsequent studies examining coach and athlete perspectives on communication during official match intervals.

METHODS

Strategy of data synthesis A comprehensive literature search will be conducted in Scopus, PubMed/MEDLINE, and Web of Science Core Collection from database inception to September 3, 2026. Search strategies will be adapted to the syntax of each database and will combine terms related to badminton, coaching, communication, instruction, and feedback. Core search concepts will include badminton AND terms such as coach*, trainer*, communicat*, feedback, instruction*, advice, cue*, message*, coaching information, interaction*, interpersonal communication, communication style*, communication strateg*, verbal behavior/behaviour, nonverbal behavior/behaviour, and coaching behavior/behaviour. Additional feedback-related terms will include corrective feedback, positive feedback,

instructional feedback, augmented feedback, knowledge of performance, and knowledge of results. Searches will not be restricted by coaching context or study design in order to maximize sensitivity. Only English-language studies will be eligible. Reference lists of included studies will be screened for additional eligible records, and forward citation searching will be undertaken where feasible. Full database-specific search strategies will be reported in the supplementary material.

Eligibility criteria Population: Badminton coaches and badminton athletes/players of any age, sex, competitive level, or playing discipline will be eligible.

Concept: Studies must investigate human coach-to-athlete communication in badminton, including instruction, feedback, advice, coaching information, verbal and nonverbal communication, or related communication behaviors. Particular attention will be given to what is communicated and how communication is delivered.

Context: Any badminton coaching context will be eligible, including training, skill development, precompetition, competition, official in-match intervals, between-game intervals, and postcompetition settings.

Study designs: Primary empirical studies using quantitative, qualitative, mixed-methods, observational, experimental, quasi-experimental, cross-sectional, longitudinal, or case-study designs will be considered.

Exclusion criteria: Reviews, editorials, commentaries, protocols, opinion articles, non-empirical book chapters, and conference abstracts without sufficient empirical data will be excluded. Studies examining automated, artificial intelligence-based, virtual, or technology-generated feedback without direct human coach-to-athlete communication will also be excluded. Studies focused solely on peer-to-peer coaching, physical education teacher-student communication, or researcher-delivered feedback without a coach-to-athlete communication component will be excluded. Only studies published in English will be included.

Source of evidence screening and selection All identified records will be imported into reference-management software and duplicates will be removed before screening. Two reviewers will independently screen titles and abstracts against the predefined eligibility criteria. Records considered potentially eligible by either reviewer will proceed to full-text assessment. Two reviewers will then independently assess the full texts for inclusion. Reasons for exclusion at the full-text

stage will be recorded. Any disagreements between reviewers will be resolved through discussion and consensus; if consensus cannot be reached, a third reviewer will adjudicate. The study selection process will be documented using a PRISMA flow diagram.

Data management All records retrieved from the electronic databases will be exported to reference-management software for organization and duplicate removal. After deduplication, records will be transferred to a screening platform for title/abstract and full-text screening. Screening decisions and reasons for full-text exclusion will be documented systematically. Data from included studies will be charted using a standardized data-extraction form developed for this review. The form will capture bibliographic details, study characteristics, participant characteristics, coaching context, communication content, delivery characteristics, communication modality, timing, relevant outcomes or perceptions, and key findings. The data-charting form will be piloted on a small number of included studies and refined as necessary before full extraction.

Language restriction English.

Country(ies) involved Thailand.

Keywords Badminton; Coach-Athlete Communication; Coaching; Feedback; Instruction; Interpersonal Communication; Sports Coaching; Scoping Review.

Contributions of each author

Author 1 - Saranrat Manunyanon.

Author 2 - Yuttachai Hareebin.

Author 3 - Chime Eden.

Author 4 - Weeratian Tawanwongsri.

Email: weeratian.ta@gmail.com