'How did I learn all this stuff?':

The socialisation of coaching knowledge and learning practices within a sub-elite coaching population.

Written by:

Laura. J. Dorrell.

Supervisors:

Dr Simon Phelan & Dr John Jakeman

Masters by Research Degree awarded by Oxford Brookes University.

This thesis is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements of the award of MA by Research, December 2020.

Acknowledgements:

First and foremost, my acknowledgement and thanks go to my supervisor, Dr Simon Phelan. Thank you for your unwavering support, innovative guidance and unbelievable patience throughout the duration of this study. I am beyond grateful for your time, knowledge and above all, your sense of humour.

Thank you to the participant coaches who allowed me to step into and unpick their day to day lives for the benefit of the study. I hope that your learning journey continues to prosper.

My final thank you is to Ben. Your dependable character and kind nature have proved to be invaluable in the final stages of this study.

Abstract:

Coach education in its entirety has been identified as a key vehicle for raising the standard of coaching practice and that of which creates a *good* coach. In saying this, existing literature (Barker-Ruchti *et al.,* 2016; Cushion *et al.,* 2010; Hodkinson *et al.,* 2008; Gheradi, 2008; Corsby, 2017; Gilbert and Trudel, 2005) highlights that formalised coach education has offered little value to the growth, learning and development of coaching practitioners. The basis of knowledge that coaches are *given* creates a mould that shapes the 'type' of coach that fits into a sporting setting where said knowledge can be transferred into a foretold environment (Fyall *et al.,* 2018; Nash *et al.,* 2017; Fernandez-Balboa, 1997; Howley & Howley, 1995). The difficulty in this is that coaches are at risk of being rendered as unskilled in the socio-dynamic environment that houses them (Fyall *et al.,* 2018; Nash *et al.,* 2017). Thus, in evaluating the learning process and accumulated knowledge of sub-elite coaches, light can be shed how coaches have come to know what they know, do as they do and how this process can best be facilitated.

Using the work of Pierre Bourdieu, this thesis attempts to interpret the accumulation of knowledge and the learning therein through the notions of habitus, capital and field (Bourdieu, 1984; 1977). Through constructivist grounded theory analysis, the purpose of this study is to empirically explore the learning culture in and around coach education and the transferability of said learning into contextual, day to day practice. Through ethnographic observation, the data captured will draw on personal, historical and current dispositions that determine coaches as characters of knowledge (Cushion *et al.,* 2003; Jones *et al.,* 2008).

Table of Contents:

Contents

1.0 Introduction:

Within the last two decades, the provision of coach education and the learning therein has significantly increased (Cushion *et al.,* 2003; Cassidy *et al.,* 2006; Trudel and Gilbert 2006). In doing so, the deliberation over what classifies knowledge, and the value of coach education has become somewhat questioned in terms of the formal provisions and content criteria (Cushion *et al.,* 2010; Trudel and Gilbert 2006). Coaching is considered to be a socialised process where the learning of 'craft knowledge' might be likened to an apprenticeship in a sense that instead of content, you learn through the contextual and socialised environment (Cushion, 2003; Jones *et al.,* 2010).

However, in saying this, coaching is continually being perceived as unproblematic and niche in terms of the coach as a product of coach education (Avner *et al.,* 2017). In breaking that down, coach education presents coaching as unproblematic in its practice meaning that the production of 'good' coaches, is niche to their experience in learning as opposed to their contextual setting. Furthering this, the cultural discourse attached to coach education paints an autocratic, hierarchical and rigid picture whereby it becomes difficult to negotiate the capacity of transferring the learning to contextual and socialised daily environments (Mallet *et al.,* 2009; Stodter and Cushion, 2010; Hassanin and Light 2014).

Within coach education literature, there is continual focus on the microscopic limitations within coach education and the culture within. In doing this, research is continually providing insight piece by piece without recognising the 'bigger picture' to the beneficial development of coach education (Daniels, 2001; Jones and Thomas, 2015). Thus, there is a need for clarity in respect to the macroscopic social structures within coach learning that influences common beliefs, values and fields of practice (Cushion and Jones, 2006; Roderick, 2006; Purdy *et al.,* 2009).

Further to this, coaching certifications have become a common requirement within British sport (O'Dwyer, 2020) whereby the content varies from defining technique of the sport, the complexities of session planning and various elements of sport science (Nash *et al.,* 2017; Hall *et al.,* 2018;). The foundation of knowledge that coaches are taught and expected to demonstrate moulds them into the biological and psychological 'fit' to a sporting setting where they can transfer and communicate said knowledge to a predicted scenario and or audience (Howley & Howley, 1995; Fernandez-Balboa, 1997; Nash *et al.,* 2017; Fyall *et al.,* 2018). In continually replicating this cycle, there is the risk of rendering current coaches as unskilled in the socio-dynamic environment that houses them (Nash *et al.,* 2017; Fyall *et al.,* 2018).

Coaching practice requires a sense of realism and experience to be able to fulfil an interpretivist paradigm where theory can be applied to practice with a contextual and socialised understanding

(Mallet *et al.,*2016; Jones 2008; 2016). In unpicking the concept of coaching as socialisation, the process can be understood as one ground in reflexive observation, negotiated actions, prior experience and legacies that mould the identities and philosophies applied in daily practices (Cushion *et al.,* 2003). Thus, socialisation describes the process of development whereby characteristic dispositions act as pillars to effective and successful performance (Brown, 2005; Nash, 2017). A significant part of socialisation in coaching is determined through imparting values, behaviours and ideas that sit in line with the societal expectations of a coach which are then contextually applied within practice (Cushion and Jones, 2012).

Coaches advocate that learning grounded in everyday experiences is considered to have greater value in terms of learning in comparison to the formalised process (Mallett *et al.,* 2009; Piggott, 2012; Stodter and Cushion, 2014; Townsend and Cushion, 2017). In doing this, high performing coaches perceive the current and historical dispositions of coach education to be their opinions around learning, the socialisation of coaching, their role expectations and identity creation within their environments.

In considering that the learning within socialisation is somewhat concealed or embedded within normal practice, there is difficulty in determining the 'what' of learning that takes place, and thus this can be referred to as the 'hidden curriculum' (Kirk, 1992; Margolis and Romero, 1998; Cushion and Jones, 2014; Blacket *et al.,* 2019). In shortened terms, the hidden curriculum consists of values, social norms, related knowledge wrapped into implicit messages that are tailored through educational processes (Avner *et al.,* 2017). Here is where we firstly recognise the difference between what is learnt and valued within the hidden curriculum versus the formal pathway of education.

Previous literature has shed light on the fact that experience as an athlete has had a considerable influence in the process of learning and development for high performing coaches (see; Gilbert, *et al.,* 2006; Wright, *et al.,* 2007; Erickson *et al.,* 2008; Gilbert; Nash and Sproule, 2009; Rynne & Mallett, 2012). From here, the career transition from a high-performance athlete, to a high performance coach can be considered as idiosyncratic and normalised when considering the discourse that underpins the knowledge and learning therein of high performing coaches (Erickson *et al.,* 2008; Carter and Bloom, 2009; Werthner & Trudel, 2009). Blackett (2017) explains that culture is created through pre-existing societal agenda and therefore, when considering this with the thoughts of Hunter (2004), culture can be seen as the decisions that are embedded within interactions of field, habitus and social agency (Bourdieu, 1984). Thus, it could be said that current research presented on the culture of coaching is encouraging the traditional forms of coaching which results in uncritically reciprocating knowledge (Purdy *et al.,* 2009).

This means that when exploring the learning culture in and around high-performance coaches, this thesis contributes to the inaccurate representation of the socialised and contextual learning process. This is further emphasised by (Cushion *et al.,* 2010; Barker-Ruchti, e*t al.,* 2016) where the need to explore the socio-cultural approach of coach learning is encouraged to shed light on the limitations of formalised coach education and the lack of transferability to contextual practice. This reflects the work of scholars who have ignited the idea of coaches being social agents situated within socio-cultural structures (Hassanin & Light, 2014) and thus posing the need for further clarity on the provisions of formal education.

In the recognition of learning, reflective practice is continually growing in coaching practice and is becoming known as a key component in the construction of coaching knowledge (Smallwood *et al.,* 2011; Boud, 2013). In saying this, it becomes telling that a valuable method in learning comes from the ability to 'self -teach' in a sense that coaches create their own curriculum (Grosseman *et al.,* 2014). Reflection is a process of self-recognising and exploring methods, strategies and their application to a reconstructed or balanced solution for development and improvement in the next phase of the learning cycle (Gilbert and Trudel, 2004; Nelson and Cushion, 2006; Hume, 2009). Thus, it causes reason to question the effectiveness of reflective practice and where this derives from in relation to socialised learning. It does not go without saying that through the concept of reflection and reflexivity, there is a need to consider the perilous ways in which reflective learning can potentially be detrimental to the retention of knowledge in terms of its lack of guided criteria and room for self-criticality (Smallwood *et al.,* 2011). Thus, in recognising learning as a socialised process, it would be beneficial to clarify the key learning points that coaches reflect and develop their practice on. In saying this, the process of reflection and reflexivity provides coaches with the continuous learning opportunity to perceive a situation through varying lenses that aid the critique for future practice. When bringing these considerations together, we recognise that the informality of reflective learning allows for a continuous cycle of contextualised learning whereby coaches can share practice through socialisation. Thus, despite the need for confirmation of knowledge, the flexibility in learning could become preferable to the individual in terms of professional growth due to the relatability in the learning context (Rynne and Mallet, 2017).

This study adopts the work of Pierre Bourdieu to frame the different social processes that have a role in the development of coaching knowledge that have been advocated before in the works of (Cushion, 2003; Cushion and Jones, 2012; Townsend and Cushion, 2017; Townsend and Cushion 2020). Bourdieu considered that learning requires the need to be a competent social actor who absorbs the appropriate social actions and behaviours of those in their environment (Jones, 2000). In saying this, it can be argued that the learning process can be considered as "regulated improvisation" (Bourdieu,

1977, p.79), whereby learning cannot be pigeonholed into a linear perspective and nor can it be entirely unsupported (Maguire, 1991; Mallet *et al.,* 2016). Further supporting this, Bourdieu's concept of habitus suggests that what coaches do in their practice resonates with their personal history and their capital within a specific social position (McCray and Board, 2017). Thus, if coaches have little contribution to the learning that takes place, there is limited opportunity for transferability into a coach's contextual environment. Beckett and Hager (2002) highlight that learning is embodied and constitutes of psychological, emotional cognitive and physical states that interrelate as one instead of in their isolated terms. Therefore, this study concerns itself with identifying the problematic limitations within current coach education and the learning processes therein with acknowledgement to the dualistic (mind and body) approach and how this can be better facilitated for the development of high performing coaches (Atkinson, 2011).

In consideration to constructivist grounded theory analysis undertaken in this study, the value lies in examining the impact of the philosophical and paradigmatic assumptions that have encouraged the rationale behind various methodological conclusions. This study will detail constructivist grounded theory, reflective practice and systematic analytical coding to firstly establish the benefits of ontological and epistemological considerations within the paradigm but furthermore, to shed light on the ethnographic nature of this study. Ethnomethodology refrains from interpreting the meaning of interaction but instead, unpicks the way in which the participants interpret each other through varying interactions (Acocella, 2012). In doing this, an understanding is shared between the participants and the researcher of the study of topic. Ethnography in its entirety is seen as the obvious or unobvious participation into the lives of others for an extended period of time (Atkinson and Hammersley, 1994). In doing this, the researcher embeds themselves into the research by "*collecting whatever data are available to throw light on the issues that are the focus of the research*" (Atikinson and Hammersly 1994, p.74). The authenticity that this study presents through the unfiltered observation of high performing coaches and their understanding of coaching knowledge and the learning therein.

In acknowledging that the role of coach education holds importance in the progression of good coaching practice, there is a need to recognise the value of content provided. Thus, through empirical investigation, this study will provide clarity on coaching knowledge and the learning process therein. The value of this thesis lies in examining how coaching knowledge and the learning therein is constructed through socialised, cultural practice. The study will highlight why coaches do as they do in daily practice with consideration to the accumulation and development of coaching knowledge and the learning therein through the means of coaches' experiences and interpretation of their personal learning process. In turn, the data throughout will provide a more nuanced understanding of contextual and socialised knowledge. The research question that drives this study is "How is coaching

knowledge, and the learning practices therein are socialised within a particular coaching population". To be able to answer that, the sub questions within are 'what is the value of formalised coach education and how does this transfer into socialised practice?' and 'how does pre-existing culture define behaviour and the learning process within?', 'what determines a 'good coach' and how does knowledge and the learning process fit into that?'. In saying that, there is recognition to the fact that within each sub question there are areas, namely, identity, reflection, indoctrination, situated practices and expertise that need to be clarified in order to fulfil an answer to the research question and the sub questions within. The following chapter will highlight the current understandings around topics within socio-cultural learning and the theoretical considerations that have imposed further reason for the creation of this study.

2.0 Literature Review:

There is a growing recognition within coach development research that linear and functionalist development models do not accurately reflect the fragmented reality of what coaching practice truly represents (Jones *et al.,* 2004). As advocated by many (e.g. Cushion *et al.,* 2010; Barker-Ruchti, *et al.,* 2016), further research is required to encourage coaches to engage in exploring the socio-cultural dimensions surrounding the learning process of developing as a coach and how this may be influenced by coaches in various positions in terms of progression. This recognition for further research has stemmed from previous literature around the concept of coaches as social agents within socio-cultural structures (Hassanin & Light, 2014) and the need to theoretically comprehend the cultural build within coach learning. In simpler terms, in an everchanging learning environment, coaches are required to be dynamic in their work to best facilitate their practice within the cultural build that has been created through their institutions. The difficulty lies with an array of cultural expectations from individuals within the same body of work differentiating from one another and acquiring goals from an individual and microscopic perspective as opposed to a macroscopic aggregated goal. As a result, coaches come to question the validity of their knowledge and where it comes from, if not from a socialised and contextual context.

This literature review will look to explore current literature that sits in and around coach education, coach learning, coaching culture and underlying notions of Pierre Bourdieu to theoretically interpret the considerations made. By integrating these topics with current and previous literature, the clarity on what this study looks to achieve will become clear in terms of how and why coach education may benefit from taking an approach to learning that looks outside of the box of traditional educational norms (Blackett *et al.,* 2019). This chapter will shed light on pre-existing beliefs through examining how coaching knowledge and the learning therein has previously been interpreted to be one in the same (Cushion and Jones, 2014). Thus, the value of this chapter comes through the provision of a more nuanced understanding of coaching knowledge and the learning therein in place until now.

2.1 Introducing Bourdieu: a theoretical framework.

The standard paradigm of learning is currently understood to be epitomised in cognitive thinking, (Beckett and Hager, 2002) meaning that learning is centred on the mind and through propositional knowledge. However, Becket and Hager (2002) also remind us that learning is embodied; learning constitutes of psychological, emotional, cognitive and physical states that are interrelated as opposed to isolated. Thus, the concerns that underpin the purpose of this study is expressed by identifying problematic limitations within current coach learning and coach education literature whilst acknowledging their relation to a dualistic (mind and body) approach (Atkinson, 2011).

Furthermore, a continuous theme in previous literature (See: Pardjono, 2016; Lewin *et al.,* 2018; Henning *et al.,* 2018) is the claim of learning being a cultural phenomenon through the use of activity theory (Pardjono 2016). This approach derives from the work of Vygotsky where he explored how individuals learn through the historical and social dimensions within participation of active learning (Jaramillo, 1996). This traditional approach to education and learning is systematically drawn upon throughout the following review and further into the discussion chapter, evaluating what is meant by the term 'culture' and what that meaning imposes on learning and coach education.

To illustrate why a Bourdieusian framework best suits this study, Bourdieu understands practice to be a blend of conscious and unconscious engagement which is created and demonstrated to be second nature (Hodgkinson *et al.,* 2008; Warick *et al.,* 2017). Furthermore, the use of his work within this field to date advocates that coaches perform as social actors who absorb appropriate social (inter)actions that formulate what is *known* (Jones, 2000). As discussed below, Bourdieu's notions of habitus dismiss the debate between objectivist (structure) and subjectivist (agency) but, instead aids the suggestion that culture exists in and through various interactions, practice environments and communications (Bourdieu 1977; Biesta 2004; Cushion, 2010).

Bourdieu argued that the body follows social memory that involves the individual culturally learning and conjuring dispositions to act (Jarvie & Maguire, 1994). These unconscious schematics are learnt through continuous exposure to certain conditions through internalising external constraints (Newman and Falcous, 2013). This is where we acknowledge the concept of habitus. Habitus in this sense, is the actions of a coach that stem from their personal history and habitation in a particular social position (Costa and Murphy, 2015). Therefore, a coaches' actions or knowledge base can be viewed as both the product and process of a personal experience that sits within the coaching process (Obembe, 2007; Costa and Murphy, 2015). It is then a matter of the coach's personal history and predispositions within learning that determines how the action or knowledge was learnt (Obembe, 2007). Here, we are introduced to what is known as the 'sociological picture' (Bourdieu, 2004) which highlights that when individuals are embedded within their practice, they can complete and understand the *social picture* as opposed to attempting to restructure culture from the outside in (Bourdieu, 2000; 2017).

Bourdieu's (1977) concepts of capital, habitus and field, when applied to coaching, can be seen as a 'shift' in social activity that continually reproduces and legitimises the culture within the social structure of coach education (Cushion, 2011; Cushion and Jones, 2014; Townsend and Cushion, 2017). Thus, as previously mentioned, we are talking of 'socialisation' whereby Coakley and Pike (2009) acknowledge the complex process of development that guides individuals to adopt and encourage a

given social system. By adopting this process of development, individuals adopt characteristics that shape their actions and beliefs with the hope that it is advantageous to performance and is understood to have a 'weak' form which is the process of adoption, and a 'strong form' that reproduces stratified social relationships between individuals in terms of habitus (Bourdieu, 1997; Margolis and Romero, 1998). Above all, Bourdieu talked of the field of power which sits within macro-political decision making (Vaughan, 2008). In simpler terms, in establishing coaching knowledge and the learning therein, there is a need to recognise that the distinct issues within education, namely, gender, social class, ethnicity and the globalisation that is embedded within society all together, to be able to recognise why it might be misconstrued to believe a learning culture or field has specific boundaries (Vaughan, 2008).

The notion of *strong* and *weak* forms of habitus likens itself to the uncritical interpretation of knowledge within elite sport learning environments when you consider that an individual may inherently adopt what they see to be authentic and, ultimately, correct (Cushion and Jones, 2014). Through Bourdieu's notions of habitus, capital and field, this study is strengthened through confirmation bias (Cook and Smallman, 2008). To simplify, strong habitus represents that which is bound in the identity of the individual and has been uncritically adopted, as opposed to weak habitus where previous discourse is questioned and adapted in practice (Mellor and Shilling, 2010). Thus, put simply, it refers to the physical embodiment of cultural capital, that in turn likens itself to the habits, skills, and dispositions rooted within everyday experiences (Bourdieu, 1984; 1977; Margolis and Romero, 1988; Cushion 2011; Townsend and Cushion, 2017).

Here, there are two types of capital: cultural and symbolic (Bourdieu, 1984). Cultural capital is embodied in institutions that refer to academic qualifications or a status that is hierarchically desired by another (Bourdieu, 1984; Cushion 2011; Townsend and Cushion, 2017). On the other hand, symbolic capital evolves from the institutionalised relationships that offer potential resources or legitimate opportunities to one another (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 2013).

Bourdieu (2003) explained that in line with symbolic capital is symbolic violence; he detailed it to be the categorisation of thought that is grouped by the domination of social agents. Put simply, it is the pre-empted assumptions of unconscious social structures that govern positions of *right* and *wrong.* However, he further proclaims that individuals can only succumb to the environment that is known (Bourdieu, 2003) which then highlights the value of studies in this nature. This therefore means one can only question the conformity when outside of the practice environment. This notion results in the suggestion that coach education cannot dictate the importance of specific knowledge but instead, could demonstrate the worth of a learning experience (Kvangig, 2003).

To summarise, through interpreting previous literature from a Bourdieusian perspective, there is the opportunity for clarity on *how* and *why* coaches do what they do. In determining coach knowledge and the learning therein, there is value in understanding the surrounding influence (field), historical discourse and current dispositions (habitus) and personal identity in the environment (capital). Thus, it lends itself as beneficial to this study to inherently understand the nuanced understanding of contextual and socialised knowledge of coaches and how this situates within the educational pathways.

2.2 Social capital, cultural capital and the influence on learning.

Cushion (2011) interprets Bourdieu's (1977) concepts of capital, habitus and field as allowing for the coaching to be seen as a 'shifting social activity' that reproduces and legitimises the culture within the social structures of coach education. Habitus is also referred to as the learnt dispositions instilled by the social structures within the environment through the significant actions and practice undertaken by social agents (Bourdieu, 1997). Habitus encourages an understanding that coaches construe through dispositions and capabilities, which are the underpinning bases for practice (Cushion, 2011). This is an important notion when you recognise that the reality of coaching cannot be taught and therefore habitus and capital are adopted through means of experience.

Social capital is bound between two extremities: uncritical acceptance and critical retreat (Coakley and Pike, 2009). Becker and Murphy (2009) epitomise social capital as any social interaction that entails a continuing effect. In simpler terms, it is detailed as filling in the 'gap'; if you take the remaining forms of capital out of the equation, namely, natural, personal or physical capital, social capital is what is formed through the gaps between. This then causes reason to re-position how capital is perceived from a Bourdieusian perspective: the cultural, social and symbolic capital, for example, are historically limited to the circumstances that create them. Thus, with continual analytical commitment to the contextual construction of capital, it poses the idea that social capital is fluid and never whole (Becker and Murphy, 2009). Therefore, coaches are again in a loop of uncritical acceptance of their status as a professional and person entwined together. The notions of role construction, role identity and how they partner with learning methods and opportunities, provides reason to ponder the differentiation between the *want* to develop and the *need* to develop as a coach.

Coach education is incidentally separating theory from practicefor example, instructing the correct actions to take in a situation where change is inevitable and therefore dynamic. In doing this, highly skilled types of tasks are moulded into sequential routine that arguably reduces the level of learning and skill for the practitioner in relation to human and cognitive interaction (MacDonald & Tinning, 1995; Jones, 2000; Potrac *et al.,* 2000). Indeed, Schon (1987) suggests that professions that encourage

a technocratic approach are inadequately preparing learners (coaches) for the unpredictable and complex social realities they will encounter throughout their careers (Cassidy *et al.,* 2015; Nash, 2016).

Cultural capital in coaching is embodied within governed institutions that refer mainly to academic qualifications or that of which can be possessed by one and desired by another (Bourdieu, 1984; Cushion 2011; Townsend and Cushion, 2017). Symbolic capital, however, evolves from the relationships that are institutionalised through networking that offer legitimate or potential resources to one and other. Symbolic violence is the categorisation of thought grouped by the domination of social agents. In other terms, it is the pre-empted assumptions of unconscious social structures that dominate positions of *right* and *wrong* (Bourdieu, 2003).

The socialisation process previously detailed as the hidden curriculum (Cushion and Jones, 2014), reflects on the learning process that is innately followed and further grows from symbolic violence and the imposition of meaning (that being the culture). This is done in such a way that the experience transitions from symbolic to legitimate (Raven, 1958; French and Raven, 1959). In the context of this study, organisations and institutions may not prepare coaches for the reality in which their journey of learning will take place. Furthermore, symbolic violence engages with pedagogic action; reproducing the interests and abilities of a cultural field that follows the interests and abilities of the more dominant group. This reinforces the relationship of power between the coaches and athletes and how the power relation is perceived not for what it objectively is, but more so what is expected as legitimate from who is being educated (French and Raven, 1959).

When applying socialisation to the concept of coach education and the perception of learning opportunities, we learn from Mallet *et al.,* (2016) that learning opportunities are not all seen or valued as equal by individuals; they explain that learning opportunities should be prioritised in order of those that establish purpose to the primary focus of practice. Within these types of learning experiences, or rather, how coaches perceive these learning experiences, an environment is provided where learning can take place and thus determining the optimisation of coach development (Maclean and Lorimer, 2016).

It is here that we can perhaps consider that coaching has progressively theorised as a complex social system (Bowes and Jones, 2006; Jones *et al.,* 2008; LeBed and Bar-Eli, 2013) meaning that despite the social interaction in place, coaching can be subject to the same dynamics in any given situation. To highlight what coach education focuses on, the content narrows down to the bio-scientific factors of both technical and tactical learning, whilst partnering in situ learning with formalised education. Thus, when placing coaches in light of education, where they are perceived as learners, we begin to

understand that coaching is not contingent but rather, complex (Cassidy *et al.,* 2004; Jones *et al.,* 2008; LeBed and Bar-Eli, 2013).

With this complex understanding, learning becomes entwined between what *is* and what *should be* (LeBed and Bar-Eli, 2013). The term 'learning' is engrained in coaching research and is used flippantly in conversations and interactions without appreciation or understanding of what is meant by the term in the context of coaching, coach learning and coach education. As previously stated by Nelson and Cushion (2006), learning is a continuous change in behaviour meaning that adaptability and willingness to comprehend and view opportunities from multiple perspectives, allows for a new and reformed experience which encourages the construction of knowledge.

2.3 Indoctrinated beliefs and reconstructing identity:

In laymen terms, indoctrination is understood to be the process of uncritically interpreting ideas, behaviours, methods and cognitive strategies for a particular doctrine (profession). To be indoctrinated is to follow suit in what is to be deemed as *known* without applying criticality to their thoughts, behaviours or actions within the professional role (Taylor, 2017; Hansson, 2018). To indoctrinate is not to be confused with to instruct; if we are to instruct, we are passing on knowledge to be interpreted, to be indoctrinated is a result caused from two parties where the receiving individual either acts upon or follows verbatim as a deciding factor of being taught or indoctrinated (Cushion and Jones, 2014; Blackett, 2017). When you partner indoctrination and socialisation together you come to understand that to be indoctrinated is part of the socialisation process where you are in this continuous cycle of reproduction to fit into societal expectations by eliminating any challenge of the status quota. Having said that, coaches hold their agency within the coach education process by choosing to engage with the learning opportunities in their social context (Cushion and Jones, 2001; 2014). Put simply, coaches adopt indoctrinated beliefs and or actions that determine the role of a coach, however, through socialisation, they willingly develop their own learning through contextual and socialised practice (Cushion, 2003; Cushion and Jones, 2014)

As previously mentioned, an ideology that underpins coaching is the socialisation process of combining behaviour with societal expectations (Cushion and Jones, 2001; 2014; Cushion, 2003). Here, there are two considerations to be made firstly, all practice is conducted with the intent of progression but more so social acceptance however, in controversy, the notion of progression is shaped by socially accepted behaviours. Blackett *et al.,* (2017; 2019) state that historically, coaches that fall into high performance coaching have previously established themselves as an athlete and therefore maintain this psychological stance that they are in a dominant position merely by having the title of 'coach'. In

simpler terms, coaches are subject to the process of indoctrination, meaning coaching behaviours (such as learning) are those which are uncritically adopted through means of experience. Thus, there is a necessity to consider the construction of identity and the influence of indoctrination.

The term 'identity' can be defined as self-categorisation as an occupant of a role whilst integrating the self with the expectations and meanings associated with the role and how it is deemed to be fulfilled (Stets and Burke, 2000). Lally (2007) puts forth that concept that identity is deemed to be dynamic in relation to an individual's sense of self over a period of time. From this, the contribution of social and environmental factors is of interest to explore due to the nature of change that they present (Callary *et al.,* 2012; Oyserman, 2015).

This study opens opportunity to explore the concepts of identity within coaching through theoretical perspective and underlying meaning (Burke, 2006). According to Burke and Stets (2009), previous literature has defined identity as a set of meanings that collectively defines who an individual is when in occupation of a given role. Furthermore, certain characteristics, actions and personal demeanour depicts the identity of a person and this is created from the societal role presenting a meaning for action, thus an identity of a person. To simplify, role identity theorists (Burke & Reitzes, 1981; Burke, 2006) detail that behaviour is premised on a classified or named environment. The environment consists of names and classifications (both physical and social) that carry meaning from societal and physical expectations through social interaction (Burke and Stets, 2009). This highlights the difficult implications that lies within being a coach. Through the possible interactions a coach will have, they will learn and inherit the behavioural and societal expectations for that role. The corresponding actions and thought processes will then be a result of this and thus creating a natural doxa in the coach's environment (Bourdieu, 1984).

The identity attached to each role is a combination of meanings that are defined as a response to external stimuli that stems from either an observational behaviour or cognitively trained behaviour (Burke and Stets, 2009). These responses grow from expectations that are learned through responses or reactions of those in an opposing role in the corresponding environment. For example, a coach will present their role differently in observing their athlete as opposed to observing another coach (Pope *et al.,* 2014). Within the coach-coach educator relationship, ironically both parties are trying to recognise their role identity, and both read the responses of the other in order to do so. When bringing these thoughts and considerations together, it highlights that an identity can almost never be perceived as whole; an individual is created through multiple identities which represent a *role* in an individual's life and therefore can be known as role identity. With the fluidity of this process, it is noteworthy to recognise that this 'role' is continually reconstructed (Kaplan and Garner, 2017) and

thus the opportunity for growth and development is continually evolving; the way the coach perceives their environment and opportunity determines their learning and engagement as an individual. Therefore, to provide opportunity to various learners, coach education will benefit by affording these opportunities to learners (Miller and Kerr, 2000) which, again, reiterates the process of socialisation.

When considering what this means for coach learning and, or knowledge development, coaches shape their own learning opportunities through the identity they adopt at that time and thus coach learning cannot be taught in a disciplined approach but should instead adapt the ever-changing needs of coaches in the reality of their own environment. Meaning that as coaches continue to adopt indoctrinated beliefs, coach education in its formalised sense does not facilitate the choice of specific traits, behaviours and beliefs that are being passed through coach to coach. They key point to highlight here is the nuanced understanding of contextual and socialised knowledge.

2.4 Coaches, coaching and culture… 'I learnt from you, by doing what you do!':

When terminology and language such as *consensus, conformity and societal* is used in coach education literature (see: Crow, 2012), the functionalist misconception of coaching comes to light (Mansoori *et al.,* 2019). It highlights the role of a coach to be practical in serving a purpose (Crow, 2012). Moreover, coaching is presented as a benevolent and unproblematic activity, meaning that the reductionist approach to coaching limits the influence that coaching has on the reproduction of social structures (Shoukry and Cox, 2018).

Fernandez-Balboa & Muros (2006) explain that coaching can be seen as an ideology that has risen from and embedded within the culturally structured world. The ideology stems from various concepts drawn together creating a 'coaching philosophy' (Taylor and Garratt, 2010). On the contrary, it is argued that coaches see little value in understanding the theory that underpins a philosophy (Partington and Cushion, 2013), but instead look for more tangible content (in-action delivery) to build their 'philosophy' (Nash *et al.,* 2008). In recognising this, there is the implication that coaches continually reconstruct their knowledge through human interaction (Cushion *et al.,* 2003) and a result of this is that coaches are situated in an un-reflexive understanding of coaching practice. Thus, it is recognised that the contextual field in which coaches are situated within perhaps has greater influence over their learning and development than the theoretical underpinnings of *why* coaches do as they do (Cushion and Jones, 2014). With this suggestion, it poses the question of how or perhaps where this socialised culture began and why it is continuing in current practice.

The discourse that has derived from coaching as we know it is known to be autocratic, gendered and hierarchical (Cushion and Jones, 2006; Cushion, 2007; Purdy *et al.,* 2009) which is created through

cultural norms and expectations. Culture is created through pre-existing, political and societal agenda that supports an overarching approach to living (Blackett, 2017). In addition, Hunter (2004) details *culture* as the actions and decisions rooted within the reproduction of everyday occurrences through the interactions of field, habitus and social agency (Bourdieu, 1984). In this sense, a cultivated expectation is created that suggests culture is derived from pre-existing notions and beliefs which suggests that socialisation, and that of which it entails, is key to coaching practice (Purdy *et al.,* 2009; Blackett, 2017).

From here, it could be said that current research presented on the culture of coaching is educating us on the traditional forms of coaching and the previous coaching limitations it presents, and potentially reciprocating knowledge without criticality (Purdy *et al.,* 2009). In saying this, it is highlighted that coaches should be provided with the opportunity to be a learner within their own right (Iserbyt *et al.,* 2016) and therefore it is worth noting here that coaches are recognising this and achieving their optimal performance through a socialised and contextual process. There are discrepancies in the recognition that coaches are characters of knowledge and require the opportunity to shape their learning, as opposed to being presented with what is deemed appropriate coach knowledge (Cushion *et al.,* 2003) which is where the conflict in coaching knowledge and learning practices therein are in is somewhat convoluted. Taking into consideration the multiple factors that facilitates coaching, learning is central to coaching performance in the sense that it should recognised as a pivot for practice for coaches (Goleman, 2003; Armour *et al.,* 2004; Maclean and Lorimer, 2016). Thus, coaches can be viewed as more functional learners where learning through practice can enhance coach performance as an ongoing process.

2.5 Socialisation - the hidden curriculum:

The socialisation of coaching implies an ideology that guides behaviour to harmonise with societal expectations. In simpler terms, coaching behaviours are the process of socialisation (Cushion and Jones, 2001). Thus, the learning from said socialisation becomes concealed within daily practice, misrecognising the concept that socialisation could be part of a 'hidden curriculum' (Cushion and Jones, 2001) that orchestrates implicit values relating to coaching norms, knowledge and or the generic attitude of learning through an educational process (Kirk, 2004; Margolis & Romero, 1998; Cushion and Jones, 2001). Blackett *et al.,* (2017; 2019) highlights that coaches often derive from some form of competitive-athletic career that depicts the understanding of athletes being submissive to the strands of domination from the coach which in turn aids their acquirement of knowledge. Consequently, it could be said that coaches are embedded within the informal, socio-cultural norms of the sub-culture within the club that they belong to, meaning that the 'hidden-curriculum' is

something that is greatly diverse and should be understood from a more macroscopic perspective (Lemyre *et al.,* 2007; Hassanin & Light, 2014; Barker-Ruchti *et al.,* 2016).

When talking of 'socialisation', there is recognition to the complex process of development that guides individuals to adopt and implement a given social system (Coakley and Pike, 2009). This said process of development (socialisation) allows learners to adopt particular characteristics that will shape their beliefs and future actions which then become advantageous to performance (Bourdieu, 1977). This is influenced by the way in which coach education is taught, combined with the societal expectations and the need for results. Habitus is not consensus because it is unique to the individual (coach). It is obtained through personal experiences in a particular social context, as it exemplifies the inconsistency and influence of the social world on different beings (Cushion and Jones, 2006).

This is where the 'hidden curriculum' can be introduced to unpick learning culture at a greater depth. The hidden curriculum, in vast terms, is an umbrella for the numerous amounts of pathways in which one will maintain societally built expectations without formal agenda, effecting the development of coach education (De Haan and Sotiriadou, 2019; Ronkainen *et al.,* 2019; Blackett *et al.,* 2019). To elaborate further, the term curriculum defines a type of syllabus, a guide of *how* and *what* to entail in subject form (Cushion and Jones, 2001). In a formal education sense, as previously mentioned, this would be learning through application of work and study to acquire a pass-or-fail qualification. Thus, in an obvious sense, the term *hidden* implies that there is not a way of perceiving, understanding or demonstrating what may appear to be known knowledge. It is merely falling in line and following suit of what is already embedded in the surrounding culture (Cushion and Jones, 2014). This correlates with what has been previously advocated by many theorists, (e.g., Lemyre *et al.,* 2007; Hassanin & Light, 2014; Barker-Ruchti *et al.,* 2016) in saying that the hidden curriculum is vastly diverse and requires an open-minded, macroscopic perspective to thoroughly understand the entwining theories that underpin it. This restates the concept that coaches are working towards maintaining a status form from a socialised, uncritical process.

In associating the work conducted in coach education to a broader scale of educational literature, Gheradi's (2008) work details the relationship between the cause of an action and the effect it leads an individual to have, known as indexicality. A coach's behaviour and actions are continually renegotiated based on who their interaction is with and therefore you see the link to the supporting theorists of the hidden curriculum (Cushion and Jones, 2001; Cushion, 2003; Blackett *et al.,* 2017; 2019) with regards to uncritically recreating their role identity through the socialisation process. The hidden curriculum continuously builds to meet the standards and expectations of what others (athletes, colleagues, external professions) perceive their role to entail (Hansson, 2018).

Coaching behaviours are not isolated in their motivations but are instead influenced by dynamically changing environments (Jones *et al.,* 2016). Subsequently, as highlighted by LeBed and Bar-Eli (2013) it can be considered that the act of coaching and, specifically, the decision making of a coach can be construed as 'regulation of equifinality', meaning that we are providing numerous potential means to an end. To further exemplify, the generic guide (regulation) is for coaches to achieve the same end goal (equifinality) in terms of the best succession. However, the means to achieve this result is varied and, despite similarities, allow coaches to form their own pattern in which they achieve the same goal. Therefore, it can be understood that coaching is not devoid of structure; a system cannot exist without one, so it can be recognised that disorder and contestation are intrinsically within the system, hence making coaching complex (Bowes and Jones, 2006; Jones *et al.,* 2008; 2016; LeBed and Bar-Eli, 2013).

Coaching knowledge and the learning practices therein should be considered as non-linear, chaotic and messy (Cassidy *et al.,* 2004). In turn, depicts the social reality of coaching to be in a constant state of interpreting and reinterpreting. Here, it is reinstated that the complex nature of coaching is perhaps dismissed by coaches and practitioners alike when recognising the lack of adoption to new ways of learning and understanding the dynamic evolution of coaching (Jones *et al.,* 2016). With the previous concepts of coach education and the complexities of coaching, the equifinal result of coach education revolves around unstructured structure (LeBed and Bar-Eli, 2013; Jones *et al.,* 2008; 2016).

This opens the opportunity to influence a constructive change on the current perspectives of coach learning. When drawing upon the thoughts of many researchers within coach education (i.e., Côté *et al.,* 1995; Cushion *et al.,* 2003; Jones *et al.,* 2008; Rynne and Mallet, 2012; 2014) it can be realised that the current notion of coach learning is non-existent. Coaches are continuously exposed to elements of the unknown with a culturally informed expectation that they are to provide us with educationally informed solutions. In an ideal situation, coaches would be situated in an environment where the cultural expectations are not of who is perhaps most knowledgeable, but instead, those who are more open to flexibility in their development and progress as a coach (Cushion *et al.,* 2003; Champathes, 2006; Jones *et al.,* 2008; Mallet *et al.,* 2016).

2.6 I'm an expert coach… what now?

Coaching status is built upon knowledge and experience (Rynne and Mallet, 2014) highlighting that as a society both in and outside the world of sport, we are putting forth the concept that successful coaches are those who hold copious knowledge in their field, otherwise known as experts (Côté *et al.,* 1995; Rynne and Mallet 2014). This means that expert coaches possess power and social reign, otherwise known as a type of capital, that evolves through societal expectations that, in turn, places

individuals in a hierarchical position of power through attained knowledge (Passmore, 2009). Thus, for the socialised process of learning to be successful, coaches would benefit from demonstrating power and capital in their practice in order for their knowledge and the learning therein to be deemed valuable. From this, as advocated by many (e.g., Gilbert and Trudel, 2005; Nelson and Cushion, 2006; Carson 2008; Rynne and Mallet, 2012) performance coaches should understand themselves (for example, strengths, weaknesses and skills) extensively through intrapersonal knowledge to not only remain informed but to encourage the continuous opportunity for learning and development. Furthermore, Shulman, (1986) highlights that knowledge is not something that can be completed; coaches, time and criteria is continually evolving and thus naturally, the dynamic and complex art of coaching cannot be 'achieved' as absolute.

In the findings of educational literature, Teques *et al.,* (2017) familiarise us with the dyad of beginner and expert by highlighting the way in which affordances are perceived by both. It is detailed that experts will seek out functional affordances in comparison to beginners who will base their decision-making upon cultural or environmental observational affordances (Hartson, 2003; Teques *et al.,* 2017; Seifert *et al.,* 2014). In some senses, it could be argued that a take-home message from this thesis is that coaches who are more open to flexible and adaptable decision making, are more in tune with opportunities that could better their coaching performance (Seifert *et al.,* 2014). This then highlights that perhaps the more expert you become in your coaching career, the more you are willing to expand your knowledge through learning. Furthermore, this highlights the realisation that coaches are very much in an educational environment where the opportunity to learn is expected and normalised as opposed to incidental (Cote, 2006; Rynne *et al.,* 2012; Phelan and Griffiths, 2018). Thus, it can be recognised that formalised education (decontextualised learning and linear criteria) is not necessarily situated within a coaches everyday dynamic and contextual practice, meaning that for coaches to come to what they know, and do as they do, socialised practice can be deemed an integral part of learning and development (Cushion, 2003).

Côté *et al.,* (1995) and Rynne and Mallet (2015) further suggest the notion that the term 'expert' is merely a judgement of self and is, in fact, immeasurable. With varying agents contradicting the systematic path of knowledge and the learning therein, it can be argued that the opportunity to learn is infinite and therefore causes reason for dispute as to whether a coach can truly deem themselves or be determined as an expert (Seifert *et al.,* 2014; Baker, 2003; Hartson, 2003). Therefore, with consideration to the literature put forth regarding expertise and coaching, it influences the thought that as coaches become more expert, they may be misaligned with the opportunity to learn (Baker, 2003).

This, like previously, descends from the coaches' judgement of self and their personal ability, which highlights that it could perhaps be that some coaches do not acknowledge the opportunity to learn and progress in fear of it being detrimental to their current status (Bloomer and Hodkinson, 2000). Again, it can be suggested that learning in a formalised sense is hypothetically detached from everyday practice when you consider that coaches avoid learning underpinned by criteria (Cushion and Jones, 2014). This propensity for reflection and self-criticality is arguably the drive for coach learning (Carson, 2008). It is a self-constructive system that identifies areas of improvement with the intention of it becoming a natural response to be both reflexive and reflective throughout coaching practice. With this being woven into the 'norm' of coaching (Rynne and Mallet, 2012), it can be hoped to become a structural change in the culture of coaching to incorporate learning as an intrinsic factor of coaching (Gilbert and Trudel, 2005; Nelson and Cushion, 2006; Carson 2008; Rynne and Mallet, 2012). Thus, socialised and contextual learning offers value to *expert coaches* to continue professional development (Nelson and Cushion, 2006; Cushion and Jones, 2014).

When drawing on the concepts advocated by authors covered thus far (e.g. Nelson and Cushion, 2006; Carson 2008; Cushion and Jones, 2014; Seifert *et al.,* 2014; Rynne and Mallet, 2015; Teques *et al.,* 2017), this view of self-belief in application to learning can lead us to think that the cultural field of coaching, as a generalised perspective, can aim to be reconstructed but, to do this, coaches must firstly address their personal response to learning (Rynne and Mallet, 2017). Thus, it would be beneficial for clarity on the preference of education and that of which is provided to coaches to determine coach knowledge and the learning process therein.

2.7 I learn this way and you learn that way… is there a right way?

Nelson and Cushion (2006) as cited in Mallet *et al.,* (2009) introduce a breakdown of learning into three subcategories: formal, informal and nonformal. Formal learning implies a structured and purposeful delivery with guidance to pass on knowledge, a process by which learning is deliberate (Nelson *et al.,* 2006). As a concept, informal learning, often linked with the term *experiential learning*, takes place outside of learning institutes and is understood to be involuntary. In simpler terms, as individual beings, we are in situ where learning is embedded within everyday practice, whether that be intentional or not; this underpins informal learning as it becomes incidental conscious and subconscious (Marsick and Watkins, 2001; Nelson *et al.,* 2006; Mallet *et al.,* 2009). Lastly, nonformal learning which arguably and in various ways, falls under the umbrella of both formal and informal learning and stems from conscious learning whereby the individual chooses to take on a challenge and 'learn' something new. It is worth noting here that it is advocated by many (e.g., Mallett, *et al.,* 2009; Piggott, 2012; Stodter and Cushion, 2017; Townsend and Cushion, 2017) that coaches lean towards

informal learning in the developmental process because of the personal account in which it can be applied.

Kemmis *et al.* (2017) present learning as an ongoing and active behavioural choice of interaction. It is a process of engaging and manipulating experiences and interactions that create models of interpretivism (Vygotsky, 1986). Through observation and interaction with external phenomena, connections are made between prior understandings and new ideas that lead to recreation of learning opportunities. Learning involves a scaffolding process whereby one individual's knowledge is the foundations in scaffolding the construction of new learning (Kemmis *et al.,* 2017) therefore, learning is not isolated as a learnt process, it is continual and should not be perceived as a singular occurrence. In its place, learning can be understood as complex through the socially interactive environment through the means of communication, actions, evidenced experience and environmental information that shapes the behaviour of the learner (Bransford *et al.,* 2006). Despite this, learning inevitably revolves around cognitive motivation and engagement for the persistence, effort and willingness to engage in this continuous change of behaviour (Bransford *et al.,* 2006; Kemmis *et al.,* 2017).

In a formal learning sense, there is structure to the learning which can be altered, and comprehended uniquely by an individual, thus crossing into the informal learning criteria, often how coaches like to perceive their learning to take place (Marsick and Watkins, 2001; Nelson *et al.,* 2006; Mallet *et al.,* 2009; Piggot, 2012). This now offers a parochial view where coaches feel the need to be strategic in their approach to learning when, idealistically, coaches will implement a perspective from each type of learning to gain more of a holistic approach to learning (Piggot, 2012). Furthermore, existing coaching programmes follow the sequential nature of educating in a formal manner and demonstrate through a practical scenario. The rigidness of this routine suggests that to effectively learn, a series of boxes must be 'ticked' in order to attain coaching knowledge or status (Greenhow and Lewin, 2016). Despite the logic in different types of learning, it seems convenient to 'pigeon-hole' types of learning engagements as a justification to narrow the learning criteria for different *types* of coaches (Nelson and Cushion, 2006; Mallet *et al.,* 2009). From this, it could be suggested that formalised educational setting leaves little room for individual, contextual or socialised learning which causes reason to question the quality of what is being provided.

As learning is unpredictable, by segregating learning methods we are separating the ways in which we can better facilitate learning (Cushion *et al.,* 2003; Braun *et al.,* 2009). Meaning that there is perhaps a grey area in the works of Nelson and Cushion (2006) in reference to the linearity of learning forms. Thus, in understanding the types of learning that takes place, and the limitations that they present, it can be suggested that coach learning is convoluted and cannot be determined through such an insular

perspective (Barker-Ruchti *et al.,* 2016). Having highlighted the learning types there is a necessity to comprehend the learning process and how that binds into the provisions of coach education, daily practice and the discrepancies in between.

2.8 Situated within the learning practice:

One meaning of 'situated' with reference to practices is that the performance depends on the way indexicality is resolved. In simpler terms, the relationship between the cause of a situated practice and the aftermath effects this will have upon those involved depends entirely on whether the relationship between the two can be determined in practice (Gheradi, 2008). For example, the session intention can be broken down from the effects of the previous session and therefore the relationship between cause and effect can follow a non-linear approach with a particularly linear outcome. Therefore, to explicitly explain situated practices regarding coach education, one must understand that it is based upon comprehension of the task, the individual, the process of creating learning opportunity and the broader context in which they are situated.

It can be understood that coach education poses the risk of uncritically interpreting and applying knowledge to coaching. When recognising that the 'gatekeepers' within National Governing Body (NGB) awards deem what they believe is necessary knowledge, there is reason to question if this overrides education with positional power of said gatekeepers. However, from a Bourdieusian perspective, in the transition of symbolic power to legitimate power, recipients of said power must be complicit in a sense that they are willing to succumb to the task or practice without question as this is what is perceived to be the societal norm in coaching (Bourdieu, 1984). A coach will turn up to practice, follow a set plan and stick to the routine. Contrarily, Bourdieu proclaims "one is only hooked if one is in the pool" (1984, p. 89). Therefore, one can only question the conformity when outside of the practice environment. So, when questioning how coaches query their learning experience, one must 'step back' and reflect to allow room for positive change. This inherently illustrates that coach education cannot deem knowledge as invaluable; coach education needs to exemplify the worth of a learning experience (Kvanvig, 2003). Therefore, coaching should be understood as an everchanging profession whereby the most successful coaches, are those that allow for adaptation over time rather than those who look to become a *good* coach as an immediate result.

Knowledge and the learning practices therein are produced within both purposeful and incidental sociocultural contexts which provides an attractive asset to an individual and thus making them more valuable to those around them. Schempp (1993) opposes that as knowledge evolves from the refined experience from practice, knowledge is living and not merely inanimate. Yet, as previously mentioned, the coach is still being blindly guided to uncritically reciprocate previous knowledge, despite the

necessity of high skill to comprehend such a task (Kvanvig, 2003). The shortfall of learning and development of the coaches is the primary concern with regards to coach education (Jones *et al.,* 2003; Iserbyt *et al.,* 2016; 2017). Summarising the above points, a transformation for coaches is overall, being culturally repelled in an act to protect the capital of said coaches. Thus, coaches are apprehensive of change or perhaps blinded by the context: an opportunity which could be learnt from due to the damage it may have upon the current cultural capital inhabited by coaches (Bourdieu, 2004).

As a reminder, Lemert (2012) details culture to be the means in which a society 'organises' beliefs, values, histories and other representations of what they follow or avoid. As such structures have been created, they can therefore be recreated. The difficulty in said recreation is that with new structure, a new cultural norm is created. Thus, there is a need for care and consideration to allow the rules to be somewhat followed. This poses the consideration of scaffolding (a restructure of culture) which involves developing a societally shared understanding of contextual aims which will result in providing a common way of thinking and reflecting upon actions (Houston, 2015). This allows for concurrent engagement with the micro, meso and macro actions of coaches and practitioners alike as opposed to interacting with them as alternative or individual courses of action. It is at this point that coaches should understand that the micro changes they may make are part of a bigger picture; the cultural norms are rooted within day to day living and so, to influence the macroscopic view of culture, there is a need to understand that micro, meso and macro factors are embedded within each other. In doing so, the relationship between the macroscopic theories used in practice design to influence the micro interaction coach learning can be appreciated.

2.9 Reflexivity and reflection - a critical learning process:

Reflective practice is growing in coaching practice and is recognised as a key component in the construction of coaching knowledge (Smallwood *et al.,* 2011; Boud, 2013). Reflection is a process in which the coach or practitioner aims to self-illuminate and explore the use of different methods, strategies and how they are applied to then reconstruct a balanced solution for progression in the next phase of the learning cycle (Gilbert and Trudel, 2004; Nelson and Cushion, 2006; Hume, 2009).

Reflexivity, in laymen's terms, is to perceive, act and reconstruct in the moment (Boud, 2013). It can be described as a mechanism applied to what we learn, illustrate meaning to and then apply to the continuing approach of teaching and learning which in turn, furthers the learning process (Alvesson *et al.,* 2008; Maritz and Jooste, 2011; Boud *et al.,* 2013). According to Guillemin and Gillam (2004), reflexivity allows for integrity in the various forms of learning taking place but further allows for all

participating parties to engage in the learning process and continuously apply a critical lens to their coaching practice.

In acknowledging the learning process through reflection and reflexivity, there is a need to consider that it can be perilous in its ways of learning from its lack of guided criteria and room for self-criticality, in some cases, being a flaw (Smallwood *et al.,* 2011). Despite the limitations presented through crossing reflexivity and reflection, the process provides coaches with the continuous learning opportunity to perceive a situation through a multitude of lenses and critique it for future practice. Having said this, coaches are characters of knowledge (Cushion *et al.,* 2003; Jones *et al.,* 2008), it can be suggested that coaches are bound by their current knowledge and the learning therein, meaning that it limits their opportunity of recognising learning opportunities around them. Furthermore, if a coach is deemed expert, as mentioned above there is a need to create instability in their environment to begin the learning process again (Passmore, 2009).

Here it is recognised that there is value in the ability to self-recognise the process of learning whereby coaches apply their contextual practice to educational content and create a unique curricular of self-learning (Grosseman *et al.,* 2014). Thus, it could be suggested that in the recognition of varying methods, strategies and solutions to contextual limitations, individuals are tailoring their own improvement to the final stages of the learning cycle (Gilbert and Trudel, 2004; Nelson and Cushion, 2006; Hume, 2009). The difficulty here lies with establishing the effectiveness of reflective practice within socialised learning when considering the flexibility and choice in engaging with the learning opportunities (Smallwood *et al.,* 2011). In terms of socialisation reflective practice allows for continuous learning opportunities to be interpreted through varying lenses that allow critique for future practice. Furthermore, the same opportunity can present itself time and again throughout the socialisation process that offers further insight to the learning and development of the coach (Gilbert and Trudel, 2004; Nelson and Cushion, 2006; Smallwood *et al.,* 2011). Thus, despite the requirement for confirmed educational content (theoretical application) the flexibility in learning could become preferable to the individual in terms of professional growth due to the relatability in the learning context (Rynne and Mallet, 2017). However, this does not go without recognition toward the benefits and requirements of formalised coach learning.

2.10 Let's educate ourselves…but we have to do it the formalised way.

Coaching certifications and awards are now a common necessity for coaches in British sport; having evolved in previous years, each award covers areas from issues within technique and the complexity of session-planning to the elements of sport science (Nash *et al.,* 2017; Hall *et al.,* 2018). The foundation of knowledge that coaches are expected to demonstrate leads them into fitting the

biological, psychological and further scientific moulds of the sporting settings where they can transfer and communicate their subject matter to a predicted scenario, which arguably, renders current coaches as unskilled (Howley & Howley, 1995; Fernandez-Balboa, 1997; Nash *et al.,* 2017; Fyall *et al.,* 2018). Coaching requires a sense of realism and experience to be able to apply theory to practice which again supports Mallet *et al's.* (2016) and Jones' (2008 and 2016) suggestion that coaching should be positioned through interpretivism, which requires a profound and socially sensitive understanding.

The content for course programmes within National Governing Bodies has traditionally been directed toward the promotion of sporting achievement which stems from a narrow focus on performance enhancement (Liukkonen *et al.,* 1996). This poses as problematic for coach education based on the assumption that coaching knowledge can be broken down and then tied back together again. This becomes apparent in programmes that are subdivided into sections of teaching or modules which as a result, is unnecessarily breaking down and providing inadequate attention to the broad coaching field that cannot be divided (Jones, 2000). Macdonald and Tinning (1995) contend that this subdivision of knowledge being taught reflects coaching as a compilation of taught realities (pre-existent coaching situations that cannot be repeated) that are merely passed through generations. Thus, the implications of these actions now cause society to regard coaches as simply means of transfer in reciprocating previous knowledge (McDonald & Tinning, 1995). Furthermore, it has previously been addressed that coaches show preference to informal learning which suggests that formalised coach education limits recognition towards individual needs of coaches as learners (Mallett, *et al.,* 2009; Piggott, 2012; Stodter and Cushion, 2017; Townsend and Cushion, 2017).

This rational approach becomes problematic when we discover that the educational system and the experiences it provides now become decontextualized, thus creating what could be said as 'two-dimensional' coaches (Downham, 2020). This results in coaches replicating previous practice through basing their decision-making on previous taught realities which, in turn, poses risk to development when considering the dynamic and complex human interaction that is applied in the real-life coaching context (Turner & Martinek, 1995; Jones 2000). This accumulated knowledge could be considered to be incidental and unstructured that naturally unfolds in a workplace or learning environment meaning that through reductionist forms of learning, coach education is failing to acknowledge socio-cultural limitations that present themselves (Erickson *et al.,* 2008; Lemyre, Trudel & Durand-Bush, 2007; Mallett *et al.,* 2009; Christensen, 2013; Rynne, 2014). Thus, we have coaches bound in traditional culture (formalised education) in which they are unprepared for the realities of coaching when, in fact, coaches should be educated as transformative intellectuals (Giroux, 1988; Rynne, 2014). From this the suggestion of knowledge and the learning therein, is better constructed through socialised cultural practice meaning there is a need to look further into what this means for coaching practice.

Within research, it is recognised that the detail underpinning how coaches encourage development may not be best understood and implemented in practice (Jones *et al.,* 2016). In turn, this influences a negative sway on the perceptions of coach education (Saury & Durand, 1998; Jones *et al.,* 2016; Stodter and Cushion, 2017). Moreover, at this point the undesiring view on coach interaction between the coaches and the coach educators can be understood. From this variation of opinion, a form of social editing occurs, otherwise known as 'gatekeeping' where particular themes are either promoted or eradicated, namely (in terms of promotion) the use of coaching forums and conferences to encourage coach to coach learning as opposed to coach and coach educator, there is a level platform for coaches (Lawson, 1993; 2009). Thus, the process now becomes somewhat political with regards to the close link between power and control over what is constituted as legitimate knowledge and furthermore, who guides that knowledge in the culture and profession of coaching. This significantly highlights the political desire from organisations, namely National Governing Bodies who police what is deemed to be right and wrong and therefore 'manage' the culture for coaches. Here, it can be recognised that regardless of educational content (formal, non-formal, and informal), the learning process revolves around contextual and socio-dynamic environments that determines the learning that takes place.

2.11 The need for a macroscopic perspective, the bigger picture:

In terms of coaching learning, the literature thus far surrounds the microscopic limitations of coach education and culture within. This is where the thesis refers to the content being taught in formal coach education, the access to education for coaches, and the smaller limitations that piece up to a more macroscopic view of the problematic system that currently stands as formalised coach education. It therefore puts forth the idea that by merely adjusting one micro aspect at a time, we will not be efficiently scaffolding the culture as we are not dealing with the 'bigger picture' – that being the macroscopic standpoints as previously mentioned.

From a cultural perspective, there should be a willing approach to shape the current microscopic ideas into what is most beneficial to the greater context in terms of learning (Wells, 1999; De Martin Silva, 2016). Assumedly, this will result in individuals not necessarily acting in a setting that is perhaps one of their choosing, however, they will still possess the opportunity to be active proxies in the development of not only themselves but also to resultant macroscopic perspectives (Daniels, 2001; Jones and Thomas, 2015).

Here, the notion of interaction and engagement over the ideas that are presented to us through social formation and thus influencing the construction of what and how we think. This now presents the interplay or, arguably, the tension between agency and structure (Biesta and Tedder, 2007). Put

simply, culture is the biggest influence upon the creation of individuals and their tendencies, however, it must be recognised that culture in itself is formed from a human creation. Thus, we must acknowledge the difficulty in change (Bakhurst & Sypnowich, 1995). It is here that Jones *et al.* (2015) highlight the importance of realising that the way we think can be created through scaffolding, as mentioned previously, and 'framing' the activity taking place (Cassidy *et al.,* 2004).

This framing leads us to believe that, for example, a picture should be painted in a way that allows for resultant limitations or implications that may arise (Bakhurst & Sypnowich, 1995). Therefore, to consider how scaffolding can be understood from a macro perspective in coaching, it should be addressed that the language being used is what underpins the current culture; until action is taken on changing the way coaches talk and act, a cultural change will merely be forever short-term and thus ineffective (Faulkener and Finlay, 2002). This is where the importance of socialisation is highlighted in a sense that a culture is merely a presence of the traits, beliefs, ideologies and philosophies of those who sit within it. Thus, to influence change, learning as a socialised process holds significant responsibility in actioning this.

Thus far, we have established that societal expectations are what creates the unspoken values of the coaching norms. This concept is then positioned next to the work of Nelson and Cushion (2006), who address the concept that learning is a continuous change in behaviour which creates new experiences to build knowledge. However, if this is the case then as supported by Cote, (2006) Rynne *et al.* (2012) and Phelan and Griffiths (2018), learning is staged and normalised as opposed to incidental. Highlighting that learning is created through a behavioural change that is implemented through the socialisation process. From this societal pressure, the generalised perspective of coaching as we know it can be recreated, but at the will of the individual's (coach) personal response to learning (Rynne and Mallet, 2017).

As noted previously by Mallet *et al.,* (2016) learning opportunities should be prioritised in order of purpose of practice, but if these are not aligned with the perspective of learning from the individual (coach), then the reconstruction of the coach learning process is in a consistent uncritical loop. Therefore, with societal expectations creating the coaching norms, but the evolution of coach learning aligning with the habitus of the coach, it can be assumed that there is a divide in the current literature of coach learning that encourages the need for a macroscopic understanding of the coach learning process which is underpinned by coach education (Cushion and Jones, 2006; Lemyre *et al.,* 2007; Hassanin & Light, 2014; Barker-Ruchti *et al.,* 2016).

Bourdieu (2004) talks of what is known as the 'sociological picture' in which it is highlighted that if we embed ourselves within a practice and or production, we can complete and understand the 'social

picture' rather than attempting to restructure the culture from the outside in (see also: Bourdieu, 2000 and 2017). Furthermore, King (2009) reiterates this viewpoint in arguing that the although the macro aspects (for example, broad economic and political interests) influence social practice, they cannot be understood without consideration to the microscopic factors (the practice). Therefore, from this perspective it can be put forth that the social fields and the culture rooted within the field, cannot be solely associated with macro subjects and that the positioning of individuals in the fields, or perhaps the social context, need addressing preliminarily. Creating the conflict of opinion with regards to changing the culture in learning with regards to changing the macro before addressing the meso, micro and vice versa (Grenfell and James, 2004).

As we draw to the end of reviewing the literature around the concepts of coach education and the learning processes therein, it is apparent that current literature presents numerous avenues to both further explore and develop the importance of how the existing coaching culture is embedded in a technocratic and linearly led learning environment of which we have established to be somewhat problematic (Cushion *et al.,* 2010; Rynne, 2013). The hidden curriculum presents societal norms within socialisation and, thus, coaches are bound in believing that to each problem, there is a solution: the problem lies within establishing where the solution is fed from and how can it be critically evaluated for each individual coach and situation (Cushion and Jones, 2001; Hassanin and Light, 2014). Here it is highlighted that coaches are positioned as leaders over learners.

Consequently, complex nature of coaching partnered with cultural behaviours, it enlightens the prospect that knowledge is arguably dispensable without the propensity for self-reflection. Contrarily, the difficulty lies with the need for a cultural change and the misconstrued understanding of how this can be achieved. With reconstructing the culture, the self-presented issue is the willingness for change. With the current culture unknowingly being created by coaches themselves, it becomes difficult to change what appears to be their 'norm'. The limitation is that coaches can be conscious or weary of change in their practice due to the misunderstanding of how said change may influence or impact their job role into day-to-day routines (Fullan and Knight, 2011). From the microscopic factors presented so far, the solution will consistently remain temporary until we macroscopically facilitate a cultural change. Each micro solution facilitates the answer to a bigger limitation; this presents the gap in the literature in terms of establishing the macroscopic solution and therefore to establish coaching knowledge and the learning practices therein; this study will continue in its attempt to shed light on why coaches coach as they do, thus providing a more nuanced understanding of contextual and socialised knowledge.

3.0 Methodological Approach

In introducing the methodological section of this study, the following discussion looks to explicate the ethical and methodological considerations taken throughout. The chapter has been split into separate, yet interrelated sections that aid clarification in all corners of the study. In providing a detailed consideration of the methodological paradigm that underpins the thought processes throughout, light will be shed on how cultural studies within sport, adopt a justified qualitative response as demonstrated by authors, namely, Townsend *et al.,* (2020), Rynne and Mallet, (2012, 2015) and Armour *et al.,* (2004). Krane *et al.,* (1997) imply that researchers can push to find rich data of a common, yet meaningful experience should they use an interpretivist approach through qualitative research and with the requirement of personal involvement, this study will follow a qualitative approach.

With consideration to the narrative analysis paradigm applied in this study, there is value in examining the impact of the philosophical and paradigmatic assumptions. Therefore, for the purpose of this research, I have chosen to undertake an ethnographic study which provided the opportunity to study the interaction between the participants and how they observed each other (in several meanings) instead of my interpretation of them which in turn, provided a shared understanding of the research topic (Acocella, 2012). The data collection and analysis process were conducted through inductive thematic analysis that, through the ethnographic nature of this study, was grounded within observation, semi-structured interviews and field notes. Whilst there was a demonstration of reflexive consciousness within the study, with the vast amount of data collected it would be philosophically paradoxical to claim any position of complete detachment to the study (Salmon, 2017). Therefore, the final stage was a reflexive discussion that, of in reference to the work of Pierre Bourdieu and his concepts of habitus, capital, and field, intended on making sense of the data and what this meant for future practitioners.

This chapter will detail constructivist grounded theory, reflective practice, systematic analytical coding, and will explicitly clarify the ethnographical approach that is adopted throughout, whilst highlighting the structure between empirical methods (for this study) with the ontological and epistemological considerations denoted in their sections.

3.1 Purpose of the methodological paradigm:

The methodology of this research reflects a postmodern, interpretivist stance to the research process. Whilst it is important to acknowledge the significant value gained from research in a positivist paradigm, it is necessary to address why it is not best suited to this study or myself as a researcher. This research sits within social science and, therefore, my stance on research stems from

epistemological belief in the constructed nature of knowledge which then positions my study in a defensive stance to the objectivity and validity of research. An interpretivist perspective can be understood as one where knowledge is acquired through interpretation by both the researchers and the participants (Williams, 2000; Yoshida, 2014). Thus, ontological and epistemological perspectives align with the idea that knowledge is constructed through social actions that result in multiple realities (Porter and Magill, 2010; Wright, 2018). To provide clarity on these approaches within this thesis, it is worth noting that this thesis sits in parallel to the term 'social constructivism' in a sense that it draws upon how the approach to learning is constructed and negotiated in line with the participants social, cultural and historical standpoints.

The purpose of this research sits within a paradigm that intends to understand meaning in respect to varying perceptions and multiple realities. As supported by the literature review, to comprehend the social action (relationship), the deliberation of meaning that constitutes the social action must firstly be understood (Schwandt, 2006). To facilitate this, the methods used follow a qualitative nature (i.e. participant observations and semi-structured interviews), that provide the opportunity to enquire for and interpret actions, experiences, opinions and values of the participants (Macdonald *et al.,* 2002; Goldkuhl, 2012). Qualitative data is concerned with understanding humanistic data from the researcher's perspective by adopting a negotiated and dynamic reality and is used through several academic disciplines that follow social and human sciences (Dey, 2003). The paradigms that provide the structure for qualitative research take as the primary field of interest in subjective and intersubjective social knowledge by human agents, produced by human consciousness (Lincoln and Guba, 2000). Contrasted with positivism and post-positivism, a constructivist paradigm assumes a subjective epistemology, a relativist ontology and a naturalistic set of methodological procedures. As a result, there is a reconstructed understanding of the social world (Denzin and Lincoln 2008).

It is important to consider the nuances of qualitative research and the influence it may have in respect to the generation of knowledge and how qualitative approaches bring us to an understanding of empirical sporting studies. As suggested by Maguire, (1991, p.11), and advocated by Townsend *et al.,* (2020) *"qualitative research enables a multidisciplinary perspective of sports studies that allows for an imaginative and informative research agenda".* This inherently aligns with the need and value of a macroscopic perspective on intricate hypotheses that liken themselves to the nature of this study and that of which it is aiming to achieve.

When undertaking research from a cultural perspective, as this study does, the qualitative research process is contextualised within a larger cultural and historical framework. The concept behind cultural research is not to recreate a new general view or theory but rather to offer an alternative light

on social history through interpretive analysis (Williams, 2000). This outlook follows the 'hourglass' model (Alasuutari, 1996). A broad theoretical and structural framework in the first instance creating a large social context which then validates the construction of a case study. When visualising an hourglass, the fieldwork would symbolise the epicentre of the hourglass, then to be analysed in detail as a specific or defined object of study in its own reality. The final stage of the study is through assessment and discussion of results from the case study within the broader framework that will have been influenced to somewhat change and develop, which then forms the bottom of the hourglass as it broadens back out for a new case study to be developed (Alasuutari, 1996).

To further simplify, cultural studies explore elements of varied research disciplines (e.g., anthropology, history, sociology and institutional practices). Therefore, it should not be viewed as an independent discipline but instead, various perspectives of multi-disciplinary aspects of societal and cultural work (Hall *et al.,* 1990).

3.2 Ontological and epistemological considerations:

When talking of ontology, we refer to an area of philosophy that surrounds the nature of existence (Slevitch, 2011). Ontology questions the nature of reality (Guba and Lincoln, 1994) and their existence along with the subject or theme that we, as researchers, are looking to explore (Sparkes, 1992). This allows for researchers to establish and explain the boundaries of legitimate inquiry (Guba and Lincoln, 1994) that the participants can easily identify as a topic that is somewhat unknown. To further explicate, 'relativist' perspectives assume multiple constructed realities (Coll and Chapman, 2000) whereby, relativist ontology encourages and allows for researchers to consider variety in their data. Therefore, for this study, ontology better affords the opportunity to expand upon the social reality. However, there is recognition that the social reality will not be identical between one person and the next, therefore, to add meaning to the social phenomenon of those being studied, the research will form through an ontological and epistemological approach. To elaborate further, functionalism is characterised through institutionalism, periodisation, urbanisation and social systems (Gruber, 2018). The ontological and epistemological underpinnings to this study influence the methodological tools and highlights clarity on the ethnographic approach rooted in the ontological and epistemological stances detailed above.

For further clarification, epistemology is a philosophical domain that concerns itself with the construction of knowledge by focussing on how knowledge is collated and investigating the underpinning truth to it (Johnson, 2005). Epistemology is known as the relationship between the researcher and the known reality (Krauss, 2005). This philosophy is underpinned through questioning the creation of knowledge due to the disbelief that a concept is *fixed* in its term (Squires, 2016; Wright,

2018). Transcendentalists believe that data, and that from which data is formed, is acquired through human sense and can change or develop continuously (Johnson, 2005; Wright, 2018).

When this is perceived from a subjectivist perspective, the researcher is embedded within the environment as a co-creator of the data findings. The 'known' element is therefore a combination of negotiated actions between the researcher, the participant and the meaning of data, that is then attached to the phenomena (Giacobbi and Poczwardowski, 2005). Through the means of an interpretivist approach, the research becomes richer in value by highlighting the relationship between the consensus of the sample with both previous and current literature (Williams, 2000; Goldkuhl, 2012). The types of data collection used within an interpretivist approach follow a naturalistic and humanistic approach, namely, observations or interviews which can be understood through various approaches to studies. When talking of said approaches, one approach to understand is hermeneutics, linking closely with the understanding of theoretical literature and verbal communication (Myers, 2004; Flick, 2014). This is followed with a descriptive overview on the application of ontological and epistemological considerations which have strongly influenced the nature of the research methodology applied within this study.

3.3 Ethnographic approach:

There is importance in acknowledging the ethnographic approach to this study to understand and engage in the theoretical underpinning concepts of ethnomethodological studies, likened to the work of Townsend and Cushion (2020) Townsend *et al.* (2020) and Gibson and Atikinson (2018) who each explore the boundaries of ethnographic, cultural studies and demonstrate the evidence of various sporting studies and how this is applied through qualitative research.

The aim of an ethnographic approach is to recognise the central importance of human action and meaning in the construction of the social world. Ethnography then attempts to place specific encounters, events and understandings into a fuller more meaningful context through the transformation of meaning into a visual form (Tedlock 2000). Atkinson and Hammersly (1994, p.74) describe ethnography as: "*In its most characteristic form it involves the ethnographer participating, overtly or covertly, in people's lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, asking questions- in fact collecting whatever data are available to throw light on the issues that are the focus of the research*"**.** Such a critical ethnographic approach recognises that participants (including the researcher) are fundamentally attached to the worlds they inhabit. As a result, there is no effort to adhere the positivistic standards of 'science' that call for distance between the researcher and those being studied (Simmons and Smith, 2019).

In ethnomethodology, the researcher tends to refrain from interpreting the meaning of interaction but will instead study the way in which participants interpret each other (in several meanings) and thus achieves a shared understanding of the study topic (Acocella, 2012). The reason this methodological emphasis can be seen in cultural studies is because the research does not aim to compete with practical reasoning (Garfinkel, 1967). Instead, it analyses the interpretation of each other along with the habitus within, which is then made sense by us and by them (the researcher and the participant) of the situations and phenomena (Garfinkel 1967; Alasuutari, 1996; Bourdieu, 2007). Despite the traditional view of qualitative data being non-numerical, it often looks for sequential routine and pattern formation to support the findings presented. Cultural and behavioural patterns can be both examined and described analytically but to discern the pattern is a matter of personal interpretation and thus qualitative data is not merely collating masses of data, it is instead, evaluating what is necessary (Davids *et al.,* 2005).

It is worth noting here the innate theoretical application of autoethnography that can be understood as an autobiography through personal self-awareness whilst simultaneously examining the relationship between themselves (as the researcher) and the cultural descriptions given through multitudes of ethnographic explanation (Ellis and Bochner, 2000). Autoethnography follows epistemic criteria utilising self-reflection through qualitative data whilst ruthlessly evaluating all aspects of the experience (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000; Sparkes, 2000; Anderson, 2006; Chang, 2016). The human mind reacts through sensual memory stimulation (Delamont, 2007) and therefore it can be suggested to be problematic. With consideration to this study, autoethnography presents the argument of restricting the researcher to analyse and or address the key moments within the situational time period. Further to this, it could be proposed that reflective practice can be compromised through personal recollections over critical reflections (Delamont, 2007).

Through following an ethnographic approach within this study, I embedded myself within the professional and to some extent, the social aspects of participants life. With the ethnographic nature of this study, the relationships between myself and the coaches provide an element of trust and comfort to the participants (Simmons and Smith, 2019). A consideration in this type of methodological approach is the necessity to be willing and adaptive to the changes that incur opportunities throughout the process. Rigidly, the participant (coach) was observed for a period of sessions and interviewed at the end of their allotted time. However, when opportunities for rich data occurred (for example, coach meetings, training camps and athlete tutorials) it became a matter of analysing current and situational data to interpret how these opportunities prove themselves most beneficial. This again highlights the fluidity of ethnography as opposed to positivist approaches (Moisander and Valtonen,

2006). From here, it would be beneficial to understand the interpretive and reflexive nature of ethnography and how this approach best suits the nature of this study.

3.4 Interpretivism through reflexivity:

The pragmatic utility of both qualitative and interpretivist approaches heavily influence the methods used within this study. Theoretical claims made on the grounds of one independent study on a niche group can naturally only be perceived as tentative (Yoshida, 2014). From having multiple interpretations, an element of self-mistrust regarding the robustness and validity of the research process can be made (Williams, 2000; Yoshida, 2014). Alternatively, this mistrust can be positively restated to improve the quality of the empirical research by encouraging self-scrutiny in terms of both subjective and paradigmatic assumptions (Williams, 2000). This is demonstrated in the observational period where if the captured data did not amount to the needs of the study within the given time period, the observation period is extended where possible to suit the needs of the study. It is only in hindsight, with the vast amount of data that the links between the original observations and the extended versions become richer.

Similarly, interviews provided the opportunity for direct and closed responses meaning that the quality of the results are limited (Mansoori *et al.,* 2019). Positively, this allowed me the opportunity to not only extend the interview but to envelope myself further into the life of the individual and more thoroughly understand their educated opinions on matters within the study. The ability to reflexively outline the paradigmatic assumptions provided room for greater development of an epistemologically and ontologically comprehensible research design that offers a detailed rationale of the methods empirically embedded within it.

With the topic of reflexivity in mind, it would be negligent to divert attention away from the impact of myself, as the researcher, on the direction and findings this research presents. Given my position in sport previously and up until now, the motivations for this study stemmed from my passions as a coach, or at the very least, through a degree of self-analysis as a coach and coach developer in line with other coaches, whereby the topic in hand has been somewhat of a grey area in coaching culture. The research question presented has been given significant consideration and stems from the imbalanced presentation of my personal experience as an athlete and laying the fault of errors in the coach's hands, only to be ironically educated that coaches are learners and thus, through my coaching experience, the question posed itself through reflection of both myself and others that pose themselves in a challenging position.

In recognition to the benefits of personal subjectivity, Rosenburg (2014) highlights that previous experience in the domain of research has a positive advantage in the quality of data presented due to the pre-empted insight of the possible thought processes the interviewees may express. In saying this, the insight I have to the environment of the coaches (from personal experience) and therefore I was at the advantage of being aware of the normalities within daily practice (habitus), the distribution of capital, and how this was both given and received. Therefore, as a benefit to the data collection, there was awareness to the more niche and discrete occurrences that may not be recognised by those who are unbeknown to the environment. A further benefit is having an empathetic view on the challenging situations and dilemmas they may face in expressing their personal views and position of vulnerability with regards to this topic (Rosenburg, 2017; Mansoori *et al.,* 2019). However, with my pre-emptions comes possible biases surrounding interests and opinions that neglect views that do not act in favour of those that support my own with regards to the phenomena presented. Whilst there is a demonstration of reflexive consciousness around these difficulties, it would be deceitful and philosophically paradoxical to claim any position of complete detachment to the study (Salmon, 2017).

Bourdieu spoke of 'epistemic reflexivity' and posed significant arguments of the need for reflexivity in the world of social sciences (Maton, 2003). He argued that the conception of epistemic reflexivity did not merely provide a rich description of the social action but also provided a basis of adequate and epistemologically secure social sciences (Waquant, 1992). In simple terms, epistemic reflexology refers to the iterative process of accounting reality that depends on pre-existing knowledge (the experience) which highlights that the knowledge attained and then provided cannot be fully separated but, instead, can become reflexively richer (Bourdieu, 1984; Waquant, 1992; Maton, 2003). Bourdieu speaks of actors within a social context that highlights the (reflexive) question that said actors, which in this case, are the coaches, are in a partial and somewhat positioned nature of knowledge that is produced within the field in current time (Moore and Muller, 1999). Suggesting that, knowledge is an accumulation of perspectives and viewpoints Bourdieu further proclaims that, "one is only hooked if one is in the pool" (1984, p. 89). Therefore, one can only question the conformity when outside of the practice environment which highlights the value of epistemic reflexivity.

3.5 Participants and sampling strategy:

It is worth acknowledging the process of subjectivity through reflexivity in the application of qualitative research and the necessity to understand the methodological decisions made throughout. In the first instance, the study required a substantial amount of data through the means of various methodological sources. Furthermore, the study required the data sample to be niche with enough opportunity for expansion of findings in order to effectively make the study worthwhile. However, this

does not go without recognition to the niche requirements of the study and the necessity to collect rich data at pivotal points, as opposed to piecing together data from a broader scale. As this project unpicks the interpretation of learning based on the individual, it is inevitable that the results will fluctuate in terms of contextual experiences and personal biases and therefore the results are unpredictable (Marshall and Rossman, 2006).

The sample consisted of four performance coaches belonging to the same performance pathway programme with between three and five years of coaching experience (each) in national and international competitive environments. Each coach is housed by individual institutions as training hubs for the programme. Thus, a purposive sampling approach was taken to ensure that the sample remains exclusive and met the requirements of the study whilst avoiding the 'snowballing effect' (Green, 2013) which can be particularly common in cultural studies. It is also worth noting here that due to the means of contact, all members of the sample are male. Although non problematic, it should be understood despite the researcher being female, it is a potential limitation to the research due to the lack of female perspectives.

3.6 Constructivist interpretation of grounded theory:

Grounded theory is a systematic methodological procedure that aids the handling and shaping of (predominantly) qualitative data; it is an approach adopted within non-positivist studies with the intention of building in structured rigor (Charmaz, 2012). The method efficiently constructs and organises data for varied researchers and studies. The grounded theory analysis works in a cycle. Abstraction of information is built directly from initial data which is then refined and reaffirmed through further data (Strauss and Corbin 1994, 1997; Pigeon *et al.,* 2004). From this, grounded theory studies yield conceptual analyses of empirical limitations and combines the theoretical development with the research process. Charmaz (1990) details five distinctive underpinning characteristics of grounded theory: 1- there is both data analysis and data collection working as simultaneous phases of research; 2- the coding process is a creation derived from the data as opposed to preconceived hypotheses; 3- the outlying behaviour and processes allow for further development of supporting theories; 4- expanding on immediate data through note-taking and analysing to distinguish categories of results arguably, the pivotal stage of study; and lastly; 5- theoretical sampling that aims to refine and confirm the emerging conceptual categories which aids the literature reviewing process (See also: Glaser, 1994; Strauss and Corbin, 1994; Charmaz, 2008, 2012).

Grounded theory methods are further distanced from the traditional concept of qualitative analysis, that being the broad, thematic analysis through interpretivism and intuition. Unlike quantitative analysis that follows a more exclusive and systematic approach, grounded theory combines them to

the suitability of the study. With this in mind, the value in grounded theory is that it provides researchers the opportunity to improve their perceptions of the data following rigorous procedures. This encourages the researcher to scope large amounts of data which in turn, adds more justification to their conclusive findings (Charmaz, 2006). Therefore, in the application of this study, by adopting a grounded theory approach, it encouraged a more diverse yet tangible approach in data collection by allowing me to interpret and analyse the data in a way that deems itself necessary for the study.

Grounded research moves away from static analysis and aims to analyse within the data collection process. The emphasis from this looks to apply an understanding and meaning between actions to allow for a more detailed and deeper development (Charmaz and Mitchell 2001). This is constructed through comprehending a multitude of layered meanings and pairing them with actions. This includes factors consisting of the stated explanation of action, the intention to engage with the research through knowingly or unknowingly understanding the effects on others, the unstated assumptions, and the consequences for secondary interaction and interpersonal relations (Strauss and Corbin, 1997).

It is worth noting that despite the strengths of grounded theory that have previously been presented, the subjectivity of the data introduces difficulty in not only the reliability but also the validity of data collected due to the inclusivity of the researcher within the cycle of data reproduction (Breen, 2006). This also highlights the undoubtable researcher-induced bias. Furthermore, despite the results being valid, they present difficulty for further practitioners and researchers alike to use the data as proof or support (Glaser, 1994; Charmaz, 2006 and 2008). Thus, it should be recognised that grounded theory provides a strong and supported structure for qualitative research, yet it presents ominous difficulties which stems through bias of the researcher and can only be minimised rather than avoided.

In both qualitative and quantitative studies, the terms' reliability and validity are the pinnacle of a good study (Kyngäs, *et al.,* 2020), yet there is little clarity in what criteria determines trustworthiness (Mays and Pope, 2020). The trustworthiness of qualitative research is retained from creditability, dependability, authenticity and trustworthiness of the findings (Rose and Johnson, 2020; Mays and Pope, 2020). As this study is built upon current socio-cultural issues within coaching, it resonates with previous, current, and future coaches, and therefore strikes interest the conclusive outcome of this study. Therefore, to meet the broad criteria of trustworthiness, I must credibly align my interpretation with the original data (Kyngäs, *et al.,* 2020; Rose and Johnson 2020). Furthermore, partnered with credibility is dependability, which concerns itself with the consistency of the data analysis throughout the data collection (Kyngäs, *et al.,* 2020). Within this study, the data collection depends on the

availability and accessibility of the sample and therefore it should be recognised that the data collection for each coach is somewhat indefinite, yet the analysis process remains conclusive.

With both credibility and dependability defining this study, the result lies within the authenticity in which the researcher connects both the data and the results. With authenticity in mind, the researcher should endeavour to fairly demonstrate a range of realities within the results (Rose and Johnson, 2020; Mays and Pope, 2020). By appropriately linking the data to previous studies, the results built upon varying perspectives in order to achieve a tangible and trustworthy conclusion. Consequently, with the researcher conscientiously undertaking this research with these factors in mind and in line with the ethical approval from Oxford Brookes University, the analysis process allowed for the results to be deemed trustworthy.

3.7 Data collection and analysis:

The data collection was broken down into two categories which are semi structured interviews and observational analysis. In order to be successful in ensuring this study followed ethnomethodological procedures for ethnographic research, the researcher stepped into the life of the coach under observation to decrease the performance element of coaching with the aim to see how coaches and their approach to learning is truly represented (Potrac *et al.,* 2002). This entailed numerous coaching sessions, athlete one-on-ones, both internal and external coaching meetings, and informal situations (for example, coaches' breakfast) where the coaches would be found informally discussing their daily routine. Each coach was under observation for approximately 200 hours spread over a period of 8-10 weeks. Towards the end of the observational period, the second part of data collection was generated through semi structured interviews ranging from 35-90 minutes. The focus of the interviews was to explore the interpretations of learning from the coach perspective and to understand the learning opportunities they understand to be valuable in contrast to the learning opportunities provided for them (see Appendix 1). Making sense of this through the work of Bourdieu allowed me to break down the *why* of the data in terms of daily practice (habitus), behaviour and interaction (capital), and the influences of the environment and institutional values (field) that influence interaction (Potrac *et al.,* 2002; Bourdieu 1984).

To fully explicate the methodological decisions made throughout, it is important to recognise that for any period where the observation was to be one-on-one, the data would be recorded through a voice microphone. This is the initial stage of the audit trail and is then transferred onto a device for transcription (see Appendix 2). Furthermore, the data collated through voice note allowed the researcher to be observing from a distance to further encourage the normality of the coaching session. In the circumstances where this was not appropriate (for example, during a conversational brief to 10

or more athletes), data was collected was through interpretive field notes of which were transcribed (See Appendix 3). All transcriptions were processed through thematic analysis. This form of analysis is deemed to be a reliable method to analyse, identify and report patterns (or themes) presented through the data (Clarke and Braun, 2014). Furthermore, thematic analysis affords the researcher with flexibility to explore a multitude of theoretical considerations which further allows for a more rich and complex data collection (Clarke and Braun, 2006). Furthermore, being able to identify the negotiation of capital from various perspectives allowed for me to gather data from various viewpoints to construe shared meaning within the analysis. As a result, the data presented a well-rounded conception of how habitus and capital identify with the individuals within the field. Despite the beneficial value this form of analysis offers for this study, the limitation it risks presenting sits with the variety of exploration it allows; a thinning process is encouraged and thus discourages the result leading to an ultimate and specific study.

Van Teijlingen (2014) proposes that semi-structured interviews prove to be highly beneficial for qualitative research due to the pragmatic and alternative trajectories which can lead to prosperous avenues for the researcher to interpret and analyse. Concurring with this suggestion, semi-structured interviews inherently added value to this study in such a way that the research can follow both the participants and the researcher's intentions. To clarify, several avenues can derive from one question, many of which may not have been considered by either the researcher or the participant, and therefore allows for criticality over the original intention of the question within the interview. This poses as beneficial when making sense of the data through the work of Bourdieu as there is a pre-empted need to break down the interview into the notions of habitus, capital, and field which allows for a string of commonalities to present themselves through not only the nature of the interviews but also through the theoretical understanding of Bourdieu. However, this does not go without consideration to the subjective limitations that follow this approach. Goldkuhl (2012) contests this in saying that with such variation, the researcher (and the study) resort to a parochial perspective due to the lack of consistency in the data. However, despite this consideration, with this study following a cultural exploration, it prepares for vast amounts of data and therefore semi-structured interviews set themselves to be the most appropriate approach to data collection.

The data analysis process for this study took place at multiple stages within and after the data collection period. The ethnomethodological nature of this study broadens the volume and quality of data that can be captured (Koch 2018) which therefore creates a necessity for me to sectionalise each participant within the sample as a singular case as influenced by Cohen's (2003) comparative analysis. Consequently, and beneficially to the study, the collected data is at low risk of following codes or themes for the sake of 'fitting' the study. With minimal limitations in taking this approach, the data

collected had not only been partially analysed at the current time of observation (for each coach) but was purposely revisited with the intention of lining up or spotting the irregularities within the codes that I concluded to be most prominent. Within grounded theory, the analytical coding process consists of assigning text (data) with labels (themes) resulting in an interpretive, analytical framework (Charmaz, 2014), as shown in Figure 1. As such, the codes represent 'transitional objects' (Bryant and Charmaz, 2010), that connect fragments of interpreted data. This iterative process demonstrates the constant movement between the data and the constructed codes that highlights the constant comparative analysis of the already coded incidents (Bryant and Charmaz, 2010; Fram, 2013). Again, within comparative analysis and the movement of data, Bourdieu's notions afforded the further exploration by re-framing the data within the iterative process to comprehend the variability of comprehension when analysing through the concept of habitus, capital or field.

Figure 1- Interview Transcript aligned with theoretical and analytical coding.

Semi-Structured interview- Focused Coding	*Coded (Themes).*
What would you say is the difference between coach ed and coach dev? When I think of education, I think of a test and working towards passing the test which I don't think should be the case. Your job shouldn't be a pass-fail type of experience, it should feel developmental, and I think that's where coach education goes wrong. They state that the best coaches are the ones that can be critical and develop themselves but then they say all grass roots have to go on a £500 course to pass and be accredited as a coach. It's backwards. Developing skill is constantly continued and macroscopic. Education, to me, sounds niche and limited. ***What are your thoughts on how coaches may interpret learning opportunities and does your response include yourself?*** I think it depends how the opportunity is laid out. I was keen for this interview, I knew you'd ask questions that challenged my thinking but if I were to meet up with the other coaches, especially Ben and Will, there would be an element of restraint because knowing them both, it would go round in circles and be a brain fuck. I think there's always a pre-emption to the opportunity and that is the deciding factor of how you interpret it. However, saying that, if someone came from another academy, I wouldn't put any expectations down as to whether I would learn or not- I would see where it led and use the opportunity in the moment. Which I guess is a bit contradicting. ***Would you consider your growth and or development as a coach is a priority to those above you?*** I'm supposed to say yes, but it's absolutely not. My head coaches do. They treat me as an equal and we work together to bring each other up. The manager of them, and me…absolutely not. He shows his appreciation of the work and the programme and how well were doing but whether he actually cares for our development or not, I'd say were just numbers on sheets for him. It depends on if you're happy in your role. If you're happy, he's happy, if you want to challenge an element of the programme, leadership or anything in his control- you then become a problem to him, and he'll try to keep you happy but still at your own expense. ***Do you feel like they listen to your concerns or do you think they would provide what you needed if you asked?*** If he (manager of coaches) actually cared about my development, we wouldn't have to deal with half the bullshit that we do. If he wanted to make coach development a priority for all academies, he'd pull his weight and employ people to do half the shit that we shouldn't have to do. ***Is your coaching identity bound by what you have learnt or what you believe needs to be seen?*** Situation based. Mostly through what I have learnt but I'm aware that people have an expectation and therefore to engage them, sometimes I have to mould myself to that.	*Expectation of Role Coach Education* *Validity of knowledge and experience.* *Personal Disposition* *Constructed Identity* *Existing Support* *Negotiated interaction.* *Leadership and Organisational Structure* *Reformed Culture* *Conflict* *Indoctrinated Beliefs*

3.8 Ethical considerations:

Ethical approval provides the researcher with the safety and consent for their study to take place (Coll and Chapman, 2000). This study was granted ethical consent through the completion of ethical approval through Oxford Brookes University (see Appendix 6). In order for this to happen and for the sample to consent, the researcher must formally address any concerns and or implications that may be presented throughout the study to ensure confidentiality of the study if appropriate (Patton, 1990; Patton, 2005). The interviewees were provided with an information sheet (Appendix 4) that provided any information that may have been verbally missed on introduction with explicit detail. Following on from this, they were then provided with a consent form (Appendix 5) of which they had the choice to consent to the study having understood the terms and conditions. To ensure total discretion and protection of the data collected in this study, I have securely filed any recordings onto a password protected computer file in a secure location at times not in possession. It is advocated by many (Patton, 1990; Patton, 2005; Samarati and Vimercati 2010) that this method of data protection is not only fundamental but also effective in ensuring the privacy of the sample is not exposed at any cost. For further confidentiality the coaches within the sample is referred to as, for example, '*Coach 1'* or for clarity in field notes, a pseudonym to eliminate personal identity and ensures complete anonymity. Lastly, the institutions that house the coaches also remain anonymous and are referred to as simply 'institution' or 'organisation' for the discretion of the performance programme. With the nature of this study, the sample are required to talk of the institution in which they belong to, the experiences they have had and their expectations for future practice. Thus, despite the unlikely situation, the researcher maintained the formal procedure of referral to external professionals should any further support be required.

Bringing this chapter to an end, it can be recognised that the approach to this study has been taken with careful consideration to provide reliable and valid data. In doing so it can be recognised that as we introduce the main discussion of this thesis, the data analysis aligns to the methodological procedures taken and will highlight the benefits and possible limitations that present themselves throughout.

4.0 Results and Discussion

The nature of this study created a vast amount of data that has been construed into four main themes, each of which captured the learning engagements throughout the course of this exploration (as seen in Figure 2). The results for this study are presented under four central themes that are a result of interpretation and meaning-making from myself as the researcher; they encompass the acculturation of how coaches embed learning in their everyday practice. Through systematic, analytical coding the data obtained from the participants, I will bring together the varying notions surrounding coach education that are perhaps imperceptible at current. This in turn will look to highlight the confined barriers of practice that do not allow for a pragmatic and macroscopic perspective of the culture in and around coach knowledge and the learning processes therein. By establishing these barriers, the intention is to make sense of how coach education might be better facilitated amongst high performance coaching communities.

The themes are as follows: (4.1) coaching as a complex and negotiated interaction, (4.2) unpicking and recreating role and identity, (4.3) coach education: the challenges of formality and existing structures (4.4) movement in cultures for future practice. Each theme is pillared by sub-themes that follow the lines of indoctrinated beliefs, validity of knowledge and experience, historical culture and organisational structure that which embellish the palpable need for positive modification and reinvention of coach education (Stodter and Cushion, 2017; Biesta *et al.,* 2019). This study is a cultural exploration of complex coaching to deliberate the notion of learning in high performance coaches to establish current limitations within coach education and how current and future practitioners can develop their learning experience.

With recognition to the preceding chapters that introduce and consider extant literature regarding coach learning and learning cultures within sport, this study is situated in sociocultural explorations with specificity to sub-elite coaching that is upcoming in sociological research (Rowe, 2017). Thus, this chapter will analyse and explore the intricacies that underpin the findings from the data collection within this study and will look to conclude a solution that will benefit future studies in this complex socio-cultural field.

Figure 2. Results Table of Themes.

Core Category	Subcategory	Description
1- Coaching as complex and negotiated interaction.	**1.1 Indoctrinated beliefs**	The 'should's' that coaches mould their coaching philosophy around. Their interpretation of coaching and learning.
	1.2 Observational Performance	Power of observation. Coaches feeling the need to perform. Justification of role.
	1.3 Validity of Knowledge and experience	What makes knowledge valuable. The limitations presented within formalised coach education (NGBs)
2- Unpicking and recreating role identity.	**2.1- Constructed identity**	Explaining that coaching identity can shape the participation and perception of learning opportunities.
	2.2- Expectation of Role	Defining the expectations and interpretation of the role and how it may interplay with learning engagement.
	2.3-Personal/Historical dispositions	Previous dispositions of self that portrayed how and why they interact with particular learning opportunities.
	2.4- Conflict	Relationship between coaches. Conversations that challenge.
Coach education: The challenges of formality and existing structures	**3.1-Existing support**	Examining the support networks that surround the development of the coaches. i.e., directors, programme leads, other coaches.
	3.2-Coach education	The validity of coach education. Coaches forming their own education. NGBs holding little value in the eye of the coach (Formal education).
	3.3- Leadership/ Organisation structure	From the top down/from the bottom up. The organisations have protocols that tire out new learning opportunities. (Institutional structure).
Movement in Cultures	**4.1 Historical Culture**	Pre-existing and historically influenced behaviour and culture. How their culture defined coaching
	4.2 Reformed culture	How the current coaches are now recreating their culture and how it is reforming learning. (how this happened).

Becket and Hager (2002) remind us that learning is embodied; learning constitutes of psychological, emotional, cognitive, and physical states that are interrelated as opposed to isolated. Thus, the concerns that underpin the purpose of this study are expressed through identifying problematic limitations within current coach learning and coach education literature whilst acknowledging their relation to a dualistic (mind and body) approach (Atkinson, 2011). Here we highlight the value of interpreting the data with a Bourdieusian lens as it allows for an epistemological and ontological perspective on the pragmatic, socialised process of learning. With this in mind, as the data is unpicked through semi-structured interviews, but with empathy towards personal observation, the observational data can become validated when correlated with pre-existing beliefs (Gill *et al.,* 2008).

The findings will be introduced through the fundamental message from the data presented, how the work of Bourdieu adds value to meaning in what is found, and finally what implications this has on coaching knowledge and the learning practices therein for future practice. In establishing the findings of this study, it is worth reminding the point that the coaches are bound by one if not two institutions in their work which results in the need to acknowledge the approach and or attitude towards learning and education provided by said institutions. The data introduces phrases such as *"(I'd) probably change education as a whole"* along with *"I'm supposed to say yes, but it's absolutely not"* which innately highlights the obvious discrepancies between coaching actions and the expected coach behaviours. It is important to note that the data presented is a collaboration of all coaches with the intention of providing a cultural understanding of the knowledge of performance coaches and the learning practices that lead to this point.

As mentioned in the opening of this chapter, the narrative underpinned by the data will provide an overview of the current knowledge of the learning practices within coach education that are observed within this experience. The participants within this study provide data that amounts to the key themes presented previously and the value lies within interpreting through the work of Bourdieu and his theoretical concepts of habitus, capital, and field that pillars the data within this chapter. These concepts dismiss the debate between objectivist (structure) and subjectivist (agency) but, instead, aids the suggestion that culture exists in and through various interactions, practice environments and communications (Bourdieu 1977; Biesta 2004; Cushion, 2010). Thus, to be explicit, the value lies with interpreting how coaches have come to know what they do through habitus, field, and capital, and further to this, how this influences the idea of a learning as a socialised process.

As highlighted previously, coach education is categorised into courses with modules that have predetermined criterion that coach learners have to meet in order to become knowledgeable as a coach (Maclean and Lorimer, 2016). However, as previously advocated by Mallet (2009), coaches have

advocated informal and socialised educational opportunities to be their preferred method of learning. Therefore, by interpreting the data of study through a Bourdieusian lens, there is the opportunity to provide clarity on the underpinning messages of the data in terms of how coaching knowledge and the learning therein can be better understood from a socialised and contextual perspective.

4.1 Coaching as a complex and negotiated Interaction:

In exploring coaching knowledge and the learning therein, this section looks to discuss the learning process of coaches and the multifaced interaction that determines the learning within the said experience. The data illustrates that coaches were continually interfacing and inconsistent with their personal beliefs with various practitioners within their institutions. From an observational standpoint, it might be suggested that the complexity of negotiated interaction is based on indoctrination, power of surveillance (Piro, 2008), and validity of knowledge. In Bourdieusian terms, as a coach determines their capital, it is continually challenged by the traditional forms of habitus that they both consciously and unconsciously adopt within their field of performance. Arguably, coaches (in this context) are adding value to the traditional culture by embedding it into their daily practice as opposed to reinventing the wheel. This poses the idea of acting as opposed to performing when you consider that there is limited individuality or innovation to their practice.

As the following data demonstrates, coaches appear to be unknowingly adopting indoctrinated behaviour:

> *'Alex* allocated himself the job of time trialling, I followed him down the river and we sat at the end of the 2k stretch. We sat on the fence looking down the straight and I used this time to understand more of the person I am observing. "You became a coach after being an athlete, didn't you? What do you think you've carried over if anything?".*
>
> *He paused for a while and said "I look back to when I was an athlete, and my coach was really good in some ways and really bad in others. He was my coach for 4, nearly 5 years and I learnt an awful lot from him. I guess I've taken all the good stuff as good and just ignored the bad stuff". "And what about when you got the job here?" I asked. "Same again really. I took all the good and overlooked the bad. I think I trust myself a lot more now, I know what I'm doing it just takes me a while to back myself when something new is added to the mix". "Ah yeah, like a new member of the team or a new athlete?" I press. "Yeah exactly, like I know my stuff but even when you started observing, you can't help but question what you know".'*
>
> **(Field Note, September 2019)**

"We have a body of coaches that work with us whether that be interns, strength and conditioning coaches, physios… the lot. But we all follow this one pattern or belief that I, (as the head coach) have the solution and that's just what coaching, or I guess more so leadership looks like here.".

"Do you think that's just here? Or more so do you think that has anything to do with you?"

"I think what it actually is, is that I am 'in charge' if you like, and historically the person in charge makes the decisions. We'll always discuss topics as a team and bounce off each other but I guess if push came to shove, the answer would fall in my lap. So, whether it's here or there, or, me or them, I think it's just always been that way".

Conversational Quote, December 2019

Interview question:
Tell me about the coaching culture you maintain.

"I don't know if it's necessarily my culture, but I like people to work hard but I like them to have a good time doing it. As long as people are doing what they're supposed to be doing and doing it well or aiming to improve then I'm fine. If they are doing what they're supposed to be doing but dicking around in the process with no intention or effort, then it annoys me, and I don't think they care. I've been told that my mood affects the atmosphere in the room, but my mood is dictated by the athletes so if I think they're all on it and cracking on then we're all happy but if they're not, then I'm not so it's a reoccurring circle."

Ok, so what makes you maintain that culture? Where has it come from?

"Well, I think the coach is always the person that "runs the room", if you like. So, I think that's just general expectations of an athlete and a coach. But for me, I think it's important to hold your own values in your practice and considering I was in this exact environment as an athlete, apprentice and now coach, I think back to what me and my team mates used to do, then to what me and the other interns did and now to me and my colleagues and I feel like I've got a well-equipped understanding of a good environment, or culture as you put it haha".
(Coach 2).

Here, we consider that although a learning culture is immersive and defining in relation to those who are situated within it (learners), it should not be assumed that this is what defines the learner (Cushion *et al.,* 2003). The individual becomes embedded within the learning environment, but it should be recognised that the person behind the learner will have become who they are through experiencing other cultural fields in earlier learning; as a result, this has a significant influence on their current

approach to learning (Bloomer and Hogkinson, 2000). It is worth noting that the majority of this sample embarked on their role having previously been athletes themselves. The data above demonstrates the indoctrinated behaviour that explicitly captures the negotiated actions between what makes good behaviour and what the coaches inherently do within their daily practice. This refers to what was previously stated whereby coaches (in this context) are adding value to the traditional culture by embedding it into their daily practice rather than reinventing the wheel (challenging daily practice). To simplify, coaches apply what they deem good knowledge to their practice but complete educational pathways as good behaviour to fit societal and educational expectations as demonstrated through the varied data in this chapter. This contributes to the need for further clarification on the differentiation between coaching knowledge and the learning therein when you consider that sub-elite coaches are adopting as opposed to adapting their coaching practice.

From the terminology used by the coaches in the data, it can be understood that there is somewhat of a *front* in their practice, whether that be to me as the researcher, or to their peers, there is a sense of aiming to please and configuring the right presentation of self (Cushion and Jones, 2001; Garfinkel, 1967). With this apparent confusion, it causes reason to believe that individuals are susceptible to change, yet only cooperate with the motions of change when it does not pose the threat of vulnerability or discomfort in their capital (position or role) (Kegelaers *et al.,* 2020), thus highlighting that change is possible but only for planned circumstances:

> *It's Saturday night on one of the testing camps. After all the planning was in place for the next day, everyone settled into the evening, had a laugh and unwound in a relaxed setting. I was creating small talk with all the coaches about my research and what I was looking into. After explaining, one of the pathway coaches jokingly said "So, are you looking to catch us at our worst and rename us as terrible at our job then?". "Haha no, of course not!... Well, not unless you are terrible at your job?" I quickly remarked. There were some laughs around the group and then what felt like suddenly, everyone was conscious of talking about their day and their coaching. It was like everyone was sceptical of the unknown.*
>
> *On the way home from the camp Joe* and I were chatting about some of the coaching that was happening over the weekend. I seized the opportunity and said "Yeah, I think some of them are still trying to work out my role here. It seemed as though they had this feeling, I was going to catch them out or something". In his honest nature, Joe replied with "Yeah, the thing is the coaches on this programme are all put on a pedestal and are presumed to have this status as a coach. If that's put in a vulnerable position, they don't like it. None of them like conflict because it's too risky. The programme has been that way for as long as I can remember".*

(Field Note, October 2019)

Indoctrinated beliefs are broken down into expectations which grow from societal norms in terms of ways of being and ways of doing (Hanssoon, 2018) but they are not consciously held as motivations (Taylor, 2017). A result of the common characteristic in learning is that cultures are governed by idealistic expectations and values surrounding effective learning, teaching and leadership that only exist in a particular setting (Barker-Ruchti, *et al.,* 2016) which, in this case, is coach education. Therefore, to make sense of this through the work of Bourdieu, it could be suggested that all individuals within one field are in a constant cycle of negotiation of role to determine capital that is advantageous for them, however, in saying this, the idea is then presented that a field is everchanging and one cannot question the conformity if there is not a consistent measure to *act* against. Thus, a consideration is that coaches within this context are bound by their field and thus for knowledge and learning to be valued by others (to establish capital) they may benefit from exploring their identity within various fields. As the data below demonstrates this sentiment, it is worth noting that this consideration derives from Bourdieu's concept of habitus when we consider the historical dispositions that shape everyday action and the exposure to conditions that normalise daily and internalised constraints, as mentioned previously:

Interview Question:
If you could change the educational process for up-and-coming coaches and for yourself moving forward. What would it look like?
"Probably change education as a whole and the way it's believed to be successful".

Can you elaborate on that? What do you mean?
"Yeah, I think when you were talking about education earlier, I was thinking about the classic formal, in a classroom, pen and paper- NGBs we have to do. So, now that you ask that, I think the better way to look at coach development is (by) giving coaches the opportunity to learn from each other. So, it would be good see coach education be more circumstantial if you like."

Why would you change that?
"Well, the NGBs are what we all need to get a job. So that means that the learning in them (the courses) is seen as really good… until you actually go on one ha-ha. But if you talk to one of your colleagues who has been working with another coach for example, you learn more from them and their experience than what the courses give you. That's my opinion anyway."
(Coach 2).

Secondarily, coaches may question the legitimacy of their knowledge because of the little value they believe in the cultural discourse of coach education and, thus, the data exemplifies the need for clarification on the content, worthiness, and credibility of National Governing Body educational courses (Nelson and Cushion, 2006). Aligning with one of the interview questions, the data below highlights the standpoint for the coaches within this study in relation to national governing bodies:

> **Interview Question:**
> *Do you think that the educational courses, (National Governing Bodies) have made a positive impact on your development as a coach? (I.e.- Level 2).*
>
> *"No. They got me a job, that's it."*
> **(Coach 1)**
>
> *"The aim is to be a safe coach and not a good coach. Which is a problem. I think who is delivering it and who else is on it makes a difference.*
>
> *I think it would be interesting to work it backwards. If you had 10 experienced coaches learning the British Rowing model which you do in level 2, it could be really, really interesting but these conversations don't happen with novice coaches, so we are actually creating problems for ourselves"*
> **(Coach 2)**
>
> *"The NGB's have been positive in terms of what is societally valuable. But no, overall, they were crap, I can only say they were positive because it helped me get a job... I could go into a job now- knowing what I know and be the best person in the room, but I still wouldn't get the job if I didn't have my Level 2. That's shit really"*
> **(Coach 3)**

Cushion *et al.* (2003) detail that coach education is perceived differently from one person to the next despite the similarities in the answers above. Coach education can be understood to be facilitating coaches with interactive opportunities underpinned by the intentions of fulfilling potential; this is established through the findings of several studies conducted by the likes of: (Côté *et al.,* 1995; Cushion *et al.,* 2003; Jones *et al.,* 2008; Rynne and Mallet, 2012; 2014). However, what is prominent within this research is the consistent theme of *coach-learning* being unrecognised if not in the formal sense. Therefore, highlighting the suggestion that the value of coach education is lessened.

Consequently, coach education is incidentally separating theory from practice, as supported earlier in the literature review by (LeBed & Bar-Eli, 2013; Jones *et al.,* 2008; 2016) where it is established that coach education revolves around unstructured structure. It can therefore be understood that for coaches to comprehend coach education and that of which it provides, the learning opportunities

presented to them, or arguably perceived by them, could be introduced through informal learning opportunities as opposed to formalised coach education. Thus, offering insight into the everchanging coach knowledge and the learning practices therein that will provide a broader understanding of contextual and socialised knowledge.

To simplify, the presentation or perception of learning opportunities can only be deciphered as knowledge and learning therein by the coach themselves and therefore it would be more beneficial to embed learning opportunities into their cultural norm (daily practice) as opposed to advanced coaching qualifications (NGBs) that fit the cultural expectations of coach education (Nelson and Cushion, 2006; Piggott, 2012).

Here it is worth noting Bourdieu's characterisation of culture. Bourdieu perceived culture through varied skill sets that afford unique and innovative performance within a cultural pattern: referring to what was previously mentioned where we clarified that one can only question the conformity when outside of the practice environment (Bourdieu, 1984; Fine, 2002). Thus, culture is internally embedded not necessarily through the mind as values but the body as habitus (Bourdieu, 1977; Townsend and Cushion, 2020). Highlighting that habitus is a system of everchanging dispositions which is encourages the solution to similarly shaped problems (Tomlinson, 2004). In a Bourdieusian sense, these internalised dispositions are customed to the individual's environment and social settings. This, therefore, suggests that *learning*, is to manipulate the social world and internalise your environment and the standards it holds which again explains how coaching knowledge, and the learning practices therein, are nuanced in terms of socialised and contextual practices (Cushion and Jones, 2013; Stodter and Cushion, 2014; Stuij, 2015).

With this in mind, the following data will enlighten us on coaches' beliefs of education, learning opportunities and knowledge, each of which can again be partnered with current literature (Smith *et al.,* 2010; Nash and Sproule, 2012; Kemmis *et al.,* 2012) to re-gauge what it is that defines coach education within the complexity of coaching in high performance sport:

> *'It's day one and I'm sitting with Adam, the head coach and I'm waiting for everything to start. He walks over to the athletes to begin the session and quite literally pretends I'm not there. It makes it more difficult than I imagined. There's an element of performance surrounding us. Like no one is being real. The athletes boated and we started making our way down the bank. Adam hasn't said a word so far and 40 minutes later, he begins to settle and give commands to the athletes.*
>
> *Before you knew it, the session was over and Adam turns to me and says, "So yeah, that's us! We do two of those sessions a day so feel free to turn up whenever suits you". We part ways and I'm*

sat in my car completely bewildered... 'that can't be it?' I thought to myself. I wasn't planning on attending the second session that day, but I did. I went back 15 minutes after he had started the second session that same day. This time he was taken aback. I stood at a distance and appeared as though I was working on my laptop and uninterested. Then there was a shift and I saw some of what I thought was really good coaching. The session came to an end and Adam walked over to me, "Came back for more so soon? Ha-ha. I was a lot more relaxed in that session for some reason. I imagine that would have been a lot better for you in terms of what you wanted to see compared to this morning" he claimed. I smiled, nodding away and paused my thinking….Ah. Now it makes sense.'

(Field note: September 2019)

Bourdieu perceived social capital as property of the individual that was established or attained primarily through their social position or status (Fine, 2002). In this data excerpt, this can be positioned from two angles: the status of the coach to the athlete, and the status of the coach to me, the researcher. Between the coach and I, it can be assumed that my presence causes unsettlement and domination on their behalf; the self-created shift in social capital presents a *false* representation in their performance as a coach through the power of observation (Cushion and Jones, 2006, 2014; Cushion, 2018). From this occurrence, it is worth noting that social capital enables an individual to exert power on the group or individual (Fine, 2002; Cushion and Jones, 2006). On the other hand, the social capital attained in the coach-athlete relationship is built upon balance and stability (Baker and Faulkner, 2009), therefore, any actions that might cause instability for the coach such as observation, will be both consciously and subconsciously avoided to remain stable. The value in recognising this is that as coach education continues to grow and develop, there is recognition towards the cultural dynamics of education and how this influences learning.

Bourdieu explained cultural capital to be the accumulation of skill, knowledge and behaviours that an individual can adopt and demonstrate to *fit* the sociocultural status (Goldthorpe, 2007). This is demonstrated when stating "*I imagine that would have been a lot better for you in terms of what you wanted to see".* Here, the coach is explicitly demonstrating the skill of *fitting* what they presume to be the sociocultural status of a 'good coach' when, in fact, they are demonstrating the threat that observation poses to their social and cultural capital.

The theme of *coaching as a complex and negotiated action* is influenced by the data which, in line with Bourdieu's conception of culture, suggests that the immersive learning culture is what builds the character of the individual, however it should be recognised that this is not the definition of who the individual *is.* In simpler terms, coaches will adapt their practice to the requirements of their learning environment, however, the learning environment does not necessarily shape the coach into

what they may practice daily but, instead, their practice is governed by what they perceive to be the most culturally acceptable (Rynne 2013). With this is mind, it is reclarified that the results of learning are highly dictated by the coach themselves and, therefore, it could be suggested that coach education would benefit from incorporating learning opportunities into day-to-day practice. This will create a cultural norm that results in the effects of learning being applied in practice rather than limited to an educational setting.

Here, we understand that coaching is recognised for its complexity in terms of applying theory (education) to practice. However, when interpreting this in relation to social capital, it would be advantageous to recognise that the actions that create instability in coaching practice would be a constructive consideration to improve coach learning because of the continual informal learning opportunity to apply to practice. It is here that we recognise the complex negotiation of interaction and therefore, to aid the fluidity of this discussion further the following section of this chapter will look to unpick the creation and reinvention of role identity.

4.2 Unpicking and recreating role identity.

The term identity is conflicting with the connotations it holds it implies individuality and personification to an extent where 'identity' is an isolated term (Kaplan and Garner, 2017). Contrarily, it is recognised as a compilation of tangible traits that manipulate personality to construct identity (De Martin Silva, 2016). It is important to recognise the problematic nature of how identity is shaped and what may cause this to change through situational based scenarios. This theme will capture how coaches construct fluid role identities based on coach education and the learning therein with the intent to clarify how elements of identity and role creation can be applied to other factors that mediate coaching knowledge and that of which creates it.

This theme is built from constructed identity, expectations of role, and conflict (relationships). Despite their interrelation, they stand as individual pillars in the foundations of creating an identity (Mills, 2015). To elaborate, Bourdieu's notion of habitus explains that learning is a result of embodiment in cultural practice (Hodkinson *et al.,* 2008). Each (learning) culture will provide learning opportunities that differ, or even constrain accessibility, to what other cultures may provide. This directly applies to how an individual can and will adopt dispositions that make up their habitus (Costa and Murphy, 2015; Bourdieu, 2017). It is important to recognise that this is more commonly noticed in conscious and 'in the moment' actions, as opposed to subconscious reactions that are more apparent in learning.

As we bring these concepts together and apply them to the data, it becomes interesting to see the terminology and language used when questioning a personal topic that relates to identity. See below:

Interview Question:

Is your coaching identity bound by what you have learnt or what you believe needs to be seen?

"The more that I learn or the more confidence I gain, the more I form my own identity into what coaching should look like."

(Coach 2)

"Mostly through what I have learnt but I'm aware that people have an expectation and therefore to engage them, sometimes I have to mould myself to that."

(Coach 1)

"I don't think it's neither. Well, I do but my identity as such, is shaped by what I have seen so I guess you could say it's from what I have learnt but that's more experience based as opposed to education based. I think from there, you tailor it to your job".

(Coach 3)

In this explicit question, the coach is led to believe that there are one of two answers in relation to their experience. However, the terminology in the question derives from Bourdieu's concept of habitus. The wording *should*, *expectations* and *mould* connote different meanings that differ from the intention of the answers given. Therefore, it introduces the idea that the participants are conflicted in the creation of their identity. It is worth noting that this data aligns with the considerations of Lave (1996) where it is argued that there are significant variances when considering how learners shape their identities. To fully grasp the learner's intentions of what is being learnt or more so, how it is being learnt, the research data would have to spread across each and every learning field. This is because all learning cultures will encourage, constrain or dissipate particular methods of learning (Barker-Ruchti *et al.,* 2016). Thus, in terms of coach learning, coach identities are bound by coach education and indoctrinated behaviours and beliefs (Taylor, 2017).

This consideration is further supported when the participant coaches were asked if their actions were determined by their environment. For reference, all coaches within this study are required to gather for varying monthly testing camps where the athletes and coaches are all in one place for 48 hours. Naturally, both environments will offer different variables that will determine the actions of the individual. This question is posed for the purpose of clarity around what a coach determines important in their learning process and thus, how that may influence the moulding process to their aspired identity. The question is as follows:

Interview Question:

Do you find yourself acting or thinking differently on a performance testing camp in comparison to the boat house?

"I used to; I probably still do but I just don't give a shit now. I think those on talent pathways are stuck in this bubble of self-entitlement and some of them, especially higher up, put themselves on an entitled platform. Yet, they hate confrontation. If I ask them a challenging question they retreat. I used to succumb to that atmosphere until I realised, I wanted to not be a part of that. I know a lot of stuff and it's like no one is interested in how I learnt it all.

(Coach 1)

"I do because I have to. I don't care for people's opinions of me, but I have to fit the criteria of my role and on camps, that's seen in a certain way. It's all short sighted and they (other coaches) tie themselves in knots when you ask them a question about their coaching because they feel attacked or challenged when instead, I am just interested. This makes me feel depleted in terms of the coaching industry. It's the one part I don't like about this job."

(Coach 3)

"Nah, I'm not very good at acting so I can't be fake if that's what you're asking. I think there is a certain way coaches are expected to be on camps but other than that not really. Although saying that, I definitely feel more comfortable in my own environment".

(Coach 2).

A key part of this data to unpick is the conflicting statements. When we talk of conflict, there is an assumption of negativity or right versus wrong (O'Connor and Macdonald, 2002) and so naturally, when the participants are asked a leading question that situates them in a conflicted position, there is an uncomfortable period of doubt where they question if they are in fact right or wrong (see also: Potrac and Jones, 2009). Each answer from this interview question demonstrated contradicting statements in terms of whether they do, or do not behave differently on testing camps. It highlights that the coaches in question recognise that they may behave differently but there is a need to justify or reason their behaviour; it restates that there is instability in their confidence as a coach and thus in the value of the knowledge they have in this context. Thus, there are two key messages to interpret from this data. Firstly, it appears that coaches shape their behaviour based on their environment as opposed to their knowledge. *Coach 1* and *Coach 2* both highlight that there is a 'criteria' or 'way' for coaches to behave and this influences their practice. Therefore, when referring to the concept of formal education it can again be suggested that the creation of content in coach educational courses is irrelevant to practice if the current coaching culture is so rigid that coaches cannot apply their

learning to practice (Mallet 2009; Stodter and Cushion, 2014; Becker and Bish, 2017). Secondly, we establish that all coaches at various points in this study acknowledge the difference in environments and act accordingly. In line with the work of Bourdieu, this highlights that coaches perceive the field they are in and align their habitus and capital to fit the criteria that situates them in a known and optimal position (Taylor and Garratt, 2010).

This not only links to the validity of knowledge as previously mentioned but also the expectations of their job role. From this finding, it is important to recognise that the cultural expectations are a fluid concept as are the individuals in it. To simplify, it is a reciprocal cycle of production: the culture (re)produces the individuals within it as much as the individuals (re)produce the culture (Hodkinson *et al.,* 2008). This cycle is influenced by several cultural and humanistic variables. Therefore, it is important to recognise that this is not a matter of *who* is right or wrong, as it is not a one-way process (Hodkinson *et al.,* 2008). It can therefore be suggested that the actions of individuals cannot be determined by the learning culture of which they are embedded in, nor are they at total free reign (Bourdieu 1997, Hodgkinson *et al.,* 2008; Nash and Sproule, 2012; Stodter and Cushion, 2019). This means that a learning culture does not encapsulate the context or environment in which learning takes place. Instead, learning culture is the pivot of social practices in which individuals learn (Thomas and Brown, 2011). Consequently, it would be beneficial to understand that learning culture does not accurately represent what may be seen in an educational setting, and thus there is already a conflicted assumption in coaching knowledge and the learning practices therein (Nelson *et al.,* 2006; Stodter and Cushion, 2019).

The following data will provide clarity on the disparity between role identity and role expectations, whilst demonstrating the need to explore how this influences coach learning. Thus, the data below looks to unpick the approach to learning opportunities for coaches:

> *"An athlete asked Alex: "Who is being observed today?". Before answering, you could see the sense of question, and maybe vulnerability flash through Alex's* demeanour. "Can Alex be observed so she (Me) can see us all in the quad?". Amused, he turned to them and discussed my role a bit further for their understanding and finished with "Just remember that the observation is for its own purpose, not ours. As knowledgeable as I'm sure she is, you guys aren't the priority". A few mumbles disgruntled words later and the athletes dispersed to boat up and I ceased the moment for questioning.*
>
> *'"You know I'm more than happy to answer any questions they have?" I pushed. He responded with "Yeah I know, I'm just conscious of what my role is and what your role is. I don't want us to flip and I'm actually observing you which is what I think I'm doing more often than not". "Why does that concern you?" "I don't think it concerns me, I just think the*

time for me to learn from you, which I absolutely am, might not be best demonstrated whilst in delivery"'.

(Field Note, November 2019).

The coach in this section is arguably demonstrating fallibility through the boundaries they set for their own learning; if the coach demonstrates vulnerability through openly learning from me in a reflexive sense, they are demonstrating that they perhaps lack in knowledge in certain areas which goes against their perceived role as a coach. Despite the assertion and confidence from the coach, there are two elements that signify discrepancies in identity and role. As above, this coach states "*I'm conscious of what my role is"* highlighting that there is either concern as to how his role *should* be perceived or consideration to the vulnerability of being educated as opposed the educator. Secondly, the following quote *"the time for me to learn from you, which I absolutely am, might not be best demonstrated whilst in delivery" highlights* that the coach is recognising the need to draw attention to his learning process but is negotiating his identity as a coach and as a person within the same environment. This could demonstrate that capital has significant influence over learning opportunities within the contextual environment and, as a result, encourages the idea that socialised learning offers the flexibility for individuals to tailor their learning experiences to one of which they are most comfortable responding to:

'We're stood on the bridge awaiting the scullers to pass below us to capture some video footage. "Can I ask you a question?" Alex turned to me. "Absolutely" I responded, slightly taken aback. "Sarah is about to come through the bridge, I'm really struggling to communicate the change she needs to make at the finish, can you have a look?". I wasn't sure what he was after but naturally, "Of course" was my response. Then, like he read my mind, "If you're wondering why, I just think if you and I are on the same page in terms of improvement, you might be able to verbalise feedback better to her after the session."'*

(Field Note, November 2019).

It is worth noting here that this analysis is strengthened through the ethnographic approach that allows for a rich and entrusted conversation (Chang, 2015; Cohen, 2003). Through being situated in the practice environment for a lengthy time period, the coach and I have formed a working relationship where being part of his environment became 'normal' practice. Therefore, the reluctance to show vulnerability in the early stages highlighted that the learning process was influenced by establishing capital. Therefore, it is worth noting here that the exchange of knowledge is on the learner's terms and highlights that this may not be replicated in formalised education as we know it.

This notion also contributes to Bourdieu's idea of field in terms of how the coach interpreted and determined capital. To further explain, a field acts as a ground of mutual dependency that also involves inequality that are enacted through forms of capital (power) (Warwick *et al.,* 2017). Individuals differ in the power that they hold through varying backgrounds and personal characteristics (Coleman, 1988) which can be demonstrated through social, economic or cultural capital. This is then 'bought into' by those around them and forms into a system of purchasing power which determines habitus in the field (Coleman 1988; Townsend and Cushion, 2017). Inherently, in this context, Bourdieu's view of doxa encompasses this transaction when you consider that receiving of power comes without saying because the giving of power goes without saying. In simpler terms, the exchange of capital (and power) within this social context is inevitable as the coaches aspire to be comfortable within their field- it becomes a give-to-receive (Hodkinson, 2008; Towsend and Cushion, 2017).

In relation to this analysis and the association with coach learning, there is a clear demonstration of the acknowledgement and need for learning, however in this case, it revolves around the choice to engage in opportunities at their personal autonomy. To exemplify, Alex* became aware of the situation and the possible benefits it held he determined not only his capital, but mine also and from there he negotiated the most appropriate solution to engage in the learning opportunity. Therefore, despite the dispute in the creation of identity, it could be said that this does not necessarily hinder the learning experience.

From a different angle, there are two considerations to make in relation to understanding coach learning and the knowledge therein. Alex* actively chose to engage in the learning opportunity but within his own boundaries (time, place and method), highlighting the benefits of informal learning. Interestingly, opportunities similar to this do not always present themselves in formalised coach education due to the structured learning requirements it holds. Consequently, suggesting that Alex, for example, would continue to reciprocate uncritical practice as opposed to being challenged to learn within his own environment. Here, we distinctly highlight how coaches determine their knowledge and learning processes therein when considering that coach learning could be best suggested to be delivered in an informal, contextual and socialised manner. Therefore, in tying this in with identity and role expectations, if learning is encouraged in an informal sense, it could be suggested that the pressurised nature of capital in coach education would decrease (Mallet *et al.,* 2009).

Consequently, it is worth noting that the inconsistency of self-assurance and belief throughout a coaching career can lead to deterring away from the natural response to learning; it becomes a pre-empted reaction (Nelson *et al.,* 2013). Thus, there is a cause for questioning the variables outside of the direct engagement with learning. The following data analysis will determine how the relationships

between coaches and the institution that houses them, may further influence the growth or stagnation of development.

> *'We were just about to walk up to the café for the coaches meeting when both Alex* and Jamie* receive an email resulting in them not being able to make the meeting. The assistant coach starts scrolling on his phone completely unphased whereas Alex seems on edge and a bit flustered. "They won't make the most of this time if we don't go, I might just cancel it." Alex talks over to Jamie. "Probably a bit late to do that since they're probably all here by now" Adam responds.*
>
> *I spend the morning pottering over tasks whilst still completely puzzled at the stress of allowing five adults (institution practitioners and interns) have a meeting without them. Eventually it's just Alex and I in the office and I ask him "Does it bother you to let them do the meeting themselves?". A long pause lingered whilst he thought over his answer. "I don't want to lose control. I'm not confident in my ability to communicate it well enough for them to do it themselves without me. I know that part of that is the inner control freak in me but… coaches here spend a lot of time listening to me but don't always voice their own thoughts. Especially if it challenges mine. So, I guess my answer is, I know where I stand when I am there. But when I'm not, I don't know what my role is in terms of what I do for them".'*
>
> **(Field note, December 2019).**

There are several considerations from this data: firstly, it reiterates the conflicting relationships between coaches. Second to this, there is disparity in the role expectations and the lack of self-trust in fulfilling those effectively. Therefore, it poses for further question on how coaches establish their identity through social capital within their field (Baker and Faulkner, 2009). However, in identifying both angles there is recognition towards coach learning and how this can be best facilitated for future practice which, to be explicit, is providing learning opportunities in a contextual and socialised environment for coaches to actively engage in personalised learning as opposed to structured and curricular coach education.

Individuals form relationships through relatedness, trust, and an element of subconscious bargaining meaning that individuals question the worth of the relationship (Hannerz, 2003). With the ethnographic nature of this study, the relationships between myself and the coaches provide an element of trust and comfort to the participants (Simmons and Smith, 2019). However, in being detached from the sociological and emotional situations, I can witness the variation of face from the coach as a result of their environment and or surrounding social systems (Goffman, 1959). The assumption can then be made that coaches base their identity on external stimuli which in this

context, are variations of capital and the measure in which they influence action. Two key considerations here are how we form our identities in the learning process and, secondly, how we approach coach education and the coach learning within it. Therefore, in analysing this data, it is highlighted that Alex* disputes his identity and role expectations when his social power decreases. As demonstrated with "*I don't want to lose control*" and *"I know where I stand when I am there. But when I'm not, I don't know what my role is in terms of what I do for them*". This pointedly validates the confusion in both role identity and role expectations when a social shift is created in the field that deviates from their *known* comfort (Pope *et al.,* 2014; Pope and Hall, 2014). Therefore, suggesting that there are one of two solutions that could influence beneficial change on coach learning. Firstly, to support coaches in their contextual environment meaning that the challenges that coaches face are explicitly developmental to their situated and cultural environment. Secondly, on the contrary it could be said that formalised coach education could progress by incorporating individualised learning opportunities to create a 'safe' environment for coaches to expose their vulnerability as learners (Kemmis *et al.,* 2017). From a Bourdieusian perspective, it could be suggested that informal learning epitomises doxa in the attempt of determining role expectations and role identity, and how the action of bargaining capital within two different fields becomes inevitable for coaches to deem their knowledge, and the learning therein, as valuable.

Coaches are educated to 'climb' to power through their position and this comes with knowledge, experience, and role accolades (Wellman and Bachkirova, 2010). There is little recognition toward challenging situations such as the negotiation of capital within everyday socialised practice something that would be difficult to formally capture. The work of Engeström (2001) exemplifies that learning theory does not highlight the significance of social power which results in assuming that coaches base their decisions (and, thus, their learning) around institutional structures and power differentials (micropolitics) as demonstrated in the above data passage. Therefore, it is recognised that (formal) situated practices that determine the learning within coach knowledge, fail to recognise the power inequalities or relationships that are pivotal to everyday practice or social setting; explicitly, coach learning or learning in general is no exception to this (Hodkinson *et al.,* 2008; Gheradi, 2008). This is where the understanding of formalised coach education (that being the current structure) becomes blurred when considering the dependency on the environment which cannot be truly replicated to the extent of all coaches (Nelson and Cushion, 2006). Therefore, it is worth noting that as the field of education determines the actions (of the coaches) in their desired environment, it could be beneficial to pose a variation fields within the learning process that encompasses the consistent and dynamic changes that occur in daily practice (Hodkinson, 2008). Again, restating that, for knowledge and

learning to be valued by others (to establish capital) they may benefit from exploring their identity within various fields due to the natural, everchanging dynamic that occurs in daily practice.

4.3 Coach education and the challenges of formality and existing organisational structures:

As this study unpicks the construction of knowledge and the learning therein, a pivotal part of the data collection demonstrates the challenges faced within coach education and or existing structures that are in place to aid the development of coaches. As this section unpicks coach education and the formalities within, it is again worth acknowledging the socialisation process that recognises the complex process of development that guides individuals to adopt and encourage a given social system (Bourdieu 1977; Coakley and Pike, 2009; Cushion 2011). This section will revisit what has been previously discussed as macro-political decision making that will how learning cultures and environmental fields shapes the development of the individuals (coaches) within it.

Despite the individuality of coaches and the philosophies they hold, coaches are somewhat bound by the institutions and or organisations that they are either part of or employed by. Therefore, to unpick the socialisation process, which in this case is a cycle of coaches determining knowledge to be learnt or known, there is a need for insight into what bounds individuals to the opportunity of attaining knowledge and who orchestrates that. The following data begins this process.

Interview question:

Would you consider your growth and or development as a coach is a priority to those above you?

"No. The people here- my managers. They are more interested in results than coach growth. This is firstly demonstrated in salary. I'm not driven by money, but it clearly demonstrates how little they perceive the role to be worth and therefore how little time they put into us."

(Coach 1)

"If they actually cared about my development, we wouldn't have to deal with half the bullshit that we do in our day to day."

(Coach 2)

"I'm supposed to say yes, but it's absolutely not."

(Coach 4)

Each fragment of data exemplifies the clear dissatisfaction from the coaches towards their superiors and or the provisions in place for their development. When this particular question was posed to the sample, the immediate reaction resonates with frustration, mockery and exhaustion. As quoted *"I'm supposed to"* and *"if they actually cared"* demonstrates, the coaches speak of this topic with resentment. Smith and Smoll (2012) talk of how coaches aid the smooth running of practices; they work as 'cogs' who facilitate systematic results. However, these results are not tuned to their development but instead to the institutional environment that they are situated within. It could therefore be recognised that coaches are acting as educators as opposed to being educated when we consider that their development does not sit as a high priority to those superior to them. This is further supported by Kemmis *et al.,* (2012) when they talk of practice architecture and the construction of a working environment. Consequently, coaches form a parochial view on the institutionalised structure where they believe that there is little value in the attempt to modify or reinvent what, supposedly, already *works* (Kemmis *et al.,* 2012; Smith and Smoll, 2012). Explicitly demonstrated in the data from the interviews above, this is further highlighted below and leads to further analysis:

> *'As we're driving to a testing camp, Harry* is on a hands-free call with his line manager and the discussion is based around the kit, equipment and specifically the vehicles signed out for the camp. "I know these camps are something you have to do but if I gave in to every request I get, we wouldn't function as an academy" he mumbles through the speakers. Harry explains that the buses need to be taken every month for the testing camps and he thought this had been pre-agreed. "Sorry, I'll pass the message on and make sure it is sorted for next time" he rushes before ending the call. We begin mumbling different comments about the call and I ask: "Is he keen for you to go on camps and do events like these for your development?". "It's difficult to answer but from our experience, he doesn't care for our development as a collective. He shows his appreciation of the work and the programme and how well were doing but whether he actually cares for our development or not, I'd say were just numbers on sheets for him".'*
>
> **(Field note, February 2020)**

Interestingly, one of the most telling parts within the data is the terminology used, namely, "*collective"* and "*our".* One of two angles to interpret this from is, firstly, the resistance to reflect, apply or consider the application of the topic or question to themselves directly; there is a natural response to introduce their views as a shared concept. The second angle provides the idea that institutionalised power has influenced a cultural norm where coaches are identified as a collective rather than individual beings with separate needs - an attitude where 'something is better than nothing'. Chowdhury *et al.* (2016)

explain that by identifying or being identified as part of a collective offers a sense of security when speaking of or actioning controversial topics that closely resemble the conversation in the data above.

When partnering these thoughts together with Bourdieu's concept of power and field it can be assumed that individuals liken themselves to one and other to increase their social power within their field which in this case, is their institution. Through hierarchical status, the coaches are in a position where their freedom to make decisions, learn, and develop is limited by the power of the institution. Thus, as suggested by Wellman and Bachkirova (2010), when an individual is in a role subordinate to others, the willingness to cooperate is through the requirements of the role as opposed to the reward of result. In this context, the lack of interest or as put "*care for our development*" causes conflicted relationships as mentioned previously, this diminishes the appreciation for coach learning as the discrepancy in value for coach education is vast. However, it is worth noting that this is not entirely down to the appreciation of coach education but, instead, the understanding of what coach education is and, or provides. In continuing the data analysis, it becomes apparent that coaches within this study have various interpretations of coach education and the culture it withholds:

Interview Question:

What are your first thoughts when I mention the term 'coach education':

"Just the boring shit you have to go through to get into the job you want. I think it's a term people use but don't understand but also, we have to do it to get some sort of status as coaches. The guys here wouldn't have hired me if I didn't have them".

Have what?

"The level badges, they only want a "qualified coach"'.

(Coach 1)

When you said coach education, I immediately thought coach development. So, I realise I don't immediately recognise the difference. When you take it away from the formalised sense (of learning) anyway".

(Coach 2)

"When I think of education, I think of a test and working towards passing the test which I don't think should be the case. Your job shouldn't be a pass-fail type of experience, it should feel developmental, and I think that's where coach education goes wrong. Developing skill is constantly continued and macroscopic. Education, to me, sounds niche and limited. There's a lot of knowledge where I sit there and think 'How did I learn all this stuff?".

(Coach 3)

"Do you mean the stuff we have to learn on the courses or, like what is good for us coaches to have in terms of personal and specific learning?"

(Coach 4).

Again, the answer from Coach 1 represents this shared responsibility through terminology such as '*we'* except, in this sense, it is through determining the use of coach education and their understanding of both coach education and development. An important caveat here is that coaches perceive the value of coach education to be lesser from an independent perspective due to their limited understanding (O'Dwyer and Bowles, 2020; Hodkinson *et al.,* 2020). Thus, institutional practitioners that are assumed to provide educational opportunities would benefit from coach education having a clear definition that differentiates away from independent coach learning, which is often misinterpreted as one (Downham, 2020). As previously mentioned, the suggestion of coaches exploring several fields to establish both their role and their identity could prove beneficial to learning and development and, in this sense, the field of formalised education poses broad understandings of how learning can take place, whilst coach learning, is the doing and application of formal learning (Blackett *et al.,* 2018). Thus, restating that the field is everchanging and pivotally, coaches will benefit from understanding how to attain knowledge and hold value with the learning processes therein by moving between them with a conscious understanding of the differentiation in education and learning.

In addition, institutions, coach education, and developmental pathways all interconnect to form an allied network that shape coaching practice (Smith, *et al.,* 2010). Therefore, coaches each have a criterion in which they must succumb to, that incidentally negates the developmental process (Blackett *et al.,* 2018). Here, it can be understood that both conscious and subconscious habitus determine the engagement in learning opportunities but with the apparent doxa in and around the environment they are within, the coach will benefit from stepping out of the environmental field in order to process and reflexively apply the learning that took place. However, this proves to be more complex when the concept of coach learning is perceived differently by the learner (coach) and the educator (institutional practitioners), as demonstrated through both the data above and below. From the previous data, there is clear disparity between what the coaches perceive coach education to be and the formalised provisions of education in place. Thus, it could be suggested that the act of learning is not identically shared between the coaches as learners and the educational pathways they have taken. This identifies with having different understandings of the daily practice (habitus) and the

environment (field) that this takes place in. A suggested solution may be that educational practitioners and coaches alike could align their understanding of the contextual environment through field-based learning as opposed to separating formal learning and the application of knowledge (Cushion 2003; Nelson and Cushion, 2006; Townsend and Cushion, 2017). In saying this, the coaches in this study dictate their development around the institution they belong to and this was further evidenced through varying informal conversations surrounding in-house development:

> *"There's elements of stuff that I don't agree with but because I am employed by (X), I have to buy into their philosophies when I'm in that environment."*
>
> *"The organisation is the bottom line. We have to work with institutional values that do not always represent our personal values. I have to play the game, it's my job at the end of the day".*
>
> **(Observational Quotes, February 2020.)**
>
> *"God that was crap. A 40-minute conversation to analyse my performance over 365 days with feedback like 'keep it up, make sure you're keeping on top of admin too'. Cool. Great review. I feel ready for the next 365 days now!" Joe* blurted out as he plummeted in his chair. "Wait, what's just happened?" I ask in confusion.*
>
> *"Every year we have a review of our performance as coaches for the previous year. We chat and get given some feedback that is supposedly developmental".*
>
> *"What does he based his feedback on? Has he been to your sessions or seen you coach? I haven't seen him?"*
>
> *"Nope, that's because he doesn't. It's so shit but it's part and parcel of the job. He has to be seen doing it".*
>
> **(Conversation in observation, September 2019).**

The data within this section thus far has demonstrated a distinct rivalry between educational development and institutional conformity. It pointedly highlights that education and what is valued in its name is shaped considerably by the institutional context and its culture. It is important to recognise that as we talk of learning cultures, there is a risk of assuming that it wholly represents the individuals within it and the traits in which they hold (Kumar, 2005; Hodkinson *et al.,* 2008). Put simply, it cannot be assumed that those who sit within one culture represent the same attitude to learning. Thus far, through the research surrounding coach education within the literature review and the data presented, it is demonstrated that coach education is shaped by governed standards (Piggott, 2012) which results in little effort to facilitate coach learning as it challenges the traditional approach to

learning (Rynne *et al.,* 2010; Barker-Ruchti *et al.,* 2016; Iserbyt *et al.,* 2016). The data below provides clarity on how this is contextually applied to institutional learning culture:

> **Interview Question:**
> *(Sub Question) With the coach development/education that you have had, do you feel like it's tailored to your personal development?*
> *"The coach developers that I have dealt with have always been slightly isolated. As if they're following a continuum that's been set out by the organisation that prevents them or, erm, maybe restricts them is the better term, from doing or saying what they may feel is best.*
> *I think learning opportunities can be provided to you but it's down to you as the coach to make it into long term development because they will do what has to be done, learning is a process between two people so if something is provided to you by coach developers then it's down to you to apply that."*
> (Coach 3)

> **Interview Question:**
> *(Sub question) If not education, tell me what you perceive coach development to look like? Do you feel like this is provided for you?*
> *"There has never been a time where I felt like my development has come from something that has been provided for me by *my institution. They provide what they need for their own organisational gain. Our development is separate from that in my opinion. It's all through the experiences we create for ourselves."*
> (Coach 4).

Nash and Sproule (2012) advocate that for coach learning to be effective, coach educators should recognise the interest biases of individuals within the learning environment. They go on to explain that educational interests are shaped by the physical, social, and educational provisions of previous organisations meaning that as coaches engage in coach education, there is a need to modify and situate learning that is tailored to the individual (see also: Hodkinson *et al.,* 2008; Cushion and Lyle, 2010).

Arguably, as the data below demonstrates that coaches engage in learning opportunities that sit outside of the formal coach education setting, there is an element of learning the culture whilst already obtaining the knowledge. Thus, it poses the question as to whether institutions and coaching education organisations are willing to recognise this in the modification of their educational process. Based on this interpretation, coaches appear to tailor their practice to their employment, whether

that be the terms of their contract, the relationships with other practitioners or organisation values. The consequence of this is that coaching knowledge and the coach learning therein is niched to the expectations and cultural context of the institution as opposed to the learner (coach).

> **Interview Question:**
> *Take a minute to think of your progression as a coach. Can you recognise critical moments where you feel as though you had a significant learning moment and or developed as a coach?*
> *I was in Belgium and I shadowed the GB Junior Assistant coach (at the time) and we had conversation at the end of our session and that was quite pivotal in reaffirming or somewhat guiding the feel or shape of what I think coaching should look like or what it should be. It was a big learning point for me.*
> *It started to give me a feel for a framework for what I might later describe as a coaching philosophy. If before this conversation, someone had asked me what my philosophy is, I don't think I would know. Whereas after this conversation, I felt more confident and happier in what I'm doing and how I feel about coaching is not miles off the mark of how other successful GB coaches, coach. Which is a good thing because I was aware that I coached very differently to the current head coach at the time and I was constantly in doubt of how far I am barking up the wrong tree, but it turns out there is more than one way to skin a cat.*
> **(Coach 3).**

It is worth highlighting Biesta's *et al.* (2019) work here, as they restate that despite the growth and socio-cultural application to education fundamentally, knowledge is the practical application of learning and learning is a continual change in behaviour in the given context which does not solely rely on the human mind but the continuous interaction with its environment and those within it (see also: Biesta and Tedder, 2007; Biesta *et al.,* 2019). Therefore, not only is there a need to tailor education to individual bias but there is a requirement for organisational structures and employers who house coaches and, thus, their development, to partner their values, ethos and priorities to coach education and the message it relays (Piggot, 2012; Mallet *et al.,* 2019). Furthermore, within an educational setting (field) we refer to formal, non-formal, and informal learning and how this is considered with individual bias, in terms of their continual and or limited perception of what is the preferred method of learning. Through a Bourdieusian lens, it is logical to look further into the power of institutional environment that influences the habitus of the coaches within. As coaches within this study advocate unplanned learning experience, the assumption can be made that formal learning is embedded into coach practice for the beneficial gain of institution as opposed to the educational gain of the coach (Phelan and Griffiths, 2019). This suggests that formal learning is less favoured in coach learning;

learning is better unstructured and aligned to the needs of the individual (Nelson and Cushion, 2006; Mallet et al., 2009).

4.4 The movement in culture for future practice:

Coaches and practitioners alike should recognise culture to be a fluid concept that is everchanging and bound in contextual environments. Bourdieu provides numerous thinking tools (capital, field, habitus, and relational thinking) (Rawolle and Lingard, 2013) that might aid the understanding of the complex relationship between coach learning and learning culture. The influence of coach learning and culture on an individual is based on the cultural landscape and the individual's dispositions towards the varying types of capital (cultural, social and economic) that are possessed (Bourdieu, 1986). In the context of this study, the concept of social capital can be interpreted through a different light whereby social capital is the product of the individual and the cultural context they are within. In using Bourdieu's work in this interpretation, it could be suggested that social capital does not always refer to the explicit version that Bourdieu claims social capital to be. Instead, it refers more to the communication, interaction, and participation within the individual's cultural landscape. Highlighting that social capital is not something that is simply assumed (Hodkinson *et al.,* 2008; Brock, 2009).

To confirm this supposition, the sample within this study highlight their opinions of the movement in cultural expectations in coach education and the socialised learning practices therein.

> *"There is a huge difference between 10 years of experience and 1 year of experience repeated 10 times. I think with professions like teaching and coaching, or pedagogy related; it's really easy to assume an older coach or teacher is better because they are more experienced. However, if you layer your learning carefully, you can be on par if not better than those with years more experience than you. It's a matter of evolving as opposed to adopting what you learn."*
>
> **(Conversational Quote, Coach 4, Field Note, January 2020).**
>
> *"There is a whole body of coaches that had this job before me and each of those learnt from their experience as an athlete and as a coach. I'd like to think I'm very different from the coach I had but then, it's only because I don't repeat what I didn't like. Mm, I'm not sure that's fair actually, I think you adapt it a bit but it's not much different."*
>
> **(Conversational Quote, Coach 2 Field Note, February 2020).**
>
> **Interview Question:**
>
> *Why does this stand out to you as a critical learning moment?*

I was at GB trials and I went on a bike ride with two other coaches who are both highly respected in GB rowing. It was fascinating. I had one who was an excellent technician who talked a lot and was focussed on really understanding the underpinning science of the stroke and the other coach who was always pushing to see results and movement otherwise it just didn't work for him. So, it allowed me to sit there and reflect on my practice and I think ultimately it gave me confidence that both of these coaches have completely different philosophies and styles yet are both segments of the same coaching paradigm.

This made me think about where I put my energy into my coaching. It's not necessarily what I'm coaching but how I'm coaching it and how I'm communicating it. Is it authentic to me as a person and my personality? You get more respect from your athletes if you are authentic to yourself.

(Coach 4).

A prominent reflection of this data is that both coaches talk of experience as opposed to education when referring to the preferred method of development. Moreover, both coaches on different occasions talk of *"evolving"* and *"adapting"* their practice, highlighting the willingness to embed themselves into the process of socialisation, learn from others (contextually) and apply in their own setting. It could be suggested that coaches are willing to learn from each other if the learning is delivered by an individual who is perceived to have equal capital to those who are learning. Here it's highlighted that coach behaviours are representative of a legacy before them within their previous engagement. This is supported in the work of Cushion (2007) and Jones (2006) where coaching is encouraged to be a process of a critical reciprocation, as opposed to gaining credibility through a course that suits coaches to a criterion.

Thus, in referring back to the notion of informal, non-formal, and formal learning, it causes reason to question the possibility of modifying coach education to a non-formal and informal setting where the learning process becomes a practical application. As a reminder, current literature (Nelson *et al.,* 2006; Mallet *et al.,* 2009; Blackett *et al.,* 2018) advocates building reformed models of formal education that is pillared by informal learning opportunities (individualised coach development) that aims to fulfil the dynamic and complex practice that occurs daily.

This becomes more interesting when we consider that thus far, the data has exemplified that formalised coach education holds little value in the eye of the participant coaches (Cushion et al., 2003; Cushion and Jones, 2014; Iserbyt et al., 2016) but the concept of coach learning is what is deemed to be not only valuable but enthused in everyday practice. It is here that as we consider the movement of culture for future practice, the application of coach education should be suited to the habitus and

field of the individual, as advocated by Mallet *et al.,* (2009). To simplify, the coaches in this sample are housed by separate institutions that offer different developmental pathways and their learning and, or development should not reflect the same process as the other (Armour, 2012) thus, for the pathway in which they belong to perceive learning as a generalised concept could be reductionist (Avner *et al.,* 2017).

The following data highlights the unlikely perspectives that shape current coaching culture, and voice the need for further discussion and clarification around coach education and coach learning for sub-elite coaches:

> *"It's infuriating to see these coaches at these big fancy meetings, discussing how to improve coaching and sport in general, with this 'learned helplessness'. It's a bit like 'stop worrying about solutions to problems that you have self-created'".*
>
> **(Conversational Quote, Field Note, February 2020).**
>
> *"Sometimes my boss looks at me with questionable glances when I tolerate some of my coaches' behaviours but I'm not willing to firstly, change a culture that works and secondly, change the personality of someone that is a valuable asset to my team. I don't care what people think coaching should look like, we have something that works, and we are going to continue growing as team and learning from one and other".*
>
> **(Conversational Quote, Field Note, February 2020).**

As this study looks to understand the culture in and around coach learning, it has been necessary to become familiar with coach education in its entirety to facilitate a clearer understanding of how it is represented in smaller fields like performance pathways, or how it is negotiated between the fields within said pathways, such as individual training centres or institutions (Cushion *et al.,* 2003; Jones, 2006). Highlighted within the data, the coaches talk of two situations whereby they situate themselves in a position of power in a sense that they are forced to take control of their own learning in the construction of what is deemed valuable learning. Linking to the work of Coakley and Pike (2009) where the complex, developmental process of socialisation encourages individuals to adopt a social system, it can be assumed that as socialisation talks of adopting characteristics to improve performance, it has perhaps been recognised that coaches best learn from other coaches in practice as opposed to coach educators. Therefore, a consideration to make is that coaches in this study are stepping away from the formalised expectations of learning. With this in mind and with what is highlighted in the data, the coaches within this study appear to be incidentally challenging the current culture around coach learning by offering controversial or arguably, challenging what the culture is traditionally viewed to be. Therefore, it can be recognised that those who sit outside of the formal

education format (coaches) are identifying the need and want to integrate a meaningful change to restate the value of knowledge within coach education and the learning practices therein as a cultural and socialised process (Jones, 2006; Cushion, 2007).

In this analysis of results, it can be argued that for coach learning to be best facilitated there is a need for a broadened and wider perspective on the educational process and how this can be situated within individual fields (Bourdieu, 1977; Hodkinson *et al.,* 2008; Cushion *et al.,* 2010; Blackett *et al.,* 2018). In this context, this means formalised coach education would benefit from including coaches in the creation of their education to provide learning opportunities that are contextual and socialised to their landscape. Thus, as we lead into the conclusive chapter of this thesis, we recognise that within the four themes there has been a continual pull towards the notion of informal, contextual, and socialised learning. In saying this, to effectively create a cultural shift there is a need for the change to be co-created whereby coach education constructs content, criteria, and learning opportunities that are centred around the learning and development of the coach learners in question. In saying this, there is a need to recognise that the data exemplified coaches conforming to social and cultural capital when shaping their identity, in addition to the behavioural and experienced legacies before them. The following and final chapter will provide clarity on the construction of socialised and cultural coaching practice and the nuances it presents.

5.0 Conclusion:

To begin the concluding thoughts to this thesis, the following chapter will draw out the conclusive findings from the four themes that were presented in the data. Each suggestive finding will aim to provide clarity on the perceptions of coaching knowledge and the learning therein to establish how coaches come to know what they do. In highlighting this change, this study has provided a Bourdieusian lens that explores the learning culture within high performing institutions that has uncovered the preference of informal and socialised learning facilitated within the social and contextualised environment. This approach has been valuable in characterising coaches learning in practice through investigations of the social happenings throughout the coaches working lives.

In recognising that coaching behaviour reflects the legacy of previous engagements with coaching practice (for example, replicating the coaches from their time as athletes) (Gilbert, *et al.,* 2006; Erickson *et al.,* 2008) the consistent finding within the study was to suggest that coaches can be seen as active agents in the creation of coaching knowledge and the learning practices therein. As such, there is a benefit in coach education, and the institutions that house coach learners, to consider the individual subjectivities of coaches as they grow and develop within everchanging coach practice. The findings from this study demonstrate reference to the varied and complex nature of this study and thus, the difficulty in fulfilling the research question. The themes within the discussion break down to suggest various considerations that may beneficially influence a positive change in the world of coach education.

The most prominent finding throughout the data and through the summary of key findings is the importance of perceiving the limitations of education from a macroscopic perspective. To explain further, it has become clear that, in the case of this sample, the value of formal learning derived from the creation of courses that credits coaches with a working status, however, the difficulty in this is that each coach held different opinions on the creditability of knowledge and the learning processes therein. From this, this thesis recognised that the issues that have been argued in this study apply to coach education but also, can be seen within wider education as a collective (Gheradi, 2008).

The research question that drove this study was “How is coaching knowledge, and the learning practices therein, socialised within a particular coaching population?”. To be able to answer that, the sub-questions within were ‘What is the value of formalised coach education and how does this transfer into socialised practice?’, ‘How does pre-existing culture define behaviour and the learning

process within?', 'What determines a 'good coach?' and How does formal coach education facilitate that?'. In saying that, there has been recognition to the fact that within each sub-question there are areas, namely, identity, reflection, indoctrination, situated practices, and expertise, that have been clarified in order to fulfil an answer to the research question and the sub questions within. In answering this, the study controversially recognises that the findings within the research are potentially problematic on a scale much bigger than coach education when looking at sport collectively and the NGBs that house coach learners. Consequently, there are two parts to concluding this study, firstly the indefinite response to the research question, and, from here, the necessities required in future practice to fulfil the limitations of this study.

5.1 Conclusion of themes:

This study partners literature with data to highlight the surrounding limitations of coach education which encourages the suggestion that learning providers (i.e., NGBs) may benefit from recognising an approach to learning that is facilitated through socialised and contextual practices (see: (Mallet *et al.,* 2009; Cushion, 2003; Jones *et al.,* 2010; Hassanin and Light 2014; Stodter and Cushion, 2014; Cushion and Jones, 2014; Blackett *et al*., 2019). Theme 4.1 posed the suggestion that coaching is manipulated through the negotiation of power within the individual fields (Rynne, 2013). The gap between education and practice is often considered to be too far a leap for formal coach education to facilitate learning (Trudel, 2005 and Corsby, 2017; Gilbert). This causes reason to question why organisations and institutions insist on the formal educational process in place for current and upcoming coaches (Rowe, 2017). Thus, the difficulty lies in recognising that within formalised coach education, it could be argued that the learning opportunities are centred around the negotiation of power in terms of which actions, behaviours and decisions situate them in a less vulnerable position. For example, coaches will engage in learning that offers value to their status (capital) however learning does not effectively take place if it challenges their capital within the field of learning.

The content that is deemed as coaching knowledge, may not necessarily adhere to or recognise individual learner needs, and thus the culture around formal coach education and the concept of certified competencies holds little value in the eyes of coaches as learners. However, it does not go without saying that when talking of learning cultures, we pose the threat of assuming the field in which an individual is situated within represents and dictates the traits and ethos that the individual holds (Kumar, 2005; Hodkinson *et al.,* 2008). Inherently, this means that by simply being in the right field, it does not provide the ultimate solution to learning; there is a need for contextual and socialised

practice in varying fields to be within a continuous and critical learning cycle of current coaching knowledge (Blackett *et al.,* 2019).

Thus, in the movement of changing culture to benefit future practice, coach education would benefit from being suited to the habitus and field of the individual (Mallet *et al.,* 2009). There is a need to recognise that some coaches, albeit the assumed minority, may benefit from the chronological and assessed structure of formal education, meaning that coaches within a certain learning culture may not share the same attitude to learning (Armour, 2012). Highlighting that learners (coaches) would benefit from being at the centre of the learning opportunities provided to them.

With this in mind, the data within this study challenges current culture around coaching knowledge and the learning therein through unpicking the underlying connotations to formalised coach education. Although understood in a negative light, it is here that we restate the opportunity to recreate, or more importantly, co-create the conceptions of coach education. As coaches begin to identify the need and want for a tangible change in their learning and thus their education, it can be realised that in debating the accumulation of learning and knowledge, the solution is embedded within a critical learning cycle where there is continual opportunity for all parties to engage in learning opportunities (Jones 2006; Cushion, 2007). Therefore, a solution could be that coach education would benefit from reflecting more opportunities within the curricular for the coaches to engage in critical learning.

Here, it is appropriate to highlight the value of using Bourdieu as a theoretical framework to make sense of this study. Throughout this thesis the discussion surrounds how coaches in various settings have stepped away from formalised coach education to make sense of the value in socialised and cultural practices within their setting. As mentioned throughout, Bourdieu's notions of habitus, field, and capital make sense of the actions, decisions, and construction of knowledge that has aided the interpretation of the data throughout this study to determine the value of knowledge and the learning process therein. As mentioned previously, Bourdieu (2004) stated that practitioners would benefit from moving close to the site of practice to complete 'the sociological picture' which highlights that the field of education can be perceived as a defined situation that is created by a system of individuals that hold particular social positions. Thus, in recognising the academic framework of this study, Bourdieu's work offers insight into interpreting coach education as a socialised and cultural practice. It does not go without saying that the work of Bourdieu has been utilised in various sociological studies prior to this one (Cushion, 2003; Cushion and Jones, 2012; Townsend and Cushion, 2017; Townsend and Cushion 2020) which influenced the positive utilisation of this lens and how it can best make sense

of sociological data. This is where it can be understood that the habitus, field and capital of the coach highlighted clear disparity in the understanding of coach education (and that of what it provides), coaches as learners, and the educational pathways they pursue (Downham, 2020). Thus, in utilising Bourdieu as an academic framework, the study provided the opportunity to unfold data in line with the individual traits, the environmental influences and the socio-dynamic relationships within.

This is explicitly understood in the theme 4.2 where it can be recognised that the knowledge (that is perceived to be) *given* within formalised coach education may not hold value in the identity of a coach. The coaches within this study demonstrated a need to justify or rationalise their behaviour which highlighted the lack of confidence in their knowledge as a coach and, arguably the value of the knowledge they have learnt within coach education. Further to this, the discussion detailed that coaches reshaped their identity based on the environment they were situated in and this varied depending on the audience and or context. In line with the work of Bourdieu, the coaches made assumptions of the required role for the field they are in and use their habitus to adopt a desired image that builds the appropriate capital for the contextual environment (Taylor and Garratt, 2010).

Here, we discover that learning, or in this case, knowledge, may not be perceived as the most important factor in the creation of 'good coaches' when the capital of the coach is recognised (Baker and Faulkner, 2009). To further support this, a distinct part of the data talks of coaches encouraging unique and unplanned learning experiences as they are deemed to be (by the coaches withing this study) most beneficial to practice. There is a general response to formal learning that resonates with the idea of information retention, pass or fail (Gheradi, 2008). In other words, it could be suggested that formal education and the learning therein, is measured by memory and action (O'Dwyer and Bowles, 2020). Thus, when those who are receiving the learning advocate for that of which is not currently provided in formal education (in most sports), it becomes questionable as to why these courses are in place. It could be argued that the formalised education system provides legalities and insurance to house a 'qualified' coach and thus the debatable rationale for these courses is arguably for institutional gain as opposed to learning.

In this sense it can be suggested that through accreditation comes reputation, and thus the assumption can be made that formal learning encourages growth in coaching practice for the beneficial gain of the institution that is representing the coach, rather than to the learning development of the coach (Phelan and Griffiths, 2019). Further supporting this assumption, Engeström's (2001) work demonstrates that learning theory does not often recognise the significance of social power which then supports the notion that coaches base their learning around institutional structures and the micropolitics within. In line with the research question and with Bourdieu's notion

of social capital, the concluding belief suggests that the idea of coaching knowledge (and what counts as knowledge) is determined through capital. The assumption of power between the coach learner and the educator further suggests that educators may impart knowledge as opposed to facilitating learning and, thus, highlights the limited acknowledgement towards individualised and authentic learning that is reflective of context.

The threat that lies in this assumption is the underpinning message that can be interpreted by coaches in the educational process. To explain further, when considering that institutions and organisations have the power to manage and influence the content that is provided in coach education, there is little room for input on the learning methods from the coach learners. As advocated by Smith and Smoll (2012), coaches lessen their opinion of coach education as it is perceived to have little value in the attempt to 'reinvent the wheel'. Kemmis *et al.* (2012, p.892) further support this in saying "practices also exist against a backdrop of practice traditions", suggesting that, in the context of this study, formal tradition is counteracting modern, critical practice within coach education. Again, recognising that for a cultural shift in coach education to occur, it would be beneficial to invite coaches as co-creators of their own educational pathway.

In addition to this finding, there is a need to highlight the importance of individuality within the learning process. The issue that coach learning and coach education presents is that within coaching practice, there is a continual negotiation of power inequalities that are pivotal to daily practice and to a wider extent, any social setting (Gheradi,2008; Warwick *et al.,* 2017). Therefore, situated practices are perhaps not recognising that individuals liken themselves to one and other to increase social power within the field of their institution and from this, it could be suggested that recent uses of coach educators might be a tentative move in supporting the development of the coach. Here, it is recognised that with the promise of social learning, comes drawbacks to current coaches in situ.

5.2 Methodological Considerations:

With consideration to the growth in research that has been conducted in the fields of coach education, coach learning, coach development, and the culture of sports coaching, the difficulty lies in generalising this work to significantly contribute to the solution of various research. The outcome of this thesis was not to produce generalisations around the concept of this study; in its nature, that would go against the epistemological stance of interpretivism (Denzin and Lincoln, 2005). Having said that, the content that this study provides is that of which can offer insight into closely related contexts

(Silverman, 2005). As such, it could be argued that the influence of socialised learning for the coaches in this study, on the construction of knowledge, could be an additional benefit to learning environments for future coaches who are following in step to those within this study. It is important to recognise that the value of this study lies in examining how coaching knowledge and the learning therein is constructed through socialised, cultural practice, as opposed to conclusively fulfilling a solution to research.

As discussed in the methodology, research in education, identity, historical cultures in sport, and their relevance to the sociological study of sport is not limited nor underdeveloped. Therefore, it would be erroneous to claim that this study has considerably developed knowledge. However, the contribution that this study makes is through demonstrating and drawing upon the complimentary surrounding fields of coaching knowledge and the learning therein by providing insight into a sociological phenomenon, in this case, the culture that surrounds coach education for high performing coaches.

To explain further, the ontological and epistemological paradigm adopted in this study helps to establish the complex negotiation between the purpose of coach education and the behaviours that distinguish coaching knowledge and the learning therein. Whilst it is advocated that this approach demonstrates the benefits of framing behaviour, it should not go without mentioning the overabundance of alternative methodologies that could also prove beneficial to this research. In saying this, it is worth considering my personal position within this study. As a participant researcher the limitation of potential bias posed as high risk in the duration of this study. Through embedding myself into the process, there is the possibility of interpreting the data within this study through a lens of bias in terms of interpretation and, or opinion to prior literature. In saying this, the value of this stems from the intuitive knowledge that can be applied to the data, thus creating a richer and clearer perspective of how and why coaches have come to do as they do. Throughout this section there is consideration to the negative implications of social learning however, the risk is lesser to the positive change this study may influence in future practice.

The data talks of varying social constructions and symbolic interactions that exemplify the avenues in which methodological analysis could adopt. It is worth noting that this perspective does not define my findings as irrelevant or invalid. Furthermore, data in this study provides concise and informative discussions with the participants regarding the topics of identity, indoctrination, coach education, and the value of learning which provides detailed account and insight to the contrasting explanations of the research question. Whilst bringing together the main findings of this research into four themes poses risk of oversimplifying the nuances within this topic, the data clearly establishes the

discrepancies between how coaches perceive their learning to take place and the formalised, educational pathways that are currently in place (that is nuanced by nature).

Within discussion point 4.4 a key part of the data highlighted that the coaches in this study talk of experience rather than education when referring to the best form of personal development and learning. Furthermore, the coaches express their want to learn from peers or colleagues through socialised practice but question the value of knowledge that is categorised within formal coach education. Posing the consideration that some coaches are willing to learn from each other if the learning is delivered by an individual who is perceived to have the relevant capital that demonstrates a positive and knowledgeable addition to their learning. Seconding this, it could be suggested here that coach behaviours are representative of a legacy of past engagements. Therefore, in terms of answering the research question, the coaches within this study have critically inherited practice from individuals before them highlighting that their knowledge and the learning therein is socialised from the historical dispositions of individuals that have educated their learning process. Again, suggesting that coaching is encouraged to be a process of a critical reciprocation (Jones 2006; Cushion, 2007). Again, it is highlighted that with the consideration of learning being non-linear and nuanced, social learning does not consider the vulnerability that lies within power, control and tradition which steers the direction of current coaches in practice.

In identifying this, a consideration for future practice is underpinned by the recognition that coaches who situate their learning outside of the formal setting are identifying the need and want to increase the value of knowledge within coach education and the learning practices therein by implementing meaning to action through socialised and contextual learning (Jones, 2006; Cushion, 2007). Again, there are consistent messages that are spread out throughout the data within this assignment that suggest that coaches negotiate the validity of knowledge through social power and that of which produces the most beneficial solution for the coach.

In concluding the final part of this study, there are four key considerations to consider for future practice. Coach education, in a formalised sense follows an uncritical process of reproducing knowledge time and again and, thus, the learning process undertaken by coaches also follows an uncritical cycle in parts. In saying this, it can be suggested that formal coach education does not facilitate the socialised and contextual reflections that present themselves in daily practice. Therefore, when establishing how coaches have come to learn their methods and philosophy, it can be assumed that this is built from shared practice within informal and formal NGB settings. As discussed previously, coaches formulate their identity through habitus, capital, and field (continuously), thus it can be recognised that the application of formal education could benefit from changing to a more contextual

and socialised approach to positively benefit the journey of learning and development for coaches in high performing sport. Therefore, in completing this study it can be recognised that the culture within coach education will proceed to incidentally uncritically replicate knowledge until National Governing Bodies, in their 'learner centred' approach, recognise that contextual, socialised and informal learning holds value in the progression of *good* coaching.

6.0 Appendices

6.1 Appendix 1:

Interview Questions:

1. Describe to me in detail what your role is and what is entailed within it.

2. What are your first thoughts when I mention the term “coach education”?

3. What are your thoughts on how coaches may interpret learning opportunities and does your response include yourself?

4. Would you consider your growth and or development as a coach is a priority to those above you?

5. Take a minute to think of your progression as a coach. Can you recognise critical moments where you feel as though you had a significant learning moment and or developed as a coach?

6. Do you feel willing to put yourself in a vulnerable position as a coach- if yes, can you describe a moment where you have felt most vulnerable as a coach?

7. If you could describe the best way for you to develop as a coach, what would be the approach you’d take?
   (Think of what you might change about what you are doing now, your interaction with other coaches, the use of external professions. An action plan to better yourself…).

8. Do you find yourself acting or thinking differently on a Start camp in comparison to the boat house? Either yes or no- detail how and why.

9. Can you specify one conversation which you have had with another coach or colleague where you believe you walked away wanting to challenge your thinking and develop yourself further?

10. Do you think that the educational courses provided by British Rowing have made a positive impact on your development as a coach? (I.e- level 2).

11. If you could change the educational process for up and coming coaches and for yourself moving forward. What would it look like?

12. Tell me what you perceive coach development to look like? Do you feel like this is provided for you?

13. Is your coaching identity bound by what you have learnt or what you believe needs to be seen?
14. Tell me about the coaching culture you maintain.

15. Is your reflection process valuable? Do you make the time to be both reflexive and reflective and implement this in future practice?

6.2 Appendix 2:
Audio Transcriptions:

Audio Transcriptions of conversation in part:

There is an imbalance between the following statement: coaches (interns) are not showing that they are capable enough of being trusted and as a result, are not being seen as capable and or trustworthy.

Coach: When a conversation happens between the coaches, the head coach will approach the conversation with the intention to listen and be questioned but then will carefully manner the response into a justification of why he is right (sometimes with slight alterations).

Conversation is diverted.

"I'd like to have more structure in the training programme- I think the athletes perform better when they can mentally prepare".

"I'm struggling to get X to understand that- because he says he agrees but I feel like I need to make it his idea for it to actually happen."

"He has a master plan where he looks at the macroscopic training programme and can see the end goals but it's just a structure with no plan".

Coach states analogy that is: Building a house without a home- you can see from an outer perspective that it's a house but with no session plan, there is no building of the home. Therefore it's difficult.

Coach- X struggles most in giving people the opportunity to do things.

Coach: "I sometimes feel like X does trust me and then other times he doesn't which then causes doubt."

Coach: "I really like the one on one sessions because I feel more invested in their training. I know their goals and what they want and as a coach you can get behind it".

Unclear audio-
He also thinks he should invest more into to the athletes that aren't involved in the 1o1s.

There's external support there and no structural conversation.

There is a culture for injured athletes returning to play- they want to improve and get better and they have this want to perform. They want the athletes to have this at the start. They are failing to realise that they have created this culture and therefore they need to allow time to let the athletes embed themselves into the culture.

Time of Audio: 10-12:00pm
Date: Monday 7th October.
Transcribed: 8th October.

6.3 Appendix 3:

Field Notes.

Diary of events.	Date and Information.
I'm walking along the river bank with Harry and we're talking about his job role as it labels 'assistant' but his work load is quite heavy. Back and forth we talk about how he fell into this role and how him and the lead coaches were all in the same boat (literally), and now they are all leading different roles. After a short pause, he explains "Arron will often feel targeted when you suggest a change in something that is in his control. That's not a fault of his but he is incredibly hard on himself and takes it personally." "So, what's your point?" I ask. "Well, the change never happens because of that reason. I will get a half-hearted response to something and then two weeks later, he's saying the exact idea I had but claims it as his own. I don't know, it's weird. It's this sense of challenge that one of us has to be the best. I don't personally care, but the others do".	16/11/2019 Session one. Mid- session chat- skills testing.
'The whirring of the ergo fans fill the room as all athletes are completing a UT2 session. Adam is on the opposite side of the room and has his head slightly tilted to the left whilst looking intently at an athlete's body position but also looking a little perplexed. He stays like this for about 5 minutes. He came and leant on the wall by me. I couldn't help myself "Why do you do that look all the time?" I asked. "What look?" he said. "You know, the one where you rub your chin, look deep in thought which your head tilted to the left? You always do it". "Haha you're not the only person that's pointed that out. I am actually thinking whilst I am doing it but it's what my coach used to do to me when I was a rower, it's just sort of stuck with me". We laughed it off and he carried on coaching. Pointing out different but not too dissimilar coaching points to each athlete.	09/01/2020 Session five. Ergo Session. 2k test.
We were just about to walk up to the café for the coaches meeting when both Alex and Jamie* receive an email resulting in them not being able to make the meeting.* *The assistant coach starts scrolling on his phone completely unphased whereas Alex seems on edge and a bit flustered. "They won't make the most of this time if we don't go, I might just cancel it." Alex talks over to Jamie. "Probably a*	21/10/2019 Session 12 Informal conversation- coaches meeting to take place.

bit late to do that since they're probably all here by now" Adam responds. *I spend the morning pottering over tasks whilst still completely puzzled at the stress of allowing five adults (institution practitioners and interns) have a meeting without them. Eventually it's just Alex and I in the office and I ask him "Does it bother you to let them do the meeting themselves?". A long pause lingered whilst he thought over his answer. "I don't want to lose control. I'm not confident in my ability to communicate it well enough for them to do it themselves without me. I know that part of that is the inner control freak in me but… coaches here spend a lot of time listening to me but don't always voice their own thoughts. Especially if it challenges mine. So, I guess my answer is, I know where I stand when I am there. But when I'm not, I don't know what my role is in terms of what I do for them".*	

6.4 Appendix 4:

Study title:

'How did I learn all this stuff?': The socialisation of coaching knowledge and learning practices within a sub-elite coaching population.

Invitation Paragraph:

You are being invited to take part in a specific research study exploring the underlying cultural conceptions of *knowing* and *learning* within the sub-elite context. Ahead of making the decision to part-take within this study; it is important for you to read below and understand why the research is taking place, what your information will aid within the study.

What is the purpose of the study?

The purpose is to produce a study that highlights both previous and current limitations within coach education and to further determine how we can deviate away from the parochial coaching culture that is currently presented. The researcher aims to form an understanding of what has arguably, caused the limitations in coach learning at present to present a proposed solution or the foundations of what could be recognised for future coaches and practitioners alike in terms of coaching culture and education. The study will efficiently analyse the data, results and present a final piece that is accessible for all coaches, athletes and professional personnel within the sporting industry.

Why have I been asked to participate?

This study is looking to gather rich data from numerous paths within the sub elite context to provide a contextual background to the study and its results. A preliminary study will take place with multiple individuals varying from athletes, sporting professionals and coaches to then provide a foundation whereby the researcher will merely be looking for the practitioner's current perspective on the coaching, education and learning to grasp an idea of what the 'coaching culture' is interpreted to be, from someone within. The study will then look to observe and interview 4-6 coaches intensely throughout to apply the knowledge, literature and ideologies to current practice. The reason you have been invited or this study is either because you fit into one of the categories previously mentioned for the preliminary study or because you are a coach within the sub-elite context which makes you eligible to be a candidate within this study.

Do I have to take part?

The choice is yours entirely as to whether or not you wish to take part in this study. If you decide that you will take part, you will be provided with a consent form that you will need to sign, and a copy of this information sheet will be provided for you to keep. It is worth noting that this study is 100% voluntary, and should you wish to withdraw at any moment, you may do so without reason.

What will happen to me if I take part?

If you have chosen to take part in this study, you will be observed through your work whereby you are allowing the researcher to take notes and reflect within the study. The participants who have been observed will be required to sit through a private interview whereby they will be asked to answer approximately 10-15 questions, over an estimated period of thirty minutes. The data provided will then be transcribed and compared with other data to highlight common areas of interest within the results section of the study.

What are the possible benefits of taking part?

You will have been chosen for this study as your profession or interest is valid for the data collection. Therefore, come the end of the study, you will be provided with a copy of the write up which will further aid your knowledge and understanding of coaching culture, education and learning.

Will what I say or do in this study stay confidential?

Within this study, the research collected will be strictly confidential, subject to any legal limitations. The research is conducted by only myself and observed by my advisor. From there, any information collected will be documented and then disposed of to ensure confidentially is kept. Privacy and anonymity is optional however when being spoke of, candidates will be referred to as 'interviewees' or 'coach' regardless. Further supporting this, data may be stored in Google Drive, for which the University has a security agreement and I state that all data will be kept securely, electronically for a period of ten years post completion of my Project Dissertation.

What should I do if I want to take part?

The research throughout this project will be conducted through the form of interviews and observation, once your consent and signature has been given, your data will become part of the study. I, the researcher, will be in touch throughout the study to update you of the process. As this study will be using a purposive sampling approach, those who would like to take part who hasn't been asked directly can put forth their thought for the preliminary foundation study.

What will happen to the research results of this study?

The data collected will be used in my dissertation to support or argue against any current literature to create a supported opinion of the current issues and the solutions for them. Should the opportunity of publication arise then I will personally be in contact with those involved to guide those who want a copy of the published research.

Who is funding the research?

I am a master's student at Oxford Brookes University conducting research to aid my dissertation study as my final project. This project is not being funded by any organisation and is being independently led.

Who has reviewed the study?

With regards to the review, the study and research has been approved by the University Research Ethics Committee, Oxford Brookes University.

Contact information:

If the need for further information is required you may email me (Laura Dorrell) at: LauraJDorrell@gmail.com or alternatively, email my supervisor (Dr Simon Phelan) at: sphelan@brookes.ac.uk.

If you feel you have any concerns over the way the study is being or has been conducted, then please contact the Chair of the University Research Ethics Committee on ethics@brookes.ac.uk.

Thank you:

Thank you, kindly for taking the time to read through this information sheet and in advance to your decision of taking part.
10/09/2018

6.5 Appendix 5:

OXFORD BROOKES UNIVERSITY

CONSENT FORM

Full title of Project: **A cultural exploration of how coaches know and learn in the sub-elite context.**

Name, position and contact address of Researcher:

Laura Dorrell

Post Graduate MSc Masters by Research student.

Oxford Brookes University. Faculty of Health and Life Sciences.

Mobile: 07814453449.

		Please initial box	
		Y	N
1.	I confirm that I have read and understand the information sheet for the above study and have had the opportunity to ask questions.	☐	
2.	I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw at any time, without giving reason.	☐	
3.	I agree to take part in the above study.	☐	
4.	I agree to the interview and the process of observation.	☐	☐
5.	I agree to the interview to be recorded and for the observation notes to be recorded.	☐	☐
6.	I agree to the use of anonymised quotes in publications.	☐	☐
7.	I agree that an anonymised data set, gathered for this study may be stored in a specialist data centre/repository relevant to this subject area for future research [This must also be included in the privacy notice]	☐	☐

Name of Participant	Date	Signature
Name of Researcher	Date	Signature

6.6 Appendix 6:

E3/FH&LS

Oxford Brookes University

Faculty of Health and Life Sciences

Decision on application for ethics approval

The Departmental Research Ethics Officer (DREO) has considered the application for ethics approval for the following project:

Project Title: A cultural exploration of how coaches know and learn in the sub elite context.

DREC Reference: 1218_40

Name of Applicant/s: Laura Dorrell

Name of Supervisor/s: Simon Phelan, John Jakeman

Please tick one box

1. The Departmental Research Ethics Officer / Faculty Research Ethics Committee gives ethical approval for the research project. ☑

   Please note that the research protocol as laid down in the application and hereby approved must not be changed without the approval of the DREO / FREC

2. The Departmental Research Ethics Officer / Faculty Research Ethics Committee gives ethical approval for the research project, subject to the following: ☐

3. The Departmental Research Officer / Faculty Research Ethics Committee cannot give ethical approval for the research project. The reasons for this and the action required are as follows: ☐

Signed: .....
Approval Date: ... 14/01/2019.....

Designation: Departmental Research Ethics Officer

(Signed on behalf of the Faculty Research Ethics Committee)

Date when application reviewed (*office use only*):.....17/12/2018.....

H&LS/FRec/E3 August 2011

7.0 References:

1. Abraham, A., & Collins, D. (1998). Examining and extending research in coach development. *Quest*, *50*(1), 59-79.
2. Acocella, I. (2012). The focus groups in social research: advantages and disadvantages. *Quality & Quantity*, *46*(4), 1125-1136.
3. Alvesson, M., Hardy, C., & Harley, B. (2008). Reflecting on reflexivity: Reflexive textual practices in organization and management theory. *Journal of management studies*, *45*(3), 480-501.
4. Anderson, B. (2006). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*.
5. Armour, K. M., Jones, R., & Potrac, P. (2004). *Sports coaching cultures: From practice to theory*.
6. Armour, K. (2010). The learning coach… the learning approach: Professional development for sports coach professionals. *Sports coaching: Professionalisation and practice*, 153-164.
7. Alasuutari, P. (1996). Theorizing in qualitative research: A cultural studies perspective. *Qualitative Inquiry*, *2*(4), 371-384.
8. Atkinson, D. (2011). A socio-cognitive approach to second language acquisition: How mind, body, and world work together in learning additional languages. In *Alternative approaches to second language acquisition* (pp. 155-178).
9. Avner, Z., Markula, P., & Denison, J. (2017). Understanding effective coaching: A Foucauldian reading of current coach education frameworks. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, *4*(1), 101-109.
10. Baker, J. (2003). Early specialization in youth sport: A requirement for adult expertise? *High ability studies*, *14*(1), 85-94.
11. Baker, W., & Faulkner, R. R. (2009)., double embeddedness, and mechanisms of stability and change. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *52*(11), 1531-1555.
12. Bakhurst, D., & Sypnowich, C. (Eds.). (1995). *The social self* (Vol. 15).
13. Barker-Ruchti, N., Barker, D., Rynne, S. B., & Lee, J. (2016). Learning cultures and cultural learning in high-performance sport: Opportunities for sport pedagogues. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *21*(1), 1-9.
14. Becker, G. S., & Murphy, K. M. (2009). *Social economics: Market behaviour in a social environment*.
15. Becker, K., & Bish, A. (2017). Management development experiences and expectations: informal vs stod. *Education+ Training*.
16. Becket, D., & Hager, P. (2002). Life, work and learning. *Practice in postmodernity*.
17. Biesta, G. (2004). Against learning. Reclaiming a language for education in an age of learning. *Nordic Studies in Education= Nordisk Pedagogik*, *23*, 70-82.
18. Biesta, G., & Tedder, M. (2007). Agency and learning in the life course: Towards an ecological perspective. *Studies in the Education of Adults*, *39*(2), 132-149.
19. Biesta, G., Filippakou, O., Wainwright, E., & Aldridge, D. (2019). Why educational research should not just solve problems but should cause them as well. *British Educational Research Journal*, *45*(1), 1-4.
20. Blackett, A. D., Evans, A. B., & Piggott, D. (2019). “They have to toe the line”: a Foucauldian analysis of the socialisation of former elite athletes into academy coaching roles. *Sports Coaching Review*, *8*(1), 83-102.
21. Bloomer, M., & Hodkinson, P. (2000). Learning careers: continuity and change in young people's dispositions to learning. *British educational research journal*, *26*(5), 583-597.
22. Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a Theory of Practice* (Vol. 16).

23. Bourdieu, P. (1984). A social critique of the judgement of taste. *Traducido del francés por R. Nice.*
24. Bourdieu, P. (2003). Symbolic violence. In *Beyond French Feminisms* (pp. 23-26).
25. Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. (2013). Symbolic capital and social classes. *Journal of classical sociology*, *13*(2), 292-302.
26. Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (2013). *Reflection: Turning experience into learning*.
27. Bourdieu, P. (2000). *Pascalian meditations*.
28. Bourdieu, P. (2004). *Science of science and reflexivity*.
29. Bourdieu, P. (2017). Habitus. In *Habitus: A sense of place* (pp. 59-66).
30. Bransford, J., Stevens, R., Schwartz, D., Meltzoff, A., Pea, R., Roschelle, J., & Reeves, B. (2006). Learning theories and education: Toward a decade of synergy
31. Bowes, I., & Jones, R. L. (2006). Working at the edge of chaos: Understanding coaching as a complex, interpersonal system. *The sport psychologist*, *20*(2), 235-245.
32. Braun, D. A., Aertsen, A., Wolpert, D. M., & Mehring, C. (2009). Learning optimal adaptation strategies in unpredictable motor tasks. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *29*(20), 6472-6478.
33. Breen, R. L. (2006). A practical guide to focus-group research. *Journal of Geography in Higher Education*, *30*(3), 463-475.
34. Brock, V. (2009). Professional challenges facing the coaching field from an historical perspective. *International Journal of Coaching in Organizations*, *7*(1), 27-37.
35. Bryant, A., & Charmaz, K. (2010). Grounded theory in historical perspective: An epistemological account. *Handbook of grounded theory*, 31-57.
36. Burke, P. J. (2006). Identity change. *Social psychology quarterly*, *69*(1), 81-96.
37. Burke, P. J., & Reitzes, D. C. (1981). The link between identity and role performance. *Social psychology quarterly*, 83-92.
38. Burke, P. J., & Stets, J. E. (2009). *Identity theory*.
39. Callary, B., Werthner, P., & Trudel, P. (2012). How meaningful episodic experiences influence the process of becoming an experienced coach. *Qualitative research in sport, exercise and health*, *4*(3), 420-438.
40. Carson, F. (2008). Utilizing video to facilitate reflective practice: Developing sports coaches. *International journal of sports science & coaching*, *3*(3), 381-390.
41. Carter, A. D., & Bloom, G. A. (2009). Coaching Knowledge and Success: Going Beyond Athletic Experiences. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *32*(4).
42. Cassidy, T., Jones, R. L., & Potrac, P. (2004). *Understanding sports coaching: The social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice*. Routledge.
43. Champathes, M. R. (2006). Coaching for performance improvement: The "Coach" model. *Development and Learning in Organizations: An International Journal*, *20*(2), 17-18.
44. Chang, H. (2016). *Autoethnography as method* (Vol. 1).
45. Charmaz, K. (1990). 'Discovering' chronic illness: using grounded theory. *Social science & medicine*, *30*(11), 1161-1172.
46. Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*.
47. Charmaz, K. (2008). Grounded theory as an emergent method. *Handbook of emergent methods*, *155*-172.
48. Charmaz, K., & Belgrave, L. (2012). Qualitative interviewing and grounded theory analysis. *The SAGE handbook of interview research: The complexity of the craft*, *2*, 347-365.
49. Charmaz, K., & Mitchell, R. G. (2001). Grounded theory in ethnography. *Handbook of ethnography*, *160*, 174
50. Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory*. sage.

51. Christensen, M. K. (2013). Outlining a typology of sports coaching careers: Paradigmatic trajectories and ideal career types among high-performance sports coaches. *Sports Coaching Review*, *2*(2), 98-113.
52. Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2014). *Thematic analysis.* In *Encyclopedia of critical psychology* (pp. 1947-1952).
53. Coakley, J. J., & Pike, E. (2009). Sport in society: Issues and controversies.
54. Cohen, A. (2003). Ethnography and case study: a comparative analysis. *Academic Exchange Quarterly*, *7*(3), 283-288.
55. Coll, R. K., & Chapman, R. (2000). Choices of methodology for cooperative education researchers. *International Journal of Work-Integrated Learning*, *1*(1), 1.
56. Cook, M. B., & Smallman, H. S. (2008). Human factors of the confirmation bias in intelligence analysis: Decision support from graphical evidence landscapes. *Human Factors*, *50*(5), 745-754.
57. Costa, C., & Murphy, M. (2015). Bourdieu and the application of habitus across the social sciences. In *Bourdieu, Habitus and Social Research* (pp. 3-17).
58. Côté, J. (2006). The development of coaching knowledge. *International journal of sports science & coaching*, *1*(3), 217-222.
59. Côté, J., Salmela, J., Trudel, P., Baria, A. and Russell, S., The Coaching Model: A Grounded Assessment of Expert Gymnastic Coaches' Knowledge, (1995), 17 (1), 1-17.
60. Crow, G. M. (2012). A critical-constructivist perspective on mentoring and coaching for leadership. *The SAGE handbook of mentoring and coaching in education*, 228-242.
61. Cushion, C. J., & Jones, R. L. (2001). A systematic observation of professional top-level youth soccer coaches. *Journal of sport behavior*, *24*(4), 354.
62. Cushion, C. J., Armour, K. M., & Jones, R. L. (2003). Coach education and continuing professional development: Experience and learning to coach. *Quest*, *55*(3), 215-230.
63. Cushion, C. (2007). Modelling the complexity of the coaching process. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, *2*(4), 395-401.
64. Cushion, C., & Jones, R. L. (2006). Power, discourse, and symbolic violence in professional youth soccer: The case of Albion Football Club. *Sociology of sport journal*, *23*(2), 142-161.
65. 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: sports coach UK*.
66. Cushion, C. J., & Jones, R. L. (2014). A Bourdieusian analysis of cultural reproduction: Socialisation and the 'hidden curriculum' in professional football. *Sport, education and society*, *19*(3), 276-298.
67. Cushion, C., & Lyle, J. (2010). Conceptual development in sports coaching. *Sports coaching: Professionalisation and practice*, 1-13.
68. Cushion, C. J. (2018). Reflection and reflective practice discourses in coaching: A critical analysis. *Sport, education and society*, *23*(1), 82-94.
69. Corsby, C. (2017). The deconstruction and reconstruction of sports coaching: An interview with Professor Robyn Jones: A commentary. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, *12*(4), 429-431.
70. Daniels, H. (2001). Vygotsky and pedagogy.
71. Davids, K., Chow, J. Y., & Shuttleworth, R. (2005). A Constraints-based Framework for Nonlinear Pedagogy in Physical Education1. *New Zealand Physical Educator*, *38*(1), 17.

72. De Haan, D., & Sotiriadou, P. (2019). An analysis of the multi-level factors affecting the coaching of elite women athletes. *Managing Sport and Leisure*, *24*(5), 307-320.
73. Delamont, S. (2007, September). Arguments against auto-ethnography. In *Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference* (Vol. 5, p. 8).
74. Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research
75. Dey, I. (2003). *Qualitative data analysis: A user friendly guide for social scientists*. Routledge.
76. De Martin Silva, L. (2016). Sports coaching students' learning and identity development: A longitudinal study
77. Downham, L. (2020). *Understanding reflection and reflective practice in high-performance coach education* (Doctoral dissertation, Loughborough University).
78. Ellis, C., & Bochner, A. (2000). Autoethnography, personal narrative, reflexivity: Researcher as subject
79. Engeström, Y. (2001). Expansive learning at work: Toward an activity theoretical reconceptualization. *Journal of education and work*, *14*(1), 133-156.
80. Erickson, K., Bruner, M. W., MacDonald, D. J., & Côté, J. (2008). Gaining insight into actual and preferred sources of coaching knowledge. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, *3*(4), 527-538.
81. Faulkner, G., & Finlay, S. J. (2012). Arsene Didn't See It: Coaching, Research and the Promise of a Discursive Psychology A Commentary.
82. Fernandez-Balboa, J. M. (1997). Physical education teacher preparation in the postmodern era: Toward a critical pedagogy. *Critical postmodernism in human movement, physical education, and sport*, 121-138.
83. Fine, B. (2002). *Social capital versus social theory*. Routledge.
84. Finlay, L., & Gough, B. (Eds.). (2008). *Reflexivity: A practical guide for researchers in health and social sciences*.
85. Flick, U. (2014). *An introduction to qualitative research*. Sage.
86. Foucault, M. (1984). Space, knowledge and power. *The Foucault reader*, *239*(256).
87. Fram, S. M. (2013). The constant comparative analysis method outside of grounded theory. *Qualitative Report*, *18*, 1.
88. French, J. R., Raven, B., & Cartwright, D. (1959). The bases of social power. *Classics of organization theory*, *7*, 311-320.
89. Fullan, M., & Knight, J. (2011). Coaches as system leaders. *Educational leadership*, *69*(2), 50-53.
90. Fyall, G., Cowan, J., & Galvan, H. (2018). Giving voice to the nodding donkey: A critical-humanistic approach to mentoring from down under. In *Learning to Mentor in Sports Coaching* (pp. 128-147).
91. Gherardi, S. (2008). Situated knowledge and situated action: What do practice-based studies promise. *The SAGE handbook of new approaches in management and organization*, 516-525.
92. Garfinkel, H. (1967). What is ethnomethodology?. *Studies in ethnomethodology*.
93. Gibson, K., & Atkinson, M. (2018). Beyond boundaries: The development and potential of ethnography in the study of sport and physical culture. *Cultural Studies↔ Critical Methodologies*, *18*(6), 442-452.
94. Gilbert, W. D., & Trudel, P. (2005). Learning to coach through experience: Conditions that influence reflection. *Physical Educator*, *62*(1), 32.

95. Gill, P., Stewart, K., Treasure, E., & Chadwick, B. (2008). Methods of data collection in qualitative research: interviews and focus groups. *British dental journal*, *204*(6), 291-295.
96. Giacobbi, P. R., Poczwardowski, A., & Hager, P. (2005). A pragmatic research philosophy for sport and exercise psychology. *The sport psychologist*, *19*(1), 18-31.
97. Goffman, E. (2002). The presentation of self in everyday life. 1959. *Garden City, NY*, *259*.
98. Goldkuhl, G. (2012). Pragmatism vs interpretivism in qualitative information systems research. *European journal of information systems*, *21*(2), 135-146.
99. Goldthorpe, J. H. (2007). " Cultural Capital": Some Critical observations. *Sociologica*, *1*(2), 0-0.
100. Goleman, D. (2003). What makes a leader. *Organizational influence processes*, 229-241.
101. Green, J. T. (2013). Evidence-based decision making in academic research: The “Snowball” effect. *The Academic Executive Brief*, *3*(1), 12-14.
102. Greenhow, C., & Lewin, C. (2016). Social media and education: Reconceptualizing the boundaries of formal and informal learning. *Learning, media and technology*, *41*(1), 6-30.
103. Grenfell, M., & James, D. (2004). Change in the field changing the field: Bourdieu and the methodological practice of educational research. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, *25*(4), 507-523.
104. Grosseman, S., Hojat, M., Duke, P. M., Mennin, S., Rosenzweig, S., & Novack, D. (2014). Empathy, self-reflection, and curriculum choice. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Problem-Based Learning*, *8*(2), 3.
105. Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *Handbook of qualitative research*, *2*(163-194), 105.
106. Hall, E. T., Cowan, D. T., & Vickery, W. (2018). ‘You don't need a degree to get a coaching job’: investigating the employability of sports coaching degree students. *Sport, Education and Society*, 1-21.
107. Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1994). Ethnography. Research Methods. Spain.
108. Hannerz, U. (2003). Being there... and there... and there! Reflections on multi-site ethnography. *Ethnography*, *4*(2), 201-216.
109. Hansson, L. (2018). Science education, indoctrination, and the hidden curriculum. In *History, Philosophy and Science Teaching* (pp. 283-306).
110. Hartson, R. (2003). Cognitive, physical, sensory, and functional affordances in interaction design. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, *22*(5), 315-338.
111. Hassanin, R., & Light, R. (2014). The influence of cultural context on rugby coaches' beliefs about coaching. *Sports Coaching Review*, *3*(2), 132-144.
112. Henning, J. A., Ballen, C. J., Molina, S., & Cotner, S. (2019). Hidden identities shape student perceptions of active learning environments. In *Frontiers in Education* (Vol. 4, p. 129). Frontiers.
113. Hodkinson, P., Biesta, G., & James, D. (2008). Understanding learning culturally: Overcoming the dualism between social and individual views of learning. *Vocations and learning*, *1*(1), 27-47.
114. Houston, J. A. (2015). Coaching for change: Amount of instructional coaching support to transfer science inquiry skills from professional development to classroom practice

115. Howley, A., & Howley, C.B. (1995). The mechanisms of anti-intellectualism in schools. In C.B. Howley, A. Howley, & E.D. Pendarvis, (pp. 44-76). New York: Teachers College Press.
116. Hox, J. J., & Boeije, H. R. (2005). Data collection, primary versus secondary.
117. Hume, A. (2009). Promoting higher levels of reflective writing in student journals. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *28*(3), 247-260.
118. Iserbyt, P., Ward, P., & Martens, J. (2016). The influence of content knowledge on teaching and learning in traditional and sport education contexts: an exploratory study, 21(5), 539-556.
119. Iserbyt, P., Ward, P., & Li, W. (2017). Effects of improved content knowledge on pedagogical content knowledge and student performance in physical education. 22(1), 71-88.
120. Jaramillo, J. A. (1996). Vygotsky's sociocultural theory and contributions to the development of constructivist curricula. *Education*, *117*(1), 133-141.
121. Jarvie, G., & Maguire, J. (1994). Classical Marxism, political economy and beyond. *Sport and leisure in social thought.*, 86-107.
122. Johnson, D. L. (2009). *Beyond relativism: A grounded theory study of sophisticated adult personal epistemology* (Doctoral dissertation, Capella University).
123. Jones, R. L. (2006). How can educational concepts inform sports coaching?. In *The sports coach as educator* (pp. 21-31).
124. Jones, R. L., Cassidy, T. G., & Potrac, P. (2008). *Understanding sports coaching: The social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice*.
125. Jones, R.L. (2000). Toward a sociology of coaching. In R.L. Jones & K.M. Armour (Eds.), (pp. 33-43). London: Addison Wesley Longman.
126. Jones, R. L., & Thomas, G. L. (2015). Coaching as 'scaffolded' practice: Further insights into sport pedagogy. Sports Coaching Review, 4(2), 65-79.
127. Jones, R. L., Armour, K. M., & Potrac, P. (2003). Constructing expert knowledge: A case study of a top-level professional soccer coach. Sport, education and society, 8(2), 213-229.
128. Jones, R. L., Edwards, C., & Viotto Filho, I. T. (2016). Activity theory, complexity and sports coaching: An epistemology for a discipline. *Sport, education and society*, *21*(2), 200-216.
129. Jones, R. L., Armour, K. M., & Potrac, P. (2002). Understanding the coaching process: A framework for social analysis. *Quest*, *54*(1), 34-48.
130. Kaplan, A., & Garner, J. K. (2017). A complex dynamic systems perspective on identity and its development: The dynamic systems model of role identity. *Developmental Psychology*, *53*(11), 2036.
131. Kemmis, S., Edwards-Groves, C., Lloyd, A., Grootenboer, P., Hardy, I., & Wilkinson, J. (2017). Learning as being 'stirred into practices. In *Practice theory perspectives on pedagogy and education* (pp. 45-65).
132. Lave, J. (1996). Teaching, as learning, in practice. *Mind, culture, and activity*, *3*(3), 149-164.
133. Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). The only generalization is: There is no generalization. *Case study method*, 27-44.
134. King, K. (2009). Education, skills, sustainability and growth: Complex relations. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *29*(2), 175-181.

135. Kirk, D. (2004). Sport and early learning experiences. *Driving up participation: The challenge for sport*, 69.
136. Kumar, N. (2005). Assessing the learning culture and performance of educational institutions. *Performance Improvement*, *44*(9), 27.
137. Kvanvig, J. L. (2003). *The value of knowledge and the pursuit of understanding*.
138. Krane, V. (Ed.). (1997). Introduction to special theme issue: Sexualities, culture, and sport. *Women in Sport and Physical Activity Journal*, *6*(2), 1-6.
139. Krauss, S. E. (2005). Research paradigms and meaning making: A primer. *The qualitative report*, *10*(4), 758-770.
140. Kyngäs, H., Kääriäinen, M., & Elo, S. (2020). The trustworthiness of content analysis. In *The Application of Content Analysis in Nursing Science Research* (pp. 41-48).
141. Lally, P. (2007). Identity and athletic retirement: A prospective study. *Psychology of sport and exercise*, *8*(1), 85-99.
142. Lawson, H. A. (2009). Paradigms, exemplars and social change. *Sport, Education and Society*, *14*(1), 97-119.
143. Lawson, H.A. (1993). Dominant discourses, problem setting, and teacher education pedagogies: A critique. 10(1), 1-20.
144. Lebed, F., & Bar-Eli, M. (2013). *Complexity and control in team sports: Dialectics in contesting human systems*.
145. Lemert, C. C. (20n 15). *Thinking the unthinkable: The riddles of classical social theories*. Routledge.
146. Lemyre, F., Trudel, P., & Durand-Bush, N. (2007). How youth-sport coaches learn to coach. *The sport psychologist*, *21*(2), 191-209.
147. Lewin, C., Cranmer, S., & McNicol, S. (2018). Developing digital pedagogy through learning design: An activity theory perspective. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, *49*(6), 1131-1144.
148. Liukkonen, J., Laasko, L., & Telama, R. (1996). Educational perspectives of youth sport coaches: Analysis of observed coaching behaviours. International Journal of Sport Psychology, 27, 439-453.
149. Lunenburg, F. C. (2012). Power and leadership: An influence process. *International journal of management, business, and administration*, *15*(1), 1-9.
150. Maclean, J., & Lorimer, R. (2016). Are coach education programmes the most effective method for coach development? *International Journal of Coaching Science*.
151. MacDonald, D., & Tinning, R. (1995). Physical education teacher education and the trend to proletarianisation: A case study, 98-118.
152. Macdonald, D., Kirk, D., Metzler, M., Nilges, L. M., Schempp, P., & Wright, J. (2002). It's all very well, in theory: Theoretical perspectives and their applications in contemporary pedagogical research. *Quest*, *54*(2), 133-156.
153. Mack, N., Woodsong, C., MacQueen, K. M., Guest, G., & Namey, E. (2005). *Qualitative research methods: a data collectors field guide*
154. Maguire, M. (1991). Education and qualitative research: teaching, learning and educational change. In *St Hilda's Conference, University of Warwick, September*.
155. Mallett, C. J., Trudel, P., Lyle, J., & Rynne, S. B. (2009). Formal vs. informal coach education (3), 325-364.
156. Mallett, C. J., Rynne, S. B., & Billett, S. (2016). Valued learning experiences of early career and experienced high-performance coaches (1), 89-104.

157. Mansoori, Y., Karlsson, T., & Lundqvist, M. (2019). The influence of the lean startup methodology on entrepreneur-coach relationships in the context of a startup accelerator. *Technovation*, *84*, 37-47.

158. Maritz, J., & Jooste, K. (2011). Debriefing interviews and coaching conversations: Strategies to promote student reflexivity and action. *South African Journal of Higher Education*, *25*(5), 972-986.

159. Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2006). Data collection methods. *Designing qualitative research*, *2*

160. Marsick, V. J., & Watkins, K. E. (2001). Informal and incidental learning. *New directions for adult and continuing education*, *2001*(89), 25-34.

161. Margolis, E., & Romero, M. (1998). "The department is very male, very White, very old, and very conservative": The functioning of the hidden curriculum in graduate sociology departments. *Harvard Educational Review*, *68*(1), 1-33.

162. Maton, K. (2003). Reflexivity, relationism, & research: Pierre Bourdieu and the epistemic conditions of social scientific knowledge. *Space and culture*, *6*(1), 52-65.

163. Mays, N., & Pope, C. (2020). Quality in qualitative research. *Qualitative research in health care*, 211-233.

164. Mellor, P. A., & Shilling, C. (2010). Body pedagogics and the religious habitus: A new direction for the sociological study of religion. *Religion*, *40*(1), 27-38.

165. Miller, P. S., & Kerr, G. A. (2003). The role experimentation of intercollegiate student athletes. *The sport psychologist*, *17*(2), 196-219.

166. Mills, J. P. (2015). An [AUTO] ethnographic account of constructing, deconstructing, and partially reconstructing a coaching identity. *Qualitative research in sport, exercise and health*, *7*(5), 606-619.

167. Moisander, J., & Valtonen, A. (2006). *Qualitative marketing research: A cultural approach*.

168. Moore, R., & Muller, J. (1999). The discourse of “voice” and the problem of knowledge and identity in the sociology of education. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 20(2), 189-206.

169. Myers, M. D. (2004). Hermeneutics in information systems research. *Social theory and philosophy for information systems*, 103-128

170. Nash, J. (2017). Understanding drivers of coaching relationship quality: the relationship between RCS and PQECR. In *Academy of Management Proceedings* (Vol. 2017, No. 1, p. 13217). Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management.

171. Nash, C., & Sproule, J. (2012). Coaches perceptions of their coach education experiences. *International journal of sport psychology*, *43*(1), 33.

172. Nash, C. (2016). Donald Schön: Learning, reflection, and coaching practice. In *Learning in Sports Coaching* (pp. 65-76).

173. Nash, C., Sproule, J., & Horton, P. (2017). Continuing professional development for sports coaches: a road less travelled. *Sport in society*, *20*(12), 1902-1916.

174. Nelson, L. J., Cushion, C. J., & Potrac, P. (2006). Formal, nonformal and informal coach learning: A holistic conceptualisation. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, *1*(3), 247-259.

175. Nelson, L. J., & Cushion, C. J. (2006). Reflection in coach education: The case of the national governing body coaching certificate. *The Sport Psychologist*, *20*(2), 174-183.

176. Newman, J. I., & Falcous, M. (2013). Political Theories of Social Class, Sport, and the Body. *A Companion to Sport*.

177. Obembe, A. O. (2007). *Knowledge Sharing and Social Interaction: An Exploration of Individual Action through the Integral Role of the Habitus* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Leicester).
178. O'Connor, A., & MacDonald, D. (2002). Up close and personal on physical education teachers' identity: Is conflict an issue?. *Sport, Education and Society*, *7*(1), 37-54.
179. O'Dwyer, A., & Bowles, R. (2020). Exploring the Potential Value of Self-Study to Support Coach Learning. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, *7*(1), 95-101.
180. Oyserman, D. (2015). Identity-based motivation. *Emerging trends in the social and behavioral sciences: An interdisciplinary, searchable, and linkable resource*, 1-11.
181. Partington, M., & Cushion, C. (2013). An investigation of the practice activities and coaching behaviors of professional top-level youth soccer coaches. *Scandinavian journal of medicine & science in sports*, *23*(3), 374-382.
182. Pardjono, P. (2016). Active learning: The Dewey, Piaget, Vygotsky, and constructivist theory perspectives. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, *9*(3).
183. Passmore, J. (2009). Coaching ethics: Making ethical decisions–novices and experts. *The Coaching Psychologist*, *5*(1), 6-10.
184. Patton, M. Q. (2005). *Qualitative research*.
185. Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*.
186. Phelan, S., & Griffiths, M. (2019). Reconceptualising professional learning through knowing-in-practice: a case study of a coaches high performance centre. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1-21.
187. Piggott, D. (2012). Coaches' experiences of formal coach education: a critical sociological investigation. *Sport, Education and Society*, *17*(4), 535-554.
188. Potrac, P., Jones, R.L., Brewer, C., Armour, K. & Hoff, J. (2000). Toward an holistic understanding of the coaching process. 52, 186-199.
189. Potrac, P., Jones, R., & Armour, K. (2002). 'It's All About Getting Respect': The Coaching Behaviors of an Expert English Soccer Coach. *Sport, education and society*, *7*(2), 183-202.
190. Purdy, L., Jones, R., & Cassidy, T. (2009). Negotiation and capital: athletes' use of power in an elite men's rowing program. *Sport, Education and Society*, *14*(3), 321-338.
191. Raven, B. H. (1958). Legitimate power, coercive power, and observability in social influence. *Sociometry*, *21*(2), 83-97.
192. Rawolle, S., & Lingard, B. (2013). Bourdieu and educational research: Thinking tools, relational thinking, beyond epistemological innocence. *Social theory and education research: understanding Foucault, Habermas, Bourdieu and Derrida*, 117-137.
193. Ronkainen, N. J., Sleeman, E., & Richardson, D. (2019). "I want to do well for myself as well!": Constructing coaching careers in elite women's football. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1-19.
194. Rose, J., & Johnson, C. W. (2020). Contextualizing reliability and validity in qualitative research: toward more rigorous and trustworthy qualitative social science in leisure research. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1-20.
195. Rosenberg, G. N. (2017). Positivism, interpretivism, and the study of law. In *Law and Social Movements* (pp. 33-53).

196. Rowe, D. (2017). We're all transnational now: Sport in dynamic sociocultural environments. *Sport in Society*, *20*(10), 1470-1484.

197. Rynne, S. B., & Mallett, C. J. (2012). Understanding the work and learning of high performance coaches. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *17*(5), 507-523.

198. Rynne, S. (2013). Culture Change in a Professional Sports Team: Shaping Environmental Contexts and Regulating Power: A commentary. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, *8*(2), 301-304.

199. Rynne, S., Mallett, C. J., & Tinning, R. (2010). The learning of sport coaches in high performance work places. Sport, Education and Society, 15, 331–346.

200. Rynne, S. B., Mallett, C. J., & Rabjohns, M. W. (2017). High performance coaching: demands and development. *The psychology of sports coaching: Research and practice*, 114-126.

201. Salmon, W. C. (2017). Logical empiricism. *A companion to the philosophy of science*, 233-242.

202. Samarati, P., & Di Vimercati, S. D. C. (2010, April). *Data protection in outsourcing scenarios: Issues and directions*. In *Proceedings of the 5th ACM Symposium on Information, Computer and Communications Security* (pp. 1-14). ACM.

203. Sandelowski, M. (1995). *Sample size in qualitative research. Research in nursing & health*, *18*(2), 179-183.

204. Saury, J., & Durand, M. (1998). Practical knowledge in expert coaches: On-site study of coaching in sailing. *Research quarterly for exercise and sport*, *69*(3), 254-266.

205. Schempp, P. (1993). World University Games Conference, Buffalo, New York.

206. Schon, D.A. (1987). San Fransisco: Josey Bass.

207. Schwandt, T. A., & Burgon, H. (2006). Evaluation and the study of lived experience. *The Sage handbook of evaluation*, 98-117.

208. Shulman, L. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge and growth in teaching 15(2), 4-14.

209. Seifert, L., Komar, J., Barbosa, T., Toussaint, H., Millet, G., & Davids, K. (2014). Coordination pattern variability provides functional adaptations to constraints in swimming performance. *Sports medicine*, *44*(10), 1333-1345.

210. Simmons, E. S., & Smith, N. R. (2019). The case for comparative ethnography. *Comparative Politics*, *51*(3), 341-359.

211. Shoukry, H., & Cox, E. (2018). Coaching as a social process. *Management Learning*, *49*(4), 413-428.

212. Smith, R. E., & Smoll, F. L. (2012). *Sport psychology for youth coaches: Developing champions in sports and life*.

213. Smith, T., Edwards-Groves, C., & Brennan Kemmis, R. (2010).

214. Smallwood, J., Schooler, J. W., Turk, D. J., Cunningham, S. J., Burns, P., & Macrae, C. N. (2011). Self-reflection and the temporal focus of the wandering mind. *Consciousness and cognition*, *20*(4), 1120-1126.

215. Sparkes, A. C. (2000). Autoethnography and narratives of self: Reflections on criteria in action. *Sociology of sport journal*, *17*(1), 21-43.

216. Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social psychology quarterly*, 224-237.

217. Stodter, A., & Cushion, C. J. (2017). What works in coach learning, how, and for whom? A grounded process of soccer coaches' professional learning. *Qualitative research in sport, exercise and health*, *9*(3), 321-338.

218. Stodter, A., & Cushion, C. J. (2014). Coaches' learning and education: a case study of cultures in conflict. *Sports coaching review*, *3*(1), 63-79.

219. Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). Grounded theory methodology. *Handbook of qualitative research*, *17*, 273-85

220. Struyven, K., Dochy, F., Janssens, S., & Gielen, S. (2006). On the dynamics of students' approaches to learning: The effects of the teaching/learning environment. *Learning and Instruction*, *16*(4), 279-294.

221. Squires, G. (2016). Modernism, Empiricism, and Rationalism. *Irish University Review*, *46*(1), 38-47.

222. Taylor, R. M. (2017). Indoctrination and social context: A system-based approach to identifying the threat of indoctrination and the responsibilities of educators. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, *51*(1), 38-58.

223. Taylor, B., & Garratt, D. (2010). The professionalisation of sports coaching: Relations of power, resistance and compliance. *Sport, education and society*, *15*(1), 121-139.

224. Thomas, D., & Brown, J. S. (2011). A new culture of learning. *Issue Eleven| September 2014*, *10*.

225. Tedlock, B. (2000). Ethnography and ethnographic representation. *Handbook of qualitative research*, *2*(1)

226. Teques, P., Araújo, D., Seifert, L., del Campo, V. L., & Davids, K. (2017). The resonant system: linking brain–body–environment in sport performance☆. In *Progress in brain research* (Vol. 234, pp. 33-52).

227. Tomlinson, A. (2004). Pierre Bourdieu and the sociological study of sport: Habitus, capital and field. In *Sport and modern social theorists* (pp. 161-172).

228. Townsend, R. C., & Cushion, C. J. (2020). 'Put that in your fucking research': reflexivity, ethnography and disability sport coaching. *Qualitative Research*, 1468794120931349.

229. Townsend, R. C., Huntley, T., Cushion, C. J., & Fitzgerald, H. (2020). 'It's not about disability, I want to win as many medals as possible': The social construction of disability in high-performance coaching. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, *55*(3), 344-360.

230. Townsend, R. C., & Cushion, C. (2017). Elite cricket coach education: A Bourdieusian analysis.22(4), 528-546.

231. Turner, A. & Martinek, T. (1995). Teaching for understanding: A model for improving decision making during game play. Quest, 47, 44-63.

232. Tinning (1997). Performance and participation discourses in human movement: Toward a socially critical physical education. In J.M. Fernandez-Balboa (Ed.), (pp. 99-120). Albany: State University of New York.

233. Vaughan, D. (2008). Bourdieu and organizations: the empirical challenge. *Theory and Society*, *37*(1), 65-81.

234. Van Teijlingen, E. (2014). *Semi-structured interviews.* In *PGR Workshop December*.

235. Warwick, R., McCray, J., & Board, D. (2017). Bourdieu's habitus and field: implications on the practice and theory of critical action learning. *Action Learning: Research and Practice*, *14*(2), 104-119.
236. Wells, G. (1999). Toward a sociocultural practice and theory of education. Cambridge University Press.
237. Welman, P., & Bachkirova, T. (2010). The issue of power in the coaching relationship. In *The coaching relationship* (pp. 157-176).
238. Williams, M. (2000). Interpretivism and generalisation. *Sociology*, *34*(2), 209-224.
239. Wright, S. (2018). Good question: Exploring epistemology and ontology in arts education and creativity. In *Creativities in Arts Education, Research and Practice* (pp. 101-115).
240. Yoshida, K. (2014). *Rationality and Cultural Interpretivism: A Critical Assessment of Failed Solutions*.