Moving on to Practice: Exploring the Impact of a Foucauldian-informed Coach Development Collaboration

by

Timothy S. Konoval

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Kinesiology, Sport, and Recreation

University of Alberta

Abstract

With so many truths about what effective endurance running coaching *is* and what it *is not*, it can be increasingly difficult for coach developers to navigate through these multiple interpretations to discern what is truly effective coaching. Recently, a group of Foucauldian coaching researchers mapped and critiqued the discourses and power relations that have come to shape endurance running coaches' practices to show how coaches' practices have become overly informed by disciplinary practices. However, as many Foucauldian coaching researchers have noted (Denison, Cassidy, Pringle, & Hessian, 2015; Denison & Mills 2014; Denison, Mills & Konoval, 2015; Mills & Denison, 2014), despite all of this critique no empirical work has attempted to understand what it might mean to change coaches' use of disciplinary techniques and instruments (Foucault, 1995) in their practices. In light of this, the purpose of my thesis was to explore the impact of a Foucauldian-informed coach development collaboration with a university endurance running team. To do this, over a five-month period, I acted as a Foucauldian-informed coach developer to collaborate with one male university endurance running coach to develop and implement a number of Foucauldian-inspired coaching practices for his athletes.

My thesis consisted of three papers that each provided different perspectives of the collaboration. My first paper aimed to explore what it might mean for a Foucauldian-informed coach developer to work collaboratively with Cliff (my coach participant) as he learned how to problematize the use of discipline. The results revealed that Cliff was able to show a degree of problematization by identifying some problems with disciplinary techniques in his practices, however, in the field, many of these practices proved too difficult to implement in a truly Foucauldian way. I argued that one reason why this may have been so difficult might be because

the power of physiology, as the dominant knowledge underpinning what constitutes an effective endurance running coach (Mills & Denison, 2013), could have prevented Cliff from reimagining how he might coach without using disciplinary techniques that support a strong physiological orientation to coaching. My second paper explored the impact that less disciplinary coaching practices might have on athletes' experiences. The results revealed that the continued presence of normalizing and objectifying processes might have prevented some athletes from understanding the full scope of the less disciplinary practices. As a result, simply implementing less disciplinary practices is not straightforward because Foucault's knowledge is not made up of clear-cut, objective, verifiable truths, that can be simply communicated to athletes through one-way transactional pedagogies. My third paper aimed to understand what it might mean for a Foucauldian-informed coach developer to introduce and teach Foucault's concepts to an endurance running coach. The results highlighted how finding ways to help Cliff make sense of Foucault's knowledge can be difficult because social science knowledge is not seen as legitimate as most traditional sport science knowledges (e.g., physiology). In addition, negotiating Foucault's knowledge can be perceived as questioning the 'truthfulness' of a coach's existing practices, and by extension, threatening a coach's identity. To conclude, I suggested Foucauldian-informed coach developers could development new strategies to delicately and constructively highlight inconsistencies that might surface throughout any collaboration.

My thesis marked a significant moment in post-structuralist coaching research because it moved beyond mapping and critiquing endurance running coaches' practices to explore the process of change using Foucault's concepts in an applied setting (Markula & Silk, 2011). It has contributed to the Foucauldian-informed coach development research by identifying key challenges and barriers to teaching a coach how to coach in a less disciplinary way. Importantly,

it showed that change is hard. Each of my papers illustrated the possibilities and difficulties that participants (i.e., coach, athletes, myself as coach developer) might experience when social-driven change is the goal. I conclude with a number of research areas for Foucauldian-informed coaching researchers to examine to help enhance the impact of future Foucauldian coach development collaborations.

Preface

This thesis is an original work by Timothy S. Konoval. The research project, of which this thesis is a part, received research ethics approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board, Project Name “Coaching with Foucault: Exploring the impact of a Foucauldian-inspired collaboration with a sport team”, No. Pro00041652, February 26, 2015.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank several people for their contributions to this thesis.

Brianna Sims, completing this thesis would not have been possible without you. You showed the endurance of a long distance runner with your unparalleled patience and support throughout this process. I love you very much.

My Parents and Family, even though you are still are unsure about what I actually studied; you all unknowingly gave me the courage to push through even when the road became rocky. I love you all.

My Edmonton Family, it is impossible to thank you enough. You feed me, housed me, and were always there to help me without hesitation. For all that you did and continue to do, I will be forever grateful.

Dr. Jim Denison, you are the best coach I ever had. Thank you for taking a chance on me and for giving me the opportunity to take on this important project. Without your guidance this would not have been possible.

Dr. Pirkko Markula, Dr. Bill Foster, Dr. Doug Gleddie, and Dr. Roslyn Kerr, I greatly appreciate all of your support, feedback, and encouragement throughout the examining process.

My Participants, thank you for allowing me to come along for the ride during this season. I hope that this work continues to help you all strive towards your sporting goals.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1.0

Introduction

When I was a university endurance runner, I was always fascinated with the different ways in which runners trained their bodies. For example, some runners followed a high mileage program with low intensity, some followed a low mileage program with high intensity, while others followed a blend of both. Through conversations with many of my fellow competitors and their coaches, it became apparent that all runners followed training programs that were centered around heavily conditioning the body through physiologically sound practices. Following these conversations, I was eager to learn about how various scientific truths about the athletic body were being validated in my training. These scientific truths would go unquestioned throughout my athletic career, and naturally, became important when I began my career as a university endurance running coach. As a coach, I designed and implemented training practices that aimed to produce specific physiological responses, in specific places, at specific times, to develop efficient endurance running bodies through a linear view of progress. In this way, I viewed effective endurance running coaching as acquiring the ability to design the most scientific coaching practices. Despite this view, coaching researchers have clearly shown there are other important aspects of coaching, such as decision-making and communication, that are critical to develop to become more effective (Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Jones, 2006; Lyle, 2002).

As the global popularity of sport steadily increases, the need for effective coaching has also increased. Parallel with this growth, coaching researchers from a multitude of theoretical perspectives have set out to capture what effective coaching essentially is to produce the most effective coaches through government led coach development initiatives. Since the mid 70's (e.g., Tharp & Gallimore, 1976), psychologically-informed coaching researchers have dominated the effective coaching literature. However, over the past 15 years, a number of sociologically-informed coaching researchers from different research perspectives have highlighted the multi-

faceted contextual demands of coaching where no two situations are exactly the same (e.g., Cushion & Jones, 2006; Jones & Wallace, 2005, 2006; Potrac, Denison, & Gilbert, 2013; Purdy & Jones, 2011). This meant that any meaning of effective coaching will always change depending on the context.

In light of this, to develop a more fluid interpretation of effective coaching, a group of sociologically-informed coaching researchers have examined effective coaching through Michel Foucault's (1995) analysis of discipline. Accordingly, Foucauldian-informed coaching researchers have shown how sports long-standing disciplinary legacy has come to influence our current understanding of effective coaching, and subsequently, what can be known as effective coaching practices (Denison, Mills, & Jones, 2013; Shogan, 1999). To extend this work, a group of Foucauldian-informed coaching researchers (Denison & Mills, 2014; Mills & Denison, 2013) showed how endurance running coaches' uncritical use of a range of disciplinary techniques and instruments in their practices can easily lead their athletes' to experience docility, and in turn, can limit coaches' effectiveness. Though Foucauldian-informed coaching researchers have made considerable progress by critiquing coaches' practices as highly disciplinary, researchers have yet to explore what it might mean to change coaches' practices to be less disciplinary.

Through my literature review, I will argue that in order to move the effective coaching and coach development literature forward, we cannot turn to past conceptualizations of effective coaching that have been produced through limited perspectives or ways of knowing. Rather, we need to look ahead and view effective coaching from a Foucauldian perspective in order to move beyond the unquestioned use of discipline towards multiple and diverse interpretations of what effective coaching might be.

Therefore, the aim of this review of literature is to understand how past conceptualizations of effective coaching have been produced, and subsequently, how they have come to influence and shape contemporary coaches' practices. To begin, I will briefly review the quantitative and qualitative psychologically-informed effective coaching research followed by the early sociologically-informed effective coaching research, which has primarily been conducted using qualitative methods. Next, I will provide a comprehensive review of the work done by sociologically-informed effective coaching researchers who have drawn from Pierre Bourdieu and Michel Foucault, given the significant impact this work has had on the field. I will then outline why and how I will apply Foucault's (1995) analysis of discipline to a coach development collaboration in order to make a substantial contribution to the effective coaching literature.

1.1 Psychologically-informed Quantitative Effective Coaching Research

Beginning in the mid 1970's, there was great interest in 'knowing' the most effective coaching behaviours that could lead to the greatest athletic achievements and performances (e.g., Tharp & Gallimore, 1976). For example, Chelladurai (1978, 1990, 1993) developed a questionnaire to measure effective coach leadership, known as the Leadership Scale for Sport (LSS). At the same time, Smith, Smoll, and Hunt (1977) developed the Coach Behaviour Assessment System (CBAS), which assessed the type, frequency, and quality of coaches' feedback to their athletes in practice and game situations. Smith et al.'s direct-observation instrument recorded when coaches displayed 12 specific behaviours believed to have the greatest utility for all coaches to display in their practices. Based on these quantitative instruments, psychologically-informed coaching researchers were able to classify effective coaching behaviours by specific categories (e.g., Lacy & Darst, 1984). These included praise, scold,

instruction, hustle, positive modelling, negative modelling, nonverbal reward, nonverbal punishment, management, and use of first name (Tharp & Gallimore, 1976).

Overall, these quantitative instruments have been useful in suggesting certain 'best coaching practices'. However, this work has also been criticized for not exploring why coaches display certain behaviours (Abraham, Collins, & Martindale, 2006; Côté, Samela, Trudel, & Baria, 1995). As a result, psychologically-informed researchers began to employ qualitative methods in order to develop a richer account of effective coaching.

1.2 Psychologically-informed Qualitative Effective Coaching Research

One of the first psychological researchers to use qualitative methods was Côté et al. (1995) who sought to identify and conceptualize the knowledge of 17 Canadian expert high-performance coaches through open-ended interviews. Similarly, Abraham, Collins, and Martindale (2006) drew on interviews with 16 expert coaches to develop a model of the coaching process as a schematic involving a multitude of decisions, where coaches pull from specific knowledge types (e.g., sport sciences, planning and preparation, practice activities, and coaching environments) to carry out specific coaching tasks. In addition, researchers have drawn from the work of constructivist learning theorists such as Jarvis (2006) and Moon (2004) to better understand the learning processes of the most effective coaches (e.g., Werthner & Trudel, 2006, 2009; Wright, Trudel, & Culver, 2007). For example, using interviews Werthner and Trudel (2006, 2009) mapped both the network of Canadian elite coaches' different learning processes and their idiosyncratic learning-paths. Through their work, Werthner and Trudel showed how effective coach learning is made up of many types of learning situations and as a result can be highly personal and subjective. Mallett (2005) built upon his work in self-determination theory (SDT) and examined his own coaching methods using field notes to try to understand how best

to motivate his athletes. He concluded that sport psychologists should work directly with coaches to facilitate the application of SDT within their coaching practices in order to increase coaching effectiveness.

Altogether, psychologically-informed coaching researchers have developed a rich profile of an effective coach through both quantitative and qualitative methods with the intention of reducing the unpredictability of coaching in order to gain as much control over the coaching process as possible (Gordon, 2009). Thus, psychologically-informed effective coaching research has produced a precise conceptualization of an effective coach as someone who displays certain observable behaviours. Similarly, by identifying certain coaching behaviours and learning experiences as being universally effective across all coaching contexts, this research has deemed all other coaching behaviours and learning experiences as largely unimportant.

However, many coaching researchers (e.g., Bell, 1997; Jones, 2000; Nash & Collins, 2006; Nash & Sproule, 2009; Schempp, McCullick, & Mason, 2006) have raised critical concerns about the problematic objective conceptualization of effective coaching inevitably produced by psychologically-informed effective coaching researchers. Moreover, it is now clear that the multi-faceted contextual demands of coaching, which have been given increased attention in the coaching literature (e.g., Jones, Kingston, & Stewart, 2011; Jones & Wallace, 2005, 2006; Potrac & Jones, 2009), cannot be completely understood through psychologically-informed quantitative instruments or qualitative or more interpretive methods (Saury & Durand, 1998; d'Arripe-Longueville, 1998; Turner, Nelson, & Potrac, 2012). For example, Jones (2000) criticized quantitative instruments for being excessively technocratic, rationalistic, linear, and sequential in their solutions, while ignoring the complexities of everyday coaching. In addition, Turner et al. (2012) argued that qualitative psychological models of effective coaching failed to

pay attention to the ever-changing demands of coaching contexts (Jones & Wallace, 2005), while also ignoring that there are multiple paths towards becoming an effective coach (Gilbert, Côté, & Mallett, 2006). Importantly, this overt emphasis on the individual coach as the unit of analysis has shielded effective examinations of the social context as an important influence towards the production of meanings associated with effective coaching.

In sum, although psychologically-informed effective coaching research has dominated a large part of the history of effective coaching research (Gilbert & Trudel, 2004), much ambiguity still exists around which behaviours, characteristics, or styles 'make' a coach effective. Accordingly, the gaps created by psychologically-informed effective coaching researchers have led sociologically-informed coaching researchers to employ the work of various social theorists in order to understand coaching as a social practice that produces many different meanings about effective coaching. In what follows, I will review the research conducted by sociologically-informed effective coaching researchers.

1.3 Sociologically-informed Effective Coaching Research

Over the last decade, many sociologically-informed effective coaching researchers have argued that coaching can only be understood as an ambiguous process "inextricably linked to both the constraints and opportunities of human interaction" (Potrac, Jones, & Armour, 2002, p. 2). This understanding inevitably makes coaching vulnerable to differing social pressures and influences (Cushion, 2001; Cassidy, Jones, & Potrac, 2004; Jones, Potrac, Cushion, & Ronglan, 2011). Given that most sociologically-informed coaching researchers have used qualitative methods, I will only review the research that has used qualitative methods to examine effective coaching. First, I will review the work of those sociologically-informed effective coaching researchers who were most interested in understanding the coach's role as a social agent and the

'nature' of effective coach-athlete interactions. Following this I will review sociologically-informed research that began to study the influence of power on effective coaching.

1.3.1 *Early Sociologically-informed Effective Coaching Research*

Early sociologically-informed coaching researchers largely drew from the work of Erving Goffman (1959, 1963, 1969) to understand effective coaching. As a well-known social theorist, Goffman's (1959) work aimed to uncover the everyday routines of social encounters. Accordingly, coaching researchers believed that Goffman's focus on order, (re)action and performance held great potential for analyzing the effective coach as a social actor (Jones, Potrac, Cushion, Ronglan, & Davey, 2011). For example, Potrac, Jones, and Armour (2002) used observations and interviews to identify pedagogical behaviours and generate in-depth insights into how one coach maintained his athletes' respect by acting as the more knowledgeable other. Using Goffman's (1959) concepts of social role, power, and the presentation of the self, Potrac et al. found that effective coaching practice was strongly influenced by a coach's need to establish a strong social bond with his or her players. In another example, through interviews with elite sport coaches, Jones, Armour, and Potrac (2004) showed how coaches engage in all kinds of strategic actions to manage the expectations of their athletes by putting on a particular front. According to Goffman (1959), a front is how individuals' manage the impressions they convey onto others through the way they present themselves in certain settings. Consequently, in drawing from Goffman's concern with manipulation and morality they concluded that an effective coach needs to take great care to maintain an appropriate front so that he or she does not lose his or her credibility as an expert (Jones et al., 2003; Jones et al., 2004). Moreover, to understand his own behaviours that he used to maintain his coaching front, Jones (2006) drew from Goffman's (1963) work on face-to-face interactions through his concepts of stigma and

impression management. Jones saw this work as providing some explanation to the constant state of communication uncertainties faced by coaches while "illuminating a number of unexamined issues that currently lie undiscovered and undisturbed in the muddy depths" (p. 1017) of effective coaching. In sum, early sociologically-informed coaching research has given the effective coaching literature a greatly needed awareness of how coaching is inevitably a social activity.

Interestingly, early sociologically-informed effective coaching research is not that different from the psychologically-informed coaching research. This body of research still places the coach (social agent) at the center of the analysis while ignoring more complex social influences present in every coaching context, including how power is intertwined within the coaching process. As a result, coaching researchers began to study the influence of power on effective coaching.

1.3.2 *Power in the Effective Coaching Research*

The first attempts to understand the workings of power in effective coaching were informed by French and Raven's (1959) framework of power (Jones, Armour, & Potrac, 2002; Jones et al., 2004; Cassidy et al., 2009). This framework included six main bases or sources of power (coercive, reward, legitimate, referent, expert, informational). French and Raven further separated these six sources of power based on their social influence — meaning the change of beliefs, attitudes or behaviours of a person — of people who occupy influential roles, such as coaches. Using this framework, effective coaching researchers have suggested that coaches aim to gain respect and trust from their athletes through their expert power (e.g., Potrac, 2001; Potrac, Brewer, Jones, Armour, & Hoff, 2000). As a result, Jones et al. (2002) concluded that an awareness of the effects of power can help coaches better understand their own practices and

ultimately lead to new, innovative, more effective ways of coaching. In another example, Potrac, Jones and Armour (2002) demonstrated how soccer coaches often use legitimate, expert and informational power to validate their role and maintain the respect of their athletes. However, this work has been criticized for viewing power as a zero-sum game, where one party (i.e., coach) possesses power over another (i.e., athlete) (e.g., Jones et al., 2005; Potrac & Jones, 2011). As a consequence, coaching researchers began to apply more complex critical theories of power, such as Anthony Gidden's (1984) theory of structuration, to understand what constitutes effective coaching.

Unlike Goffman's work and the framework of power by French and Raven (1959), who put the social actor (coach) at the center of the meaning-making process, a Giddensian perspective of power accounts for the relationship between individuals (i.e., agents) and social institutions (i.e., structures) (Purdy & Aboud, 2011). Gidden's (1984) proposed this duality of structures by suggesting that humans create meanings and social reality from within social structures. Subsequently, different social structures contain specific rules and resources which social agents use to guide their behaviours. In this way, Giddens argued that "the day-to-day activity of social actors draws upon and reproduces structural features of wider social systems" (p. 24).

To illustrate how Giddens's work could be relevant to coaching, Purdy, Potrac, and Jones (2008) highlighted issues of micro-power in the coaching process through the everyday complexities of power and resistance. More specifically, Purdy et al. explored the structural influences that existed between a head rowing coach and herself as a rowing coxswain. They concluded that "if effective coaching is to be achieved, coaches need to be sensitive to, and never take for granted, the various forms of power inherent within the coach-athlete relationship" (p.

332). Through this work, coaching researchers were able to highlight the importance of power structures in the coaching process, and as a result, the coaching process could now be seen as "a context-bound activity characterized by collaboration, struggle, and negotiation" (Santos, Jones, & Mesquita, 2013, p. 263). However, while this work was critical in shedding light on power struggles in coach-athlete relationships, Giddens' (1984) structuration theory could not be used to consider the wider effects of social systems on coaching contexts. Nevertheless, coaching research that used Giddens helped the coaching process to be increasingly viewed as an activity that used the formal and informal "power by individuals and groups to achieve their goals" (Blase, 1991, p. 11), or in other words, a micro-political activity.

Through a micro-political analysis of coaching, Potrac and Jones (2009) attempted to conceive a more comprehensive account of effective coaching that was "more true to the social and problematic nature of the activity" (p. 558) by portraying coaching as an arena of constant struggle. Drawing from both Ball's (1987) micro-political perspective and Kelchterman and Ballet's (2002) work on micro-political literacy, Potrac and Jones aimed to uncover some of the contextual social rules that underpin coaches' actions. They asserted that coaches hold different ideologies that influence their ability to operate in various situations (Ball, 1987). Further, they recommended that in order for coaches to become more effective, they must develop their 'micro-political literacy'. Potrac and Jones also argued that although coaches are all influenced by the unique structures within their coaching context, they can also change, manipulate, and influence these structures. While this research claims to account for broader sociological phenomenon, I argue that it can still be located within social psychology because it focuses on the actions of the individual actors instead of on how wider sociological forces play a primary role in influencing these actions. Subsequently, to expand upon these findings, some

sociologically-informed effective coaching researchers began to conceptualize an effective coach as someone who can productively manage and respond to complex change inherent in the coaching environment.

Jones and Wallace (2005, 2006) first suggested that in order to help coaches' better deal with the uncertain and chaotic nature of coaching, coaching should be viewed by the metaphor of orchestration. The concept of orchestration sees coaches as steering their athletes unobtrusively towards their goals, rather than giving their athletes strong directive control. While attempting to gain empirical support for effective coaching as orchestration in the field, Santos, Jones, and Mesquita (2013) argued that coach developers could improve coaches' effectiveness by engaging coaches "in alternate ways of viewing their roles and positions within the complex social system of coaching" (p. 271). To conclude, Santos et al. suggested that coach developers should design practical courses that teach coaches how to orchestrate.

To summarize, the work of early sociologically-informed effective coaching researchers highlighted the importance of developing coaches who recognize their position of power within the coach-athlete relationship. After early research broke ground by situating coaching as a social activity, coaching researchers began to highlight the importance of coaches developing a critical awareness of how power employed through various social structures can be used to manipulate and control situations to achieve desired results. This research undoubtedly progressed the sociology of sport coaching to new heights. The next level of analysis was to understand how power relations inherent in every coaching context can be used to control coaches actual practices. In the next section, I will review literature from a group of sociologically-informed coaching researchers who have used the work of Pierre Bourdieu to gain a deeper understanding of the actual practices coaches implement in their specific coaching contexts.

1.4 Pierre Bourdieu

Throughout the sociological community, Pierre Bourdieu is known to be one of "the most influential social theorists of his generation" (Tomlinson, 2004, p. 161). Bourdieu is perhaps best known for his work regarding how culture and education produce and reproduce differences between social classes and how this maintains systems of power. Sociologically-informed effective coaching researchers have been drawn to his work for two main reasons: First, his focus on the visible social world of practice, and second, his attempts to transcend binaries (e.g., agency-structure) through an emphasis on phenomenon (e.g., coaching) as relational (Cushion & Kitchen, 2011). A Bourdieusian framework acknowledges "that structures shape and are shaped by an individual's practice" (Cushion & Kitchen, 2011, p. 43). As a result, in adhering to a Bourdieusian framework, coaching cannot be separated from its historical and cultural context.

Bourdieu took a critical step forward from past social theorists who used power to interrogate effective coaching (e.g., structuration theory) by not locating social agents (i.e., coaches) within a structure external to them. By taking a Bourdieusian approach coaching researchers have attempted to address the relational aspects located within issues of agency and structure to understand how these aspects come together to create coaches' practices. Most importantly, while issues of class, politics, and economics (i.e., the macro) are key aspects in shaping social practice, Bourdieu believed that these must be preceded by an understanding of the practice itself (i.e., the micro). Using Bourdieu's (1986, 1989) concepts of capital, habitus, field and practice, coaching researchers have recently set out to unravel the complex workings of power in coaching and how it both enables and constrains effective coaching practice (Potrac et al., 2004).

1.4.1 *Bourdieusian Effective Coaching Research*

As a form of power, Bourdieu viewed capital as the amount of control one has over his or her future and the future of others (Ritzer, 1996). Subsequently, capital can occur in five different forms: economic, cultural, social, symbolic, and physical. Similar to any social field, coaches possess varying amounts of capital and actively pursue strategies to gain greater amounts of it in their fields. As a result, unravelling how capital is gained in coaching has been a crucial step for coaching researchers. For example, in their ethnographic study of professional youth football, Cushion and Jones (2006) found that coaches' social capital derived from their hierarchical position, their cultural capital derived from their years of experience and coaching qualifications, and their symbolic capital derived from their personal accomplishments. Altogether, these forms of capital established the coaches' structured practices within the bounds of the football club. In addition, Cushion and Jones applied Bourdieu's concept of symbolic violence (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) to analyze the cultural mechanisms that establish order and restraint in coaching. Through this, they were able to explore how common statements currently used in coaching allow for harmful coaching behaviours and practices to appear legitimate. For example, the coaches in their study often used abusive language such as 'you should have taken his head off' and 'never talk back' in a way that held the players within a realm of obedience while categorizing the players as either good or bad. In another example of capital, Purdy, Potrac and Jones (2008) found social, physical, and symbolic capital to be most important for negotiating power within a high-performance rowing programme. Building from this, through an ethnography of a high-performance rowing team, (Purdy, Jones, and Cassidy, 2009) found that coaches gave athletes preferred treatment if they possessed physical or symbolic capital that would increase the coaches' capital and improve their position within the

field. For example, the coach allowed his high performing athletes, who possessed social and physical capital, to make more decisions than the weaker performing athletes about their training so that the coach could continue his quest for symbolic and economic capital by winning international medals.

Having a certain amount of capital also implies that a coach has acquired a specific habitus that is valued within the field of coaching. Another key Bourdieusian concept that has been used by coaching researchers is habitus. Habitus is a system of durable dispositions through which we see, judge and act in our social worlds (Wacquant, 1998), is. As patterns of our behaviour, our habitus is the source for most of our daily practices (Bourdieu, 1962). In coaching, this habitus can become so ingrained that it becomes unconscious, which can be problematic as it may prevent a coach from effectively adapting to novel situations (Cushion & Jones, 2006). To illustrate, Cushion, Armour, and Jones (2003) examined how experience contributes to coaching practice and how a coach's practices can be explained through his or her specific habitus (Bourdieu, 1977). For example, through experiences as an athlete coaches often acquire certain traditions and beliefs about what is the 'best' way to coach. Cushion et al. critiqued the transference of habitus through experience as a major roadblock that can perpetuate the same ways of knowing while not leading towards any real, innovative change in coaching practice. Subsequently, the interactions present while learning from experience often take place within power relationships that promote only compliance to reproducing established models of coaching not creating new, innovative practices (Cushion et al., 2003; Cushion & Kitchen, 2011). As a result, Cushion et al. (2003) suggested that coaches should become proficient at challenging their own day-to-day practices and knowledge (i.e., habitus) by using critical reflection strategies.

To extend their earlier work (Cushion, et al., 2003; Cushion & Jones, 2006), Cushion and Jones (2014) examined how the 'hidden curriculum' of any prevailing coaching culture can impart distinct norms, beliefs, and cultural values onto athletes that can both produce and reproduce effective and ineffective coaching practices. Although the term hidden curriculum is typically used by critical pedagogists (Markula & Pringle, 2006), the researchers adapted aspects of the term to fit within a Bourdieusian theoretical framework. Accordingly, Cushion and Jones conducted a 10-month ethnography with a professional soccer team to show how the hidden curriculum may illustrate effects of control through "a set of relations of production and exercise of power often without power being felt" (Jenks, 1993). Since the dominant understanding of effective coaching has been shown to be autocratic, gendered and hierarchical (Cushion & Jones, 2006; Purdy et al., 2009), Cushion and Jones concluded that a greater awareness of how this understanding is transferred and learned by coaches could help coaches develop more innovative and effective practices. Cushion and Jones also highlighted the challenge for coach developers to engage with coaches in a way that raises their awareness of how their current ways of thinking about their practices could be limiting, while not threatening their accumulated capital. In sum, Bourdieu's integrated conceptual framework has allowed some coaching researchers to consider the cultural transmission of the coaching process by certain social groups that have accrued social capital. This has been accomplished through an understanding of "systems of domination and power relations that create and sustain them" (Cushion & Jones, 2006, p. 158).

While it was an essential move by Bourdieusian effective coaching researchers to examine how coaches' practices have ultimately been shaped and formed within specific contexts, histories and traditions, this research has not yet moved forward to create change to coaches' practices. As another perspective, using the work of Michel Foucault, a group of

effective coaching researchers have used a view of power that is always intertwined with knowledge to challenge contemporary meanings of effective coaching and effective coaching practice. Subsequently, unlike past social theorists used by coaching researchers (e.g., Giddens, Bourdieu), Foucauldian coaching researchers have put the body at the center of their analyses seeing it as an important site for relations of power (Foucault, 1995). In the final section of this literature review, I will examine the work done by Foucauldian-informed coaching scholars to show why I believe a Foucauldian approach is worth considering in order to explore effective coaching and bring about meaningful change to coaches' practices.

1.5 Michel Foucault

Foucault, along with other French philosophers such as Derrida, Lacan, Barthes, and Deleuze, strongly opposed the universal nature of structuralism: the search for universal patterns of language. Structuralism, as a research approach, was developed at the turn of the twentieth century by Ferdinand de Saussure to provide researchers with a universal theory that could be employed to predict and explain structures of language within social phenomenon (Markula & Silk, 2011). Accordingly, structuralists believed it was possible to understand phenomenon through the relationship between elements of human culture and overarching structures, as they see meaning produced through language as 'fixed' forever. Alternatively, instead of a world represented by fixed structures of language, Foucault (1978, 1995) saw the world as ongoing, active, and constantly changing which makes it unpredictable and irrational (Markula & Silk, 2011). Due to his beliefs of multiple meanings of reality and subjectivity in knowledge construction, Foucault has often been labelled a post-structural theorist.

Although post-structuralism consists of multiple theoretical strands, post-structural theorists all share a rejection of universal meta-narratives (i.e., positivist paradigm), the humanist

self (i.e., interpretive paradigm), and a dualistic understanding of power (i.e., critical paradigm) (Avner, Jones, & Denison, 2014). For post-structuralists, there is no one true reality waiting to be revealed, rather there are multiple meanings or interpretations that make sense when reflected on the social and historical landscape of knowledge making (Markula, Grant, & Denison, 2001). Following on from these beliefs, the ways in which a Foucauldian researcher might study social practices can be threefold: 1) to map the discourses that shape our understandings of the social world, 2) to critique the problematic effects resulting from these dominant discourses, and 3) to develop theoretically driven pragmatic interventions to foster more ethical practices and balanced power relations within specific discursive contexts (Markula & Silk, 2011). In order to carry out any Foucauldian-informed research one should have a deep understanding of Foucault's unique and substantial view of power.

According to Foucault (1978), power is not something possessed by certain dominant groups who then use it to oppress marginalized groups. Instead, through engaging in relationships with others, one is essentially part of many power relations. The idea of power as relational can be very difficult to explain because it is largely "anonymous, almost unspoken" (Foucault, 1978, p. 95). For Foucault (1978), power is a dense web or a 'capillary-like network' that works in myriad meticulous and unseen ways. Foucault said a relationship of power involves action(s) by one person to guide another's conduct, or to direct "the possible field of action of others" (Foucault, 1983, p. 221). Importantly, this view of power also meant that all power relations are inherently political as they are always exercised with specific aims and objectives in mind. In this way, power for Foucault is not only a dominating force; instead it can also be used as a productive force to create social change by reversing harmful relations.

Foucault (1995) also considered the important role of power in the creation of knowledge. As he argued, "power and knowledge directly imply one another...there is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge, nor any knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations" (p. 27). Consequently, all knowledge is deeply embedded in relations of power, which are in constant political negotiation or flux. This unique view of power, as Andrews (2001, 2008) observed, has enabled Foucauldian researchers to expose multiple and alternative interpretations of phenomenon that would typically be inaccessible or framed in one dominant way. Effective coaching is one such phenomenon that has been examined using Foucault's theorization of power. In what follows, I will review one specific form of power for Foucault that aims to limit and control the bodies of others (e.g., athletes), known as disciplinary power.

1.5.1 *Disciplinary Power and Athlete Docility*

According to Foucault (1995), the eighteenth century saw a shift from sovereign power as a central form of social control to a form power that focused on controlling and disciplining individual bodies. Accordingly, disciplinary power "reaches into the very grain of individuals, touches their bodies and inserts itself into their actions and attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives" (Foucault, 1980, p. 39). Central to the functioning of this power was an integrated system of control intended "to make useful individuals". To explain the precise details that characterized this transformation of the individual, Foucault (1995) outlined four specific techniques, and illustrated how they "made possible the meticulous control of the operations of the body" (p. 137). These four disciplinary techniques included: the *art of distributions* that involved how bodies were managed and used in spaces; the *control of activity* that involved how bodies were shaped by time in these spaces; the *organization of genesis* that

involved the way specific bodily practices were categorized and grouped; and the *composition of forces* that involved the way bodies were brought together to function as a machine. Importantly for Foucault, these techniques did not operate in a disjointed or fragmented manner; rather they worked together to exert their influence over the body through three specific instruments: *hierarchical observation*, *normalizing judgment* and *the examination*. Moreover, to maximize the workings of power, Foucault drew on Jeremy Bentham's design of the panopticon to describe how mechanisms of surveillance induce "a state of consciousness and permanent visibility that assures the autocratic functioning of power" (p. 200). For Foucault, it was the collective power of these techniques and instruments that assured the body's subjection, which he believed could easily lead bodies into a state of absolute compliance or docility.

Over the last 25 years, Foucauldian coaching researchers have clearly shown how the repeated exposure to strict systems of discipline and control can lead athletes' to experience docility which can undermine their ability to manage the demands and challenges of competitive sport (e.g., Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010; Chapman, 1997; Crocket, 2015; Heikkala, 1993; Johns & Johns, 2000; Jones, Glintmeyer, & McKenzie, 2005; McMahon, Penny, & Dinan-Thompson, 2012; Pringle & Crocket, 2013; Shogan, 1999; Tsang, 2000). As a central concept for Foucauldian coaching researchers, docility represents "a hold by another over others' bodies, not only so that they may do what one wishes, but so that they may operate as one wishes, with the techniques, the speed and the efficiency that one determines" (Foucault, 1995, p. 138). To illustrate athlete docility, through Foucault's (1995) analysis of disciplinary power, Heikkala (1993) argued that athletes learn to discipline themselves into docile, productive bodies and peak performers by uncritically following highly detailed training regimes set by the coach.

To further illustrate athlete docility, Shogan (1999) outlined how sport produces docile bodies through the use of disciplinary techniques that "map very well onto sport, thus illustrating that the classificatory and controlling impulses of modern power are also central to high-performance sport" (p. 19). According to Shogan, the dominant knowledges of sport (e.g., exercise physiology, biomechanics, sports medicine) have led athletes to strictly adhere to training programs with complete and utter compliance. Importantly, Shogan's influential work highlighted how athletes' training practices are held together by a host of complex power relations that circulate in and around every sporting context. In addition, she argued that coaches need to be aware of the normalizing and objectifying effects that their practices can have on their athletes' bodies. Following this work, a group of Foucauldian coaching researchers have aimed to provide a more comprehensive understanding of effective coaching by using Foucault's analysis of discipline to map the disciplinary techniques specifically in endurance running coaches' practices and to critique the docile-making effects they can have on the endurance running body. And given my interest in changing endurance running coaches' practices, this research is particularly relevant.

1.5.2 *Discipline and Endurance Running Coaches' Practices*

Over the last decade, a number of Foucauldian endurance running coaching researchers (Denison, 2007, 2010; Denison & Avner, 2011; Denison & Mills, 2014; Denison, Mills, & Jones, 2013; Denison, Mills, & Konoval, 2015; Mills & Denison, 2013) have argued for the importance of developing endurance running coaches' awareness of the problematic effects that overly disciplinary practices can have on endurance runners' bodies. Specifically, these researchers have centered their attention around the performance-related effects to athletes' bodies that can result from overly disciplinary coaching practices. For example, Denison (2007)

explored his own sense-making as an endurance running coach by illustrating how his strict use of discipline could be used to understand a poor performance by one of his athletes. Denison argued that to be more effective, endurance running coaches need to consider the disciplining effects that their training programs can have on their athletes' bodies. After making his initial argument for using Foucault to help develop more effective coaches, Denison moved his research forward by mapping the dominant discourses that surround effective endurance running coaching.

As a key Foucauldian concept, discourses are the unwritten rules that control how a particular social practice can be understood (Markula & Pringle, 2006). With regards to coaching, discourses frame the "dominant ways of understanding a particular social field (e.g., coaching), as well as understanding the dominant practices within a particular social field (e.g., coaching practices)" (Avner, Jones, & Denison, 2014, p. 43). Through a discourse analysis, Denison (2010) mapped the discursive formation of endurance running coaches' planning practices by identifying the dominant ways of knowing that influence how endurance running coaches understand how to coach. Denison also showed how coaches' knowledge of planning is enmeshed within relations of power and discourses to form a power-knowledge nexus that is imprinted on athletes' bodies and bodily practices.

Dominant coaching knowledge dictates what can be known as the 'truth' about the practice of planning in endurance running coaching, and subsequently, what can be known as false. Mills and Denison (2015) found the dominant coaching knowledge to be physiology, which examines how athletes' bodies adapt and respond to physical stress through training practices (Noakes, 1991; Daniels, 2005). In turn, physiology has conjoined with power relations to become a powerful tool that has come to narrow coaches view of available practices to only

those that are strictly informed by physiological principles. Following Foucault (1972), Mills and Denison concluded that endurance running coaches need to be able to understand the specific conditions that have constructed physiology as the dominant coaching knowledge, and then use this understanding to develop new coaching practices. After mapping the dominant coaching knowledge in effective endurance running coaching, Foucauldian coaching researchers began to focus on coaches' practices—what actually occurs in training spaces.

Following Denison's early work (Denison, 2007, 2010), Denison, Mills, and Jones (2013) completed a historical analysis of effective coaching to provide a more comprehensive application of how Foucault's (1995) analysis of disciplinary power and docility can help explain what is happening in endurance running coaches' practices. Denison et al. clearly illustrated that how endurance running coaches have learned how to develop their coaching practices has been largely derived from physiological knowledge that has formed a specific understanding of how to organize space, time and movement. Subsequently, Denison et al. suggested that to become more a more effective coach, and coach in less disciplining and controlling ways, endurance running coaches require a deep awareness of how relations of power have come to privilege certain coaching practices above all others. As a way to critically question their coaching practices, Denison and Avner (2011) demonstrated the importance of coaches 'problematizing' their everyday taken-for-granted practices in order to coach more ethically. Problematization is a form of critical reflection through which a person continually questions the ways in which knowledge and certain truths are formed about a particular subject in various contexts (Foucault, 2000). Denison and Avner concluded by recommending that coaches begin to problematize their use of a range of disciplinary techniques when implementing their everyday coaching practices. After theoretically outlining the contemporary conceptualization of effective endurance running

coaching, Denison and Mills (2013) aimed to provide 'empirical' support to further their critique of the need for endurance running coaches to gain a deeper awareness of disciplinary power and begin to problematize their coaching practices.

Recently, Mills and Denison (2013) showed how the use of a range of disciplinary techniques has infiltrated nearly every aspect of endurance running coaching by interviewing and observing 15 high-performance endurance running coaches. Due to this overwhelming uptake of disciplinary techniques, Mills and Denison argued that it is very difficult to perceive effective endurance running coaching as anything other than a process that must be highly structured, objective, logical, rational, and planned. Their analysis revealed that through the emphatic use of disciplinary techniques and instruments coaches have full control over their athletes training, decision-making, and essentially their athletes' bodies. This makes it difficult for athletes to practice making untold decisions about their bodily state as they must do in each and every race. Mills and Denison argued that teaching endurance running coaches how to 'coach with Foucault' could allow for possibilities of positive and ethical change by helping athletes become more engaged and have a greater understanding of their bodies, which can help diminish the problematic effects of docility.

To build upon their previous findings, Denison and Mills (2014) suggested some ways of how an endurance running coach could change his or her practices to be less disciplinary and coach with Foucault. For example, he or she could destabilize time by asking athletes to remove their watches during a workout. Or, he or she could develop workouts designed to overcome the limits and constraints that can result from ranking and partitioning athletes. Or, he or she could reduce his or her various surveillance practices. In this way, coaching in a less disciplinary way means a coach continually recognizing how he or she is using his or her power "to conduct

himself (sic) properly in relation to others and for others" (Foucault, 1994, p. 287). According to Denison and Mills, coaching in a less disciplinary way has the capacity to help endurance running coaches become aware of new ways of thinking about their coaching practices that would have previously been inaccessible within the rigid bounds of contemporary dominant conceptualizations of effective coaching. However, Denison and Mills emphasized the importance of making these changes with the 'intention' of destabilizing problematic power relations. Without intention these changes can easily become training gimmicks and 'empty promises'. Denison and Mills concluded by calling on Foucauldian-informed coach developers to help coaches, and endurance running coaches in particular, change their practices and explore what it might mean to coach in a less disciplinary way.

1.6 My Dissertation

To summarize, with so many truths about what effective coaching *is* and what it *is not*, it can be increasingly difficult for coach developers to navigate through these multiple interpretations to discern what is truly effective coaching. I began this literature review by outlining how psychologically-informed coaching researchers have promoted specific behaviours and all-encompassing models as the 'best' way to create more effective coaches. I then reviewed how sociologically-informed coaching researchers have used various social theorists to better understand the messy and complex nature of coaching to help develop an awareness of coaching as a social activity. Next, I reviewed the effective coaching research that has used Pierre Bourdieu's concepts of habitus and social capital to understand how coaches' practices have ultimately been shaped and formed within specific contexts. Finally, I discussed the work of Foucauldian coaching researchers who have mapped and critiqued the discourses and power relations that have come to shape endurance running coaches' practices. However, as many

Foucauldian coaching researchers have noted (Denison, Cassidy, Pringle, & Hessian, 2015; Denison & Mills 2014; Denison, Mills & Konoval, 2015; Mills & Denison, 2014), despite all of this critique no empirical work has attempted to understand what it might mean to change coaches' use of disciplinary techniques and instruments (Foucault, 1995) in their practices. And until any change is attempted we will continue to remain unaware of the applied possibilities that coaching in a less disciplinary way might present.

In light of this, the purpose of my dissertation was to explore the impact of a Foucauldian-informed coach development collaboration with a university endurance running team. To do this, I acted as a Foucauldian-informed coach developer to collaborate with one male university endurance running coach to develop and implement a number of Foucauldian-inspired coaching practices for his athletes. More specifically, my dissertation consists of three papers that each provides different perspectives of the collaboration. The first paper examines the coach's experiences in the collaboration. Drawing on Foucault's (1995) analysis of discipline, I analyze the coach's experiences of learning how to problematize the use of discipline in his practices. The second paper examines the athletes' experiences in the collaboration. Framed through Foucault's (1995) analysis of discipline, I analyze how the practices might help athletes gain a greater awareness of their bodies, make more informed decisions, and be more engaged with their practices and performances. The third paper examines my experiences acting as the Foucauldian-informed coach developer in the collaboration. I used a post-structuralist approach (Markula & Silk, 2011) to understand what it might mean for a Foucauldian-informed coach developer to introduce and teach Foucault's concepts to an endurance running coach. Each of the aforementioned papers is presented in a completed paper form—with its own introduction, literature review, methodology, results and discussion, and conclusion. I will complete the

dissertation with a conclusion chapter that summarizes broader themes, implications, and future research directions.

Chapter 2.0

Paper #1 The Cyclical Relationship Between Physiology and Discipline: One Endurance Running Coach's Experiences Problematizing Disciplinary Practices

2.0 Introduction

It has long been established that effective coaches need to be developed in order to maximize athletes' performance potential and ensure that they have the greatest opportunity to excel. Research in exercise physiology (e.g., Bompa & Haff, 2009) has helped coaches understand the energy demands of their athletes' bodies, while current sport psychology research (e.g., Côté & Gilbert, 2009) has shown the importance for coaches to develop strong intrapersonal and interpersonal skills to become more effective. However, recent sociologically-informed effective coaching research has demonstrated the need for coaches to consider how wider operations of power which circulate in and around every coaching context can limit and constrain the effectiveness of their practices (e.g., Cassidy, Jones, & Potrac, 2009; Cushion, 2010; Denison, 2007; Jones, 2006). More specifically, Foucauldian effective coaching research that has focused specifically on endurance running has clearly shown the need for coaches to develop an awareness and understanding of the objectifying and normalizing effects that their coaching practices can have on their athletes' development (e.g., Denison & Mills, 2014; Denison, Mills, & Konoval, 2015; Mills & Denison, 2013).

Over the last decade, a group of Foucauldian coaching researchers (Denison, 2007, 2010; Denison & Avner, 2011; Denison, Mills, & Konoval, 2015; Mills & Denison, 2013) have used Foucault's (1995) analysis of discipline to show how coaches use a range of disciplinary techniques and instruments to transform their athletes into winning bodies. However, the uncritical use of various disciplinary techniques and instruments can also, unwittingly, make athletes docile (Foucault, 1995), which has been shown to be a problematic state for athletes aiming to achieve maximal performances (Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010; Denison, 2007; Shogan, 1999). Consequently, there have been numerous calls by coaching researchers (e.g.,

Denison, Pringle, Cassidy, & Hessian, 2015; Mills & Denison, 2013) for Foucauldian-informed coach developers to help coaches change their practices to be less reliant on discipline's various techniques and instruments.

In response to this call, in this study I acted as a Foucauldian-informed coach developer to work collaboratively with one male university endurance running coach who attempted to develop and implement a number of less disciplinary coaching practices. In what follows, I first outline the relationship between discipline and effective endurance running coaching. Next, I present the rationale for my methodology followed by my results and discussion. I will then conclude by suggesting how future coach development collaborations can be more effective.

2.1 Discipline and Effective Endurance Running Coaching

For Foucault (1995), discipline is a vehicle for power that is comprised of "a whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, levels of application, and targets" (p. 215). To illustrate how discipline operated, Foucault outlined four specific techniques: 1) the *art of distributions (i.e., space)* that involved how bodies were managed and used in spaces; 2) the *control of activity (i.e., time)* that involved how bodies were shaped by time in these spaces; 3) the *organization of genesis (i.e., organization of movement)* that involved the way specific bodily practices were categorized and grouped; and 4) the *composition of forces (i.e., planning)* that involved the way bodies were brought together to function as a machine. Importantly, these techniques did not operate in a disjointed or fragmented manner. Rather they worked together to exert their influence over the body through specific instruments: *hierarchical observation*, *normalizing judgment* and *the examination*. Taken together, Foucault believed the wholesale application of these disciplinary techniques and instruments produced docile bodies.

According to Foucault (1995), *docility* suggests "a hold by another over others' bodies, not only so that they may do what one wishes, but so that they may operate as one wishes, with the techniques, the speed and the efficiency that one determines" (p. 138). A docile body, moreover, can be "subjected, used, transformed and improved" (p. 136) to unquestioningly adhere to the strict orders of those in charge. Though docile individuals can be very productive, Foucauldian-informed coaching researchers have shown that coaches' unquestioned use of a range of disciplinary techniques and instruments that render athletes docile can undermine athletes' ability to develop important skills and qualities related to excellence in sport such as decision making, problem solving, and a greater understanding of their capacities and capabilities (e.g., Denison, 2007; Gearity & Mills, 2013; Jones, Glintmeyer, & McKenzie, 2005; Mills & Denison, 2013; Shogan, 1999). One sport in particular that has been studied by these researchers is endurance running (e.g., Denison, 2010; Denison, Mills, & Jones, 2013).

In coaching, certain knowledges frame the "dominant ways of understanding a particular social field (e.g., coaching), as well as understanding the dominant practices within a particular social field (e.g., coaching practices)" (Avner, Jones, & Denison, 2014, p. 43). According to Foucault's view of power (1978), dominant knowledges intertwine with power relations to create a knowledge-power nexus that can act as a powerful tool in determining the practices that individuals are able to use. Mills and Denison (2015) have outlined how physiology, which examines how athletes' bodies adapt and respond to physical stress through training practices (Noakes, 1991; Daniels, 2005), has become the dominant knowledge in endurance running coaching. As a result, I will now discuss Foucauldian coaching research that illustrates how the dominance of physiological knowledge has resulted in endurance running coaches' practices being largely dictated by Foucault's (1995) disciplinary techniques.

Recently, Mills and Denison (2013) examined how 14 high-performance endurance running coaches emphatically used disciplinary techniques in their practices and what effects this appeared to have on their understanding of how to coach effectively. Their findings showed that all of the coaches controlled their athletes' movements by relying heavily on the use of a stopwatch (i.e., temporal control). Such reliance, importantly, can shift a coach's focus away from other important athlete attributes such as breathing, running rhythm, and ground contact (Allen-Collison & Hockey, 2007; Denison, 2010; Allen-Collinson, 2009). Furthermore, Mills and Denison showed how the coaches in their study controlled their athletes' bodies by producing, albeit unintentionally, clear ranking systems (i.e., the art of distributions) in order to make it easier for them to monitor and judge each athlete's progress relative to the others.

What Mills and Denison's (2013) study also indicated was how unaware their participants were of their use of discipline and control in their practices. This is not surprising considering that the presence and activity of discipline within sport has been shown to be "largely invisible to those caught within its intricacies" (Mills & Denison, 2013, p. 147). Interestingly, when the coaches in Mills and Denison's study were made aware of their use of various disciplinary techniques and instruments in a series of follow-up interviews and the possible unintended consequences this could have on their athletes' ability to think for themselves they all agreed it was a problem. However, the coaches were at a loss for how to resolve this as they believed implementing disciplinary techniques in their everyday practices was the only way to be an effective coach. To conclude, Mills and Denison highlighted the importance for endurance running coaches to become aware of discipline's effects and how the unquestioned use of discipline's techniques and instruments can produce "numerous effects beyond the prescribed effects of the training plan" (p. 143). In this regard, Mills and Denison

concluded, learning how to question the unintended consequences of discipline's techniques and instruments could enable endurance running coaches to consider the total effects of their practices, and lead to more effective coaching practices; especially if athlete peak performance is the ultimate aim.

To give an indication of what coaching endurance runners in a less disciplinary way might look like in practice, Denison and Mills (2014) provided a number of applied training examples. For example, a coach could disrupt the effects of time by asking athletes to remove their watches during a workout. Such a change might help coaches learn more about how their athletes are responding to various efforts, rather than only understanding their athletes' responses in relation to training times. Furthermore, a coach could disrupt the effects of space by having athletes run less common distances (e.g., 341m or 787m) or run in new locations. This change could help a coach make less judgments and comparisons about athletes' progress through well-known distances, and instead come to understand their athletes' progress in more fluid and nonlinear ways.

Importantly, as Denison and Mills, and other Foucauldian-informed coach developers (Denison, Mills, & Konoval, 2015; Gearity & Mills, 2013) have argued, for less disciplinary practices to have a lasting and meaningful impact, they must be implemented with the 'intention' of destabilizing the effects of discipline. To illustrate, if an endurance coach destabilizes space by asking his or her athletes to run a series of repetitions in the opposite direction they typically run for one practice, the athletes might interpret this as a training gimmick if the purpose of the change is not clear, and if the change is not followed up with additional less disciplinary practices. In this way, albeit unintentionally, the coach will still be using discipline in his or her practices because disciplinary instruments will maintain the unquestioned dominance of

disciplinary techniques by continuing to judge and examine athletes' bodies according to training norms. Without being able to "continually problematize and regularly disrupt" (Denison & Mills, 2014, p. 13) the use of discipline in their practices, any changes to coaches' practices will likely still occur within the same controlling framework.

For Foucault (1978, 1995), *problematization* is an open-ended form of critical reflection where an individual questions the assumptions that underlie existing ways of practicing. In endurance running, coaches should learn to problematize the strong relationship between dominant sport science knowledges (i.e., exercise physiology, biomechanics, motor learning) and discipline's techniques and instruments and how they operate together to support and determine what can be known as effective coaching practices and what cannot (Denison et al., 2013; Mills & Denison, 2013). As a result, learning how to problematize the use of disciplinary techniques and instruments in their practices is critical in order for endurance running coaches to be able to identify and challenge problems within their practices that would normally go unnoticed.

Following numerous calls by Foucauldian coaching researchers (e.g., Denison et al, 2013, 2015; Mills & Denison, 2013) to explore what it might mean for coaches to learn how to problematize the use of discipline in their practices, this study presents the first attempt at a coach development collaboration between a Foucauldian-informed coach developer and an endurance running coach. More specifically, over a five-month period, I acted as a Foucauldian-informed coach developer working collaboratively with a male university cross-country coach to support him in developing and implementing a number of less disciplinary coaching practices. Therefore, framed through Foucault's (1995) analysis of discipline, this study examined some of the barriers, challenges, and opportunities that an endurance running coach experienced as he

learned to problematize the use of discipline in his practices. I will now outline the methodology that informed how I carried out this study.

2.2 Methodology

To examine my coach participant's experiences of changing his practices to be less disciplinary, post-structuralism was deemed best suited to guide the entire design of this study, including the research question, the selection of methods, the data collection process, and the data analysis technique. Instead of searching for one fixed meaning through objectivity, post-structural researchers assume a subjective epistemology as they see knowledge as a social construction and meanings as constantly changing through a complex array of influences in a specific context. Furthermore, unlike humanist— interpretive and critical—researchers, post-structural researchers assume an ontology that considers realities to be multiple, fragmented and continually contested (Markula & Silk, 2011). As a result, post-structural researchers reject the idea of one true objective reality in the world. Importantly, Foucault's (1995) work is situated within the post-structural paradigm which allowed me to analyze my empirical material using Foucault's concepts of disciplinary techniques and instruments, and his understanding of problematization, as outlined earlier. A post-structuralist perspective is particularly well-suited for this study because of its aim to create theory-driven change to problematic practices (Avner, Jones, & Denison, 2014). I will now discuss the selection of my research participant followed by my methods.

2.2.1 Sample

This study was conducted with one high-performance university cross-country running team consisting of one male head coach and 20 athletes (10 male and 10 female). To select the coach participant for this study, who I will identify using the pseudonym Cliff, I used criterion-

based sampling (Patton, 2002). Specifically, the criteria involved a willingness on the part of Cliff to: engage with an alternative coaching knowledge, implement different coaching practices, provide me with access to all of his training practices, and meet with me regularly to discuss and summarize his understanding of Foucault's concepts (i.e., discipline's techniques) while also discussing his implementation of less disciplinary practices. I deemed Cliff to be an appropriate participant through three informal meetings where we discussed his interest and suitability. Cliff has coached at a national coaching institute, achieved a Master's degree in coaching, and has worked both at a regional and national level as an endurance coach educator. As the acting Foucauldian-informed coach developer for this study, my experiences as a former elite endurance runner and as an endurance running coach at multiple levels has given me a deep understanding of endurance running cultures.

2.2.2 Methods

This coach development collaboration took place over a five-month cross country running season that was split into two main phases, the familiarization phase and the application phase (see Figure 1 for overview). For the familiarization phase that spanned over the first two months, I observed eight of Cliff's practices and kept detailed field notes of the presence and activity of Foucault's (1995) disciplinary techniques and the effects these presences and activities appeared to be having on Cliff and his athletes. The overall goal of my observations during this phase was to understand and develop a familiarity with Cliff's common and everyday coaching practices. Observations made it possible for me to become more aware of the context of Cliff's practices in a way that other methods cannot achieve (Patton, 2002). Following categorizations by Gibson and Brown (2009), in some practices I was a passive and known observer, and in other practices I was an active participant. However, Patton argued that

researchers' participation will likely occur fluidly instead of precisely into one category. Indeed, the type of observation I used was greatly determined by the context. For example, at times I faded into the background as much as possible, while at other times I actively participated by engaging in casual conversations before and after practices with Cliff to build rapport and by assisting Cliff with pylon placement or timing athletes when he asked. I was actively reflexive throughout the entire research process to ensure I did not become too much of a participant to the point that I might lose sight of the aim of my research (Atkinson & Coffey, 2002). All observations were captured in field notes that were recorded within an hour of practice, which took place throughout the season two to three days per week in different parks around the city (6-10 hours per week).

During the application phase that took place over the remaining three-months of the cross country running season, Cliff and I made changes to 12 of his practices using the following three steps. First, I conducted 'practice development meetings' each Monday to develop new practice(s). These meetings resembled more of a conversation, as they were highly collaborative. Working collaboratively meant that I did not go into our meetings with predetermined practices for Cliff to implement. Instead, Cliff or myself first identified an opportunity for improvement, then I introduced how disrupting the unquestioned presence of one of Foucault's disciplinary techniques or instruments could help, and together we designed a practice that destabilized the chosen technique(s). The disciplinary technique(s) we chose to disrupt were fluid and were wholly dependent on the nature of our discussions and Cliff's interests and needs. Second, I observed Cliff's implementation of the new practice(s), typically on a Tuesday, Thursday, or Saturday of the same week. For these observations I followed the same approach noted above. After each observation, I recorded detailed field notes that captured Cliff's implementation of the

new practice in relation to my Foucauldian theoretical framework (Angrosino, 2005; Markula & Silk, 2011). Importantly, my field notes influenced what Cliff and I discussed in subsequent meetings, and in turn, what we discussed in the meetings was followed up in the field. Third, during the week that followed the new practice(s), I conducted 'practice evaluation meetings' to discuss our evaluations of his most recent implemented practice(s). If needed, we also recapitulated how thinking with Foucault could enable him to coach differently. Meetings were typically 60 to 90 minutes long, and there was crossover between some practice development and evaluation meetings. Overall, this study was informed by 10 audio-recorded meetings between Cliff and myself, and observations of 20 of Cliff's practices throughout the season. Ethics approval was gained and the participant signed an informed consent.

2.2.3 Data Analysis

Post-structuralist research is subjective which means that researchers are constantly interpreting their own and other individuals' accounts about what they did and why they did it in order to produce informed and theoretically-driven analyses (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008). Therefore, to complete a rigorous analysis of my empirical material I drew heavily on my Foucauldian theoretical framework (Markula & Silk, 2011). To do this, a Foucauldian theory-based analysis technique guided the analysis of all of my meetings and field notes. My technique for analyzing my empirical material (i.e., meetings and field notes) was as follows: 1) I identified all possible themes found within my empirical material, 2) I then analyzed the intersections and discrepancies between themes to identify new possible themes, and finally 3) I connected these themes to Foucault's (1995) disciplinary techniques and instruments, Foucault's notion of problematization, and previous Foucauldian coaching literature (Markula & Silk, 2011). The main difference between the analysis of my meetings and field notes was that I only wrote field

notes that directly related to my theoretical framework, but I analyzed entire meetings. Following the recommendations from Markula and Silk (2011), I continually analyzed all empirical material throughout the research process to ensure the coach development collaboration remained theory-driven. I will now present my findings, followed by the conclusion.

2.3 Developing Less Disciplinary Coaching Practices

Since this coach development study was entirely collaborative, my results will highlight various interactions between Cliff and I in order to draw a more accurate picture of our shared experiences of working together. My results are organized according to the three steps of the application phase that I previously explained in the methods. In the first section, I will briefly outline four examples of the 12 less disciplinary practices—the programming—that Cliff and I developed to show the initial intention of the practices and illustrate how the practices were different from Cliff's typical coaching practices. Due to limited space, I choose four practices that most effectively illustrated my main themes. In addition, I believe these four practices provide the most depth to Cliff's overall experiences developing and implementing less disciplinary practices. In the second section, I will return to the four highlighted practices to examine Cliff's actual implementation of these practices based on my observations in the field. For my analysis, which will be intertwined within the second section, I will draw from my empirical material (i.e., field notes, meetings) to illustrate how Cliff's effort to problematize the use of discipline in his practices was at times limited by the dominance of physiological knowledge, which is heavily drawn upon in endurance running to help coaches plan and evaluate their practices.

2.3.1 Practice #1: Temporal Control

Cliff and I began developing less disciplinary practices at the beginning of the application phase, which was during the third month of the collaboration. One of the first opportunities that Cliff identified in a practice development meeting was a problem with how his athletes' training times often placed boundaries around what they believed their bodies were capable of doing. In Cliff's words, his athletes were "paying too much attention to their training times instead of honing in our how their bodies are actually feeling." In my previous observations of Cliff's practices, I noted that he and his athletes used their stopwatches to time and record every repetition and its corresponding recovery. With these training times, Cliff could closely monitor his athletes' effort levels in order to assess their physiological progression. However, as Foucault (1995) showed, the precise and constant application of temporal forces can also be used to judge individuals bodies according to fixed norms. Following recommendations by Denison and Mills (2014), I explained to Cliff how a consequence of temporal control is that it could lead his athletes to experience a number of unintended consequences, such as those that Cliff sensed: his athletes' unawareness of their bodies. To destabilize temporal control, Cliff developed a practice where his athletes would run various repetitions on the track without the use of a stopwatch. Cliff hoped this practice would help his athletes begin to learn how to listen to their bodies' unique cues and energy levels, rather than judging their effort and fatigue based on their previous repetition times, their teammates' times, or times set by Cliff.

2.3.2 Practice #2: Spatial Arrangements

In another practice development meeting mid-way through the first month of the application phase, I mentioned to Cliff that my observations showed that his athletes always trained in the same training groups and ran in the same order during every practice. Indeed, this

spatial control was useful to Cliff because it allowed him to more easily compare and judge his athletes according to their usual rankings. However, Foucault (1995) argued that individuals who are consistently held in a specific rank could come to internalize their rank as a truth. In endurance running, this makes moving into any other rank or position in a practice or race difficult for athletes as they can too easily internalize their ranking as the place they must occupy (Mills & Denison, 2013). After explaining the effects of rank to Cliff, he said, "I agree that pecking orders can be problematic on cross country running teams." I then used the example of how if an athlete is consistently ranked fourth in team practices, it might be difficult for him or her to move out of this ranking in a race. After this explanation Cliff agreed that destabilizing his athletes' training groups was worth doing, we developed a practice where his athletes would run three to five mile repetitions. However, unlike his typical practices where all of the athletes would leave at the same time for each repetition, all of the athletes would wait on the start line for each repetition until Cliff released each athlete at an unspecified time. By doing this, Cliff intentionally destabilized the predetermined order his athletes would normally sort themselves into at the beginning of each repetition so that they could experience running in a new position or space, and potentially come to understand their unique capacities in less restricting ways.

2.3.3 Practice #3: Organizational Practices

In a practice development meeting at the end of the third month of the study, Cliff was keen to discuss why some of his athletes felt as though they were not able to physically reach the point of exhaustion in their first race of the season. More specifically, Cliff said, "many of the athletes felt as though they were not able to find that next gear and really dig deep in the race." Foucault (1995) demonstrated how organizing successive segments of time into a linear timeframe that progresses to a stable point (i.e., repetition-based training) can if one is not

careful, “make possible a perpetual characterization of the individual either in relation to this term, in relation to other individuals, or in relation to a type of itinerary” (p. 161). Consequently, a series of predetermined repetitions in a practice can easily make it difficult for some athletes to explore their unique personal limits. Predetermined repetitions can also minimize the types of feedback coaches can get from their athletes because they are simply following the coach’s set plan. Following Cliff’s concern of allowing his athletes to experiencing running until the point of exhaustion, I explained to him that his athletes may have felt limited in races because they typically have to run a ‘right’ number of repetitions in practices (e.g., 8 x 400m) that in turn can make it difficult to run until the point of exhaustion in their races because, as I specifically asked Cliff, “How can you expect your athletes to run to their maximum potential in races when their practices are not structured in a way that allows them to experience this?” As the discussion proceeded, Cliff appeared eager to modify the organization of part of his next practice that consisted of 200m repetitions on a grass field, so that his athletes would not have a minimum or maximum number of repetitions to complete, instead they could run until they felt as though they reached exhaustion.

2.3.4 Practice #4: Planning Practices

In a practice development meeting that followed his team’s second race at the beginning of the fourth month of the study, Cliff felt as though there were no opportunities for his athletes to more effectively recover after their races as they felt constantly fatigued. For endurance running coaches, it is important that athletes recover so they can prevent injury from overtraining and feel fresh for future practices. Specifically, Cliff noted that many of his athletes appeared consistently fatigued, which might be affecting their performances. Based on this, Cliff and I discussed what it might mean to give his athletes greater control over the structure of their

recovery practice, which took place the following Tuesday. For Cliff, recovery practices were done as a form of active recovery, so his athletes would still maintain a degree of fitness. Greater control over the design of their recovery practice was different from Cliff's typical recovery practices where his athletes would complete between five to ten repetitions of two-minute moderate efforts followed by two-minute easy efforts in their typical training groups. Cliff asked me to redesign this practice so that he could see what a truly Foucauldian-inspired practice looked like. Accordingly, I designed the following practice for Cliff to explain to his athletes:

> The purpose of this practice is for you to do whatever you need to do to feel recovered with no more than 20-minutes of tempo running. However, you can organize this in any way you would like. For example, as two extremes, you could do 20-minutes of straight tempo or you could do 40 x 30-second repetitions. You can also decide to go on your own or with a group. Moreover, you can decide to change the structure of the session at any time. It is important to take some time to think about this and how you are feeling before you start the practice. Please try not to ask me questions about what I think you should do.

This practice was developed to destabilize all of Foucault's four disciplinary techniques as athletes choose the time and space to complete the practice, planned the practice structure (i.e., organization of genesis), and decided to train individuality or in a group (i.e., the composition of forces). In addition, when I presented Cliff this practice, I explained that these were general guidelines and he should deliver the purpose of this practice to his athletes in a way that worked for him.

When discussing each of the practices outlined above, I weaved in caveats about how these new practices would challenge Cliff because, for example, his modes of evaluating

practices using discipline's instruments would change, which would sometimes leave him with no way to judge how his athletes' bodies were progressing. While Cliff initially appeared to understand the consequences in our practice development meetings, in what follows, my analysis of Cliff's experiences in the field implementing the aforementioned practices showed that this may not have entirely been the case.

2.4 Implementing Less Disciplinary Coaching Practices

During most of our practice development meetings, Cliff appeared willing to explore Foucauldian-inspired problematizing of his practices and he was comfortable with having conversations about making changes to his programming—the organization and structure of his coaching practices. Moreover, he was often eager to implement the less disciplinary practices we developed. Specifically, Cliff showed the ability to identify problems with disciplinary techniques in his practices, which I believe shows a degree of problematization. This in itself was an encouraging finding and I believe it showed a high-level progression for a coach to even entertain this alternative knowledge and be willing to change many of his normal everyday coaching practices. But although the aforementioned practices were developed with the 'intention' of destabilizing various disciplinary techniques, and by extension discipline's instruments, in the field, this did not necessarily occur as I anticipated. And in what follows I will discuss how the slight adaptations Cliff made to these practices allowed them to remain informed by physiological knowledge instead of Foucault's knowledge. Importantly, I will try to show that these practices were not implemented in this way because of Cliff's reluctance or hesitation, rather I will show that there were broader forces at play that highlight the difficulty in this work.

2.4.1 Practice #1: Maintaining Subtle Control

In the first previously described practice that Cliff and I developed to destabilize temporal control, Cliff asked his athletes to remove their stopwatches for various repetitions on the track. But as I wrote in my field notes, "Cliff's athletes removed their watches but Cliff did not remove his own watch and continued to time some of his athletes. I should have made it more clear that he also needed to remove his watch." Indeed, some of the athletes appeared to know that Cliff was still timing (read judging) them and proceeded to look to Cliff for guidance as to whether they should speed up or slow down. In this way, while the athletes were uncertain of their training times, they knew their coach wasn't, and that he was still able to monitor their effort levels. As a result, temporal control had not been disrupted in any meaningful way. Rather, it was made clear to the athletes that controlling time was important to Cliff. Furthermore, the athletes were aware that they could have been timed, or not. And so likely expected that, if important, Cliff would relay their times to them.

In the next evaluation meeting that followed this practice, Cliff expressed concerns with the practice, but not those noted by me. For example, he said, "I don't think the practice was successful at teaching them (the athletes) anything new about their bodies, which was what we wanted." He continued by saying that this practice showed him that his athletes were "not affected" by time because they appeared unmoved by not having their stopwatches. When I prompted Cliff to talk more specifically about his evaluation of this new workout, he quickly remarked that for him the practice did not change the way he normally coached. I explained to Cliff that this might be because he was still facilitating temporal control by continuing to time his athletes. Cliff responded by saying he did not fully understand how he was controlling his athletes because "it was not like I was running behind them with a whip!" This is true. But while

timing endurance runners to get a better indication of how their bodies are progressing is a normal aspect of endurance running coaching, this practice was meant to have the athletes focus less on objective feedback about how their bodies were responding and instead experience running beyond temporal constraints. As the meeting came to an end, Cliff remained sceptical about why he also had to be uncertain of his athletes' training times.

The implementation of this practice illustrates how understanding discipline can be so difficult because, as Cliff pointed out, it allows normalizing judgments to be implemented without requiring "excess force or violence" (Foucault, 1995, p. 177). However, talking about the prison guards, Foucault (1995) said, "even if they do not make use of violent or bloody, even when they use 'lenient' methods involving confinement or correction, it is always the body that is at issue—the body and its forces, their utility and their docility" (p. 25). For this practice, the continued reliance on discipline allowed Cliff to, albeit unknowingly, ensure that many of his athletes still achieved the 'acceptable' coach-controlled physiological adaptation. Of course, managing athletes' bodies to ensure they achieve the proper physiological response typically illustrates effective endurance running coaching (Mills & Denison, 2013). However, by continuing to time his athletes, Cliff maintained subtle control over his athletes' bodies in this practice because he was still able to employ disciplinary instruments (Foucault, 1995) to hold some of his athletes in very specific ways (Mills & Denison, 2016). As the coach developer, I must take responsibility for this discrepancy because I was not able to effectively explain to Cliff how timing his athletes would maintain the dominance of physiological truths about the body, and therefore, would likely minimize the potential impact of athletes running without a watch.

Furthermore, this practice example highlights an important disconnection between Cliff and my focus of the practice changes. Most notably, I was more interested in how the practice

changed his coaching and his reliance on timing his athletes to be effective as a coach, whereas he was more interested in how the practice effected his athletes' responses to their training. Although I often mentioned to Cliff that this was a coach development initiative, it makes sense that he focused on how the changes were going to affect his athletes. At the end of the day, his employment is judged on whether or not his athletes achieve various performance standards or not. Moreover, applied interventions are typically designed to elicit specific athlete improvements. In this sense, Cliff was only following the dominant understanding of sport science research initiatives. Whereas there are fewer examples of applied coach development interventions where the outcomes are intended to affect the coach, with the athletes then benefitting due to the coach changing his or her practices. In this way, this less disciplinary practice may have been framed too much around the changes we hoped the athletes might experience and not enough around the changes Cliff could experience. In this way, I likely assumed too much and failed to make it explicitly clear that Cliff had to also change by removing his stopwatch. Coach developers need to constantly problematize the network of power relations surrounding any coaching context that might influence the implementation of less disciplinary practices. Overall, while it can be important to time athletes' repetitions to ensure they are achieving an effective physiological stimulus, timing athletes in this practice reinforced the dominance of physiology and maintained the importance for the athletes to determine their bodily efforts according to time.

2.4.2 Practice #2: Sustaining the Disciplinary Machine

In the second previously described practice, Cliff and I aimed to destabilize the formation of rank in his training groups. However, my field notes indicated that, "Cliff was not always able to split-up certain partnerships." Specifically, Cliff kept the two top performing (i.e., highest

ranked) athletes from his women's team and some of the top performing athletes from his men's team together for some of the repetitions. Keeping his top performing athletes together allowed Cliff to still observe and make judgments about some of his athletes' performances and progressions. When I asked Cliff why he had decided to keep some of his athletes together after the practice, he exclaimed, "athletes will always get the most (i.e., achieve the strongest physiological adaptation) out of each other in a group. And I need certain athletes to train together for every practice."

While Cliff believed his athletes would benefit from experiencing less spatial control by rank, but he also had concerns with his ability to "manage all the moving parts" during the practice. Cliff said, "I think where I failed was in the design of the session was that it was just too chaotic which made it too difficult for me to manage in the moment." Cliff felt as though he had to modify the athletes' groupings so that some of his athletes could remain together. However, when I suggested to Cliff that the intended effect of the practice might have been minimized by this small but influential modification, he responded with reservations about why he had to split up all of his athletes in the first place. Specifically, Cliff said, "by doing too much destabilization we took away from the fact that we have a group of individuals that will be able to get more out of each other (physiologically) by being together." Without a doubt this makes sense, as training athletes together can be an effective training technique. I should also note that Cliff has a great deal of experience developing high-calibre athletes. However, in this practice, the dominant view that training athletes together as a unit (read machine) always allows for a more physiologically efficient training practice might have limited the intended effect of destabilizing athletes' rank.

According to Foucault's (1995) composition of forces, training athletes' together in a group means that all individuals can be monitored as one element of a machine, in order to know their place "as well as the accompanying array of habits, behaviours, and idiosyncrasies that determine what he or she should be doing" (Denison, Mills, & Jones, 2013, p. 394). By destabilizing his athletes' regular training arrangement too much, Cliff believed some athletes were not being pushed to run faster by their faster ranked teammates, and therefore, were only gaining a sub-optimal physiological response. When I explained how it is critical for his athletes to learn how to push themselves independently of each other as they will in races, Cliff countered by saying that his athletes had "been together for so long that…not that I am afraid of this…but they will ask why are you splitting us up when you spent four years putting us together?" Indeed, this is a valid point. Athletes can easily become accustomed to training a certain way, and might struggle to accept any sort of change. Following this, Cliff called upon his physiological knowledge to affirm his actions when he said, "For me there are just more (physiological) factors that come into play here that we are not talking about here." Here Cliff might have felt pressured as he fell back on physiological knowledge, knowledge he was confident and comfortable with, to make sense of the discrepancy.

In our practice development meeting, Cliff initially saw the need to destabilize rank in order to allow his athletes to experience their training capacities irrespective of their teammates. However, the realization that his top performing athletes might not be achieving an efficient, coach-determined, and physiological adaptation led Cliff to slightly modify the less disciplinary practice for some athletes. Importantly, underlining the combination of forces becoming such a focal point was Cliff's requirement to have a benchmark of the practices success for select athletes. Nevertheless, Cliff continued to practice normalizing judgment (Foucault, 1995)

because it maintained the effects of discipline by allowing him to know and modify his athletes' bodies in specific ways. Similar to the first practice, it is possible that our conversations might have been too focused around how the changes could effect the athletes while not giving enough consideration how the changes might effect Cliff's coaching. This is my fault as the coach developer because I did not help Cliff consider all the various influences that would be at play that might minimize the initial practice intention. Regardless, as the meeting concluded, Cliff said he would probably not do a practice that split up his regular training groups again and if he did, he said it would have to be "much more carefully planned out." And again, many endurance cultures and groups look to recruit athletes who can help to push other athletes by training together to achieve a high-quality physiological stimulus. However, in this case, training together might have reinforced the dominance of physiological practice outcomes and deemphasized any Foucauldian outcomes that may have been realized by destabilizing rank.

2.4.3 Practice #3: Still Making the 'Right' Decisions

In the third previously described practice, Cliff intended to destabilize the organization of genesis as each athlete was able to stop a repetition-based practice when he or she felt he or she had reached exhaustion instead of having reached a coach-controlled maximum number. In my field notes, however, I wrote:

> When Cliff talked to his athletes about this practice, he was a little vague about how each athlete had control over when he or she could stop. As the practice unfolded, the athletes seemed to follow the lead of Cliff's senior and top-performing athletes who controlled the pace for each repetition. Some of the younger athletes appeared to be confused about when they should stop. However, after eight repetitions, the senior top-performing athletes stopped and the other athletes followed. Throughout the practice, Cliff watched

with intent, as he was curious to see how many they would choose to do. After the practice, Cliff appeared happy because eight is how many they normally do.

Although Cliff gave his athletes the opportunity to run any number of repetitions they wanted, they appeared unable to break away from what they considered to be the 'right' number of 200m repetitions. When I asked Cliff in the next practice evaluation meeting if he thought the practice was successful in achieving its initial intent, he thought it was because his athletes ran the 'right' number of repetitions without him having to tell them. Cliff said, "Eight was a good number given the hard practices that would be coming in the near future." I then reiterated to Cliff that our initial intention was for the athletes to take control and run until their individual point of exhaustion. While he understood, he was convinced that eight was the 'right' number for everyone to do and that they appeared exhausted to him. In my view as a Foucauldian the organization of genesis had not been destabilized in a meaningful way. In fact, I will now show how the strength of the training plan, through the combination of the organization of genesis and discipline's instruments (Foucault, 1995), appeared to make it difficult for the athletes to get beyond running the 'right' number of repetitions to ensure the proper physiological response.

Endurance running coaches' training plans have become an important and powerful organizational tool by providing the ideal guide for how to develop the most successful athletes (Denison et al., 2013). A training plan produces a "linear timeframe where all progress orients to a fixed, stable point" (p. 393). In this way, knowing athletes' progress becomes imperative for coaches in order to ensure alignment with their stable and precise plan. A meticulously engineered training plan, therefore, gives coaches and their athletes the assurance that what the practices they are doing are the 'right' ones. However, Foucault (1995) warned that segments of time precisely organized in a "succession of elements of increasing complexity" (p. 158), such as

a training plan, can reinforce the rigidity of coaching practices and be used to normalize, shape, and mould individuals to only follow very specific processes. As such, the strength of Cliff's established training plan may have made it difficult for his athletes to move away from Cliff's normal number of repetitions that lead to a very specific physiological outcome to experience running until exhaustion.

Adding to this, as one of discipline's instruments, *hierarchical observation* (Foucault, 1995) allowed discipline to continue to work in the absence of Cliff's direct instruction of when to stop. Cliff often mentioned that because he had a relatively large team and no assistant coach he relied on his senior athletes to help him manage training practices. For example, he said, "My senior athletes basically write their own training programs. I don't have to tell them much." But ironically, Cliff's senior athletes who had been in his program the longest were likely most docile to changes in practices because they had been participating in Cliff's normal practices the longest. As a consequence, when Cliff did not explicitly tell his athletes how many repetitions to run, as he would normally do, he indirectly relied on his senior athletes to become his new eyes—part of the "perfect eye that nothing would escape" (Foucault, 1995, p. 173)—to ensure the younger athletes made the so-called 'right' decision regarding their training, which in this case was how many 200m repetitions to run. Of course, Foucault (1995) was clear that discipline's instruments do not work in isolation. In this way, normalizing judgment and the examination worked incognito to ensure that "various meanings already established as the 'right' ways to be remained fixed and in place" (Mills & Denison, 2016, p. 4). It is important to reiterate that this did not occur because of something Cliff did. In other words, it was not Cliff's fault that his athletes stopped at eight repetitions. Hierarchical observation has become an important part of the culture of many high-performance sport teams. But in this practice, its continued operation

might have caused the athletes to run a physiologically sound number of repetitions that had been deemed appropriate or correct by their training plan, rather than allowing them to discover their capacities beyond the usual number of 200m repetitions. As a result, even if an athlete wanted to do more or less repetitions, discipline's instruments worked to support and strengthen the organization of genesis by pressuring the younger athletes to stay in line with what the 'normal' number of repetitions is. And no athlete wants to be seen as abnormal.

Later in the same evaluation meeting, Cliff and I discussed some of the unintended effects of his senior athletes upholding Cliff's usual training practices and limited less informed athletes from running until they reached their sense of exhaustion. Cliff responded by saying, "I certainly think that can happen. But the mature athletes can see beyond those things." He then said that his senior athletes making the decisions in the practice "was a demonstration of me being an effective coach throughout the years," because they knew the right number to do even when he did not explicitly tell them. Put another way, Cliff's senior athletes had internalized his training plan so completely that they determined what was the right number of repetitions to do for the group. Of course, effective coaches are often seen as ones who can motivate and educate their athletes to be able to take more responsibility over their own training practices. Based on this, Cliff was right to say that this practice illustrated that he had effectively created an efficient practice environment for his athletes. However, in this practice, the continued presence of disciplinary instruments may have prevented some athletes from pushing beyond their known physiological capacities to run until exhaustion. And it is also worth asking: Where did eight repetitions come from? Who is able to say this is the right number of repetitions? How do such understandings form and why is it so hard to deviate from them? While the athletes are showing they can carry out a good plan, was it really the best plan for all of them?

So maybe the proposed practice consisting of running to the point of exhaustion simply presented too much of physiological risk to Cliff's training plan? It is commonly understood that when planning the most efficient ratio of intensity and volume of running, coaches must always find the optimal balance between overload and recovery to avoid the negative performance related effects that could be caused by overtraining syndrome (e.g., Meeusen, Duclos, Foster, Fry, Gleeson, Meeusen, Nieman, Raglin, Rietjens, Steinacker, & Urhausen, 2013; Kiviniemi, Tulppo, Hautala, Vanninen, & Uusitalo, 2014). But what is optimal for each athlete is always changing in relation to his or her unique physiology, which is not static (Kiely, 2012). In addition, one would think having their athletes experience running until exhaustion is critical because, as noted above, this is exactly what they will have to do in races. Nonetheless, Cliff explained the physiological risks associated with implementing the 'wrong' practice when he cautioned, "one of the fundamental things I learned growing up as a young coach was no one workout can make your season, but it can certainly break one." Of course, when we consider athletes' training from a physiological perspective this makes perfect sense. However, similar to the aforementioned practices, this practice example shows how dominant the physiological understanding of endurance runners' bodies is, and how this dominance makes it so hard to conceptualize endurance running coaches' practices as having any other purpose then to progress athletes physiological conditioning. In sum, because of how the organization of genesis and discipline's instruments worked together to support and cement certain physiologically informed practices as the only 'right' practices (Mills & Denison, 2016), some athletes experienced a practice that was still dominated by physiological truths.

2.4.4 Practice #4: Minimal Physiological Risk

The fourth previously described practice was meant to help Cliff's athletes understand what they might need to do to recover more effectively. My field notes indicated that this practice appeared to be successful because the athletes were able to freely choose to do many different practices in different spaces, and either on their own or in a group. When describing his evaluation of this practice Cliff said, "I liked the idea of what we did for yesterday's recovery practice. I actually thought it worked out better than what we had done in the past." In general, Cliff felt as though he was able to get the objective (i.e., to actively recover) of the practice across without having to provide his athletes with the specifics of how to achieve that. Moreover, Cliff exclaimed, "…of the 30 athletes there were probably eight to a dozen different sessions that people did, and certainly after there were a lot of smiles. Almost all the athletes said it was just what they needed." Cliff continued by saying that the recovery practice allowed him to get a better idea of how each athlete preferred to train, which would help him develop more effective programming.

The implementation of the recovery-oriented practice appeared to be more successful than the previous practices I described. This might have been because the physiological stakes were not as high given that this was 'just' a recovery practice not a building fitness practice. Therefore, Cliff was more open and comfortable to implement a less disciplinary practice that required less physiological demands as, for example, running all out until exhaustion would. In fact, his athletes understanding how to recover properly, which was a goal for Cliff through this practice, would actually support Cliff in further managing risk because his athletes would know how to recover on their own instead of Cliff having to constantly remind them. In this way, Cliff

may have been more open to try a less disciplinary practice that supported his agenda for training and did not pose too much physiological risk.

Furthermore, unlike the three practices previously discussed, Cliff was much more accepting, and actually appeared to welcome the ensuing chaos that this less disciplinary practice presented. In other practices, such as the practice that destabilized time, when the chaos, or lack of physiological control, became too much, modifications occurred that Cliff justified by saying things such as, "I changed it a bit because it was just too much chaos." Nevertheless, in the recovery practice, Cliff embraced the chaos and was intrigued to hear his athletes' responses. In Cliff's words, "more than anything, it did change some of the conversations after the practice. It changed because I now had very little information to go on about how the practice itself went." Cliff saw this feedback as giving him a better sense of how his athletes preferred to train: "I was intrigued with gathering information about each individual's practice in terms of what he or she decided to do because to me that was telling." This practice illustrates how when physiological risk was deemphasized, less disciplinary practice outcomes, and subsequently, the use disciplines instruments, were able to be disrupted with little doubt or hesitation. Discipline's instruments were not required to evaluate athletes' bodies in the recovery practice because the outcome was not to progress athletes' fitness; instead it was just to maintain fitness.

As discussed in the literature review, physiological knowledge has become the dominant knowledge to inform endurance running coaches' practices. Consequently, my results have shown that the dominance of physiological knowledge, and by extension the disciplinary techniques and instruments, continued to dictate the types of coaching practices Cliff could implement. Looking back, as the coach developer I should have done more to help Cliff challenge the dominance of physiology in our meetings. But in the meetings I was too focused

on helping Cliff problematize and change his use of the disciplinary techniques and their effects. This meant that physiology, as the underlying knowledge informing the techniques, remained intact. This might be because problematizing physiological knowledge, which I will soon show can be considered the roots of disciplinary coaching practices, is much more difficult than problematizing the effects of more visible disciplinary techniques. Indeed, it was clear that Cliff was able to change some disciplinary techniques in isolation; however, the dominant place physiological knowledge holds in informing the use of disciplinary techniques in his practices was not always problematized. As a result, I was not successful in helping Cliff problematize the total effects of how physiology acts as a powerful tool to solidify and justify the use of a range of disciplinary techniques that have become part of endurance running coaches' everyday practices.

2.5 Conclusion

Following a Foucauldian approach, I do not claim to have portrayed Cliff's experience as the one true reality; as the way he truly experienced things. Furthermore, this paper was not meant to criticize Cliff's coaching practices as ineffective. Rather, my intention was to present Cliff's experiences as he attempted to learn how to question the unintended consequences of discipline's techniques and instruments, rethink the total effects of his coaching practices, and negotiate the risks of changing his practices. Specifically, what I presented was an account, or more importantly, a constructed account of Cliff's experiences as interpreted through a Foucauldian lens. On a positive note, Cliff was able to problematize his practices by identifying problems with his use of disciplinary techniques to develop less disciplinary practices in our practice development meetings. That is, he was able to challenge disciplinary techniques on a kind of intuitive or programming level. But in the field, my findings showed that many of these practices proved too difficult to implement in the field, as elements of discipline's apparatus

remained intact. To explain this, I argue that the power of physiology as the dominant knowledge underpinning what constitutes being an effective endurance running coach prevented the less disciplinary practices from being implemented in a complete way.

The dominance of physiological knowledge in informing effective endurance running coaching is, of course, not a novel finding. In fact, in 2010, Denison argued that the strength of the physiological conceptualization of effective endurance running coaching can make it incredibly difficult for coaches to know any other way of coaching that is not informed by physiology. Following this, Mills (2012) showed that the application of physiological knowledge to endurance running coaches' practices was to help coaches move away from trial and error towards a knowledge that could be used as a rationale for proving their coaching practices to be best practices. Furthermore, Mills and Denison (2015) have shown how the proliferation of physiological knowledge in modern day endurance running training theory has greatly contributed to contemporary coaches' understanding of what type of knowledge can be seen as legitimate. Based on this, it is no wonder that Cliff asked, "If I am not managing my athletes' physiological responses, then what am I doing?" The point to accentuate here is that the far-reaching influence of physiology in endurance running cultures has led coaches, including Cliff, to understand the ability to meticulously and continuously apply physiological knowledge to their athletes' bodies as indicative of effective coaching (Denison, et al., 2013; Mills, 2012).

What has not been made clear in the Foucauldian coaching literature, until now, is how endurance running coaches' emphatic use of discipline's techniques and instruments in their practices both *support and are supported by* the dominance of physiological knowledge. On the one hand, disciplinary techniques lend great support to the legitimacy of physiology by organizing and managing physical effort levels in a way that produces knowledge about the

athletes' bodies (e.g., training times). In turn, disciplinary instruments use this knowledge to either confirm or deny each athlete's physical readiness and then determine the 'right' direction for their future coaching practices. As a result, endurance running coaches can use physiological claims, such as how a specific training practice produces a specific energy system response that leads to a specific physiological outcome, to 'prove' to their athletes, other coaches, administrators, and themselves that their practices are scientifically sound, and therefore, legitimate. And on the other hand, physiological knowledge retains its prominent position by being perpetually portrayed as the salient feature in endurance running cultures because it is the only knowledge that 'makes sense' to inform coaching practices (e.g., in coach development courses; see Avner, Markula, & Denison, 2017). And as my findings suggest, any changes not informed by physiology will not occur "within the borders of what was deemed acceptable" (Mills & Denison, 2016, p. 12). Adding to the cyclical relationship is the scientific logic surrounding effective coaching (Denison et al, 2013) that makes it even more difficult for coaches to reimagine coaching as anything other than implementing practices that are exclusively informed by physiological knowledge. As a result, coaches need to problematize the never-ending cyclical relationship between discipline and physiology if they want to implement less disciplinary practices in a more complete way.

This substantial finding, therefore, leads to important considerations for future Foucauldian coach development collaborations. I ask: how can we expect anything different when coach education is so dependent on teaching endurance running coaches about how to structure their practices using physiology? Coach developers must also remember that Foucault (1979) never wanted to replace one truth with another. Therefore, instead of dismissing dominant knowledges, coach developers need to *work with and explicitly complicate* dominant knowledges

in their particular sport (e.g., physiology in endurance running) to develop practices that are less dominated by, not absent of, dominant knowledges. For example, in endurance running, while some less disciplinary practices may not appear to offer a specific physiological stimulus, they might actually help athletes understand how to push their bodies in new ways, which can help boost their performances. I believe this recommendation can be applied to all sports where dominant knowledges might prevent the complete problematization of disciplinary practices.

There is no doubt that developing and implementing less disciplinary practices by unsettling a dominant physiological knowledge is a difficult task for any coach to embrace given the dominance of bio-scientific knowledges that encompass all contemporary coaching cultures. Subsequently, if coaches could critique the findings of physiological knowledge as only working in laboratory settings—its sampling, its methods, its truth claims—then they might be able to problematize how physiological knowledge only holds true in controlled conditions and not the messy and complex realities of sporting contexts. Furthermore, physiology applies only to the functioning of the material body in controlled conditions, and cannot help with the negotiation of the psychological, cultural, or social aspects of endurance running coaching. Therefore, I ask: Why does physiology continue to be held responsible for all aspects of endurance running coaching? Therefore, based on my findings, I believe it is critical for coach developers to spend more time helping coaches to problematize the use and function of physiological knowledge that only holds true in controlled laboratory conditions and is not, as such, readily applicable to many coaching situations.

My findings also showed how important it can be for coaches to evaluate and transform themselves to essentially form an alternative coaching logic if they indeed want to coach in a less disciplinary way. As a result, future Foucauldian-informed coaching researchers might want to

explore the change or transformation process using Foucault's (1984) technologies of the self as, undoubtedly, changing one's coaching practices means more than just changing one's practices. It also means putting real work into transforming one's coaching self. Nonetheless, the power to be effective using physiology proved to be a strong social influence in this particular coach developer-coach dynamic. But understanding what some of the barriers and challenges might be for a coach to implement less disciplinary practices was the primary goal of this study, and I believe Cliff and I did just that.

Chapter 3.0

Paper #2 Changing Practice Is Not Enough: Endurance Running Athletes' Experiences of Less Disciplinary Coaching Practices

3.0 Introduction

During my undergraduate degree I competed in cross-country running. Upon the completion of my degree, I extended my athletic career by joining a high-performance endurance running training group that was guided by the most effective (read most winning) coach in Canada. It was while immersed in this training culture that I quickly learned my place in practices: I was the third fastest runner. No matter the circumstances, I always finished third to my training partners in practices and in races. After moving to a new city, I trained on my own for a six-month period and had very little communication with my coach. When it came for my next race, I not only ran the fastest mile time of my career, but I also beat high caliber athletes, including both of my teammates. Later when my coach asked my thoughts on the race I struggled to articulate the idea that I had felt an almost heightened sense of awareness and control of my body and my performance. I was also going to tell him that I had been changing many of his training practices to suit my needs (e.g., taking more or less recovery or doing more or less repetitions, changing practice days and times), but I did not want to sound like a precious or rebellious athlete. That was not how good, coachable athletes were supposed to act.

Years later, as a graduate student, I was introduced to Michel Foucault's (1995) concepts of discipline and docility. I then realized that with having more control over my training practices, I was, albeit unknowingly, actually broadening my practice outcomes, which may have been why that mile race felt so unique and different. Making more decisions about my training practices may have allowed me to develop a deeper awareness of my body's capabilities and capacities. I essentially did more of what I wanted to do. As a result, I began to think: maybe there is something worth exploring about the nature of training groups and effective coaching

and how doing what has been deemed ‘right’ or expected of one as an athlete can be limiting and constraining?

I am not the first person to ask such a question. Over the last two decades a number of sport and coaching researchers have used Foucault’s (1995) analysis of discipline to show how strict training protocols can be problematic with respect to athletes’ development (e.g., Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010; Johns & Johns, 2000; Shogan, 1999). In an endurance running context, Denison, Mills, and Jones (2013) and Mills and Denison (2013) examined endurance running coaches’ use of disciplinary techniques and how these practices can undermine athletes’ performance potential. To counter the problematic effects that athletes might experience from highly disciplinary practices, Denison and his colleagues have called for coach developers to assist endurance running coaches to develop and implement less disciplinary practices so that their athletes might experience a broader range of practice outcomes. Similar to how I did when I began to train in ways that better suited my needs.

Towards this end, in this paper I analyze a group of endurance runners’ experiences following a five-month cross-country running season where I worked collaboratively with their coach as a Foucauldian-informed coach developer to help him learn how to develop and implement a number of coaching practices that were less informed by discipline. In what follows, I will provide a review of the research that has examined discipline and docility in endurance running contexts. Next I outline the methodology that informed my data collection and analysis followed by my results and discussion. I will finish by focusing my conclusion on coaches and what they might do to help their athletes experience less docility

3.1 Discipline, Docility, and the Endurance Running Body

Over the last two decades, sport sociologists have used Foucault's (1995) analysis of discipline to show that the repeated exposure to disciplinary practices can lead athletes to experience a number of problematic effects, such as eating disorders, overtraining, drop out, depression, early retirement, and underperformance (e.g., Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010; Chapman, 1997; Heikkala, 1993; Johns & Johns, 2000; McMahon, Penny, & Dinan-Thompson, 2012). Foucault described discipline as a vehicle for power comprised of "a whole set of instruments, techniques, procedures, levels of application, and targets" (p. 215). To illustrate how discipline operated, Foucault outlined four specific techniques: the *art of distributions* that involved how bodies were managed and used in spaces; the *control of activity* that involved how bodies were shaped by time in these spaces; the *organization of genesis* that involved the way specific bodily practices were categorized and grouped; and the *composition of forces* that involved the way bodies were brought together to function as a machine. Importantly, these techniques did not operate in a disjointed or fragmented manner; rather they worked together to exert their influence over the body through three specific instruments: *hierarchical observation*, *normalizing judgment* and *the examination*. Taken together, Foucault believed disciplinary techniques and instruments lead to docility.

As a central concept for Foucault (1995), docility suggests "a hold by another over others' bodies, not only so that they may do what one wishes, but so that they may operate as one wishes, with the techniques, the speed and the efficiency that one determines" (p. 138). A docile body can be "subjected, used, transformed and improved" (p. 136) to unquestioningly adhere to the strict orders of those in charge. Docile individuals can be very productive and useful. However, Foucauldian-informed coaching researchers have outlined how coaches' unquestioned

use of disciplinary techniques and instruments in their practices can render athletes docile and subsequently limit their performance potential (e.g., Denison, 2007; Gearity & Mills, 2013; Jones, Glintmeyer, & McKenzie, 2005; Mills & Denison, 2013; Shogan, 1999). To gain a deeper understanding of the problematic effects docility can have on athletes' development, a group of Foucauldian coaching researchers have focused on one particular sport: endurance running.

Endurance running has received a great deal of attention in the literature on athlete docility. Denison (2007) used a Foucauldian framework (1995) to explore how Brian, one of his athletes, appeared to be running in an 'apathetic haze' during a championship meet. Accordingly, Denison believed that what he "observed as Brian's apathy or discomfort during his race might be more accurately termed some type of docility" (p. 375). Denison argued that Brian's lack of motivation and poor performance may have been a result of his coaching and his use of a range of disciplinary techniques that could have, albeit unintentionally, restricted Brian's freedom to think and act for himself. Denison concluded that coaches should question their use of disciplinary coaching practices as a potential constraint for when athletes underperform.

Foucauldian coaching researchers interested in endurance running have built on Denison's study by mapping the disciplinary techniques and instruments typically found in endurance running coaches' practices. Their goal has been to understand how coaches can change their practices to open up new possibilities for their athletes to achieve their performance potential. For example, Mills and Denison (2013) demonstrated how 15 male high-performance endurance running coaches used disciplinary techniques and instruments in their practices to unknowingly render their athletes docile. Specifically, Mills and Denison showed how the endurance running coaches in their study controlled their athletes' movements by relying heavily on the stopwatch (i.e., temporal control), which can shift a coach's and his or her athletes' focus

away from other important athlete attributes for endurance running performance, such as breathing, foot strike and perspiration. As another example, the endurance running coaches in this study controlled their athletes' bodies by always returning to the same space to complete repetition workouts (i.e., the art of distribution), which can too easily become a place of disciplinary monotony that deprives athletes from taking more control over their bodies and their performances. Based on their findings, Mills and Denison argued that endurance running coaches need to learn how to problematize the imbalance between practices that aim to make athletes docile and practices that encourage athletes to think and explore the limits of their bodies and their performances.

To help coaches understand how they might begin to counter athlete docility in endurance running contexts, Denison and Mills (2014) provided a number of suggestions for less disciplinary practices. For example, a coach could destabilize the control of activity by asking his or her athletes to remove their watches during a workout. Or, a coach could destabilize the effects of rank by regularly changing the organization of the training groups in which his or her athletes typically train. Or, a coach could destabilize how enclosures can act as disciplinary spaces by asking his or her athletes to run in a space that they have never been to before. Furthermore, Denison and Mills emphasized the importance of coaches making these changes with the intention of problematizing discipline to produce long-term and sustainable changes. Otherwise, these new practices are at risk of becoming mere novelties and discipline might continue to produce docile athletes. While Denison and Mills took a big step by providing endurance running coaches with a range of less disciplinary practices designed to counter docility, research has yet to explore the actual impact these practices might have on athletes' experiences.

Sport psychologists and sociologist have examined athletes' experiences in relation to various models, concepts, and phenomena. For example, sport psychologists have examined athletes' experiences of motivational climates (Pensgaard & Roberts, 2002), resilience (Galli & Vealey, 2008), inspiration in sport (Figgins, Smith, Sellars, Greenlees, & Knight, 2016), and injury (Johnson, 2011; Mahoney & Hanrahan, 2011). In addition, sport sociologists have examined athletes' experiences of issues related to race (Cooper & Hawkins, 2014; Lawrence, 2005), and gender (Fasting, Brackenridge, & Sundgot-Borgen, 2003; Frey, Czech, Kent, & Johnson, 2006). Coaching researchers have also examined athletes' experiences by focusing on coaches' communication of body image (Coppola, Ward, & Freysinger, 2014), emotional abuse in the coach-athlete relationship (Stirling & Kerr, 2013), and poor coaching (Gearity, 2012; Gearity & Murray, 2011). Overall, this research has focused on athletes' experiences of sport within their normal, everyday training practices. However, this paper is significant because it examined athletes' experiences after their coach introduced them to a number of less disciplinary coaching practices that were designed to minimize the problematic effects of docility, and subsequently, allow the athletes to experience their bodies and performances in new ways. As a result, I examined how less disciplinary coaching practices might allow athletes to have less docile experiences.

To answer the calls for empirical research that examines the impact that less disciplinary practices might have on athletes' experiences (e.g., Denison, et al., 2015; Denison, et al., 2015; Mills & Denison, 2013), this paper I analyzed the experiences of a group of endurance running athletes after they were exposed to a number of less disciplinary practices during a five-month cross country running season. In this way, this paper explores the relationship between athlete docility, less disciplinary practices, and endurance running to understand how less disciplinary

practices might help endurance runners begin to counter the problematic effects of docility. More specifically, I examined how the practices might help athletes gain a greater awareness of their bodies, make more informed decisions, feel less normalized by established coaching practices, and be more engaged with their practices and performances. The athletes' experiences were analyzed in relation to Foucault's (1995) analysis of discipline, objectification, and normalization. In what follows, I outline in greater detail the methodology that informed this study.

3.2 Methodology

A post-structuralist perspective guided the entire design of this study, including the research question, the selection of methods, the data collection process, and the data analysis technique. Instead of searching for one fixed meaning, post-structural researchers assume a subjective epistemology as they see knowledge as a social construction and meanings as constantly changing through a complex array of influences in a specific context. Furthermore, unlike humanist—interpretive and critical—researchers, post-structural researchers assume a multiple ontology, which considers realities to be fragmented and contested (Markula & Silk, 2011). As a result, post-structural researchers completely reject the idea of one true objective reality in the world. Importantly, Foucault's (1995) work is located within the post-structural paradigm. A post-structuralist paradigm, therefore, allowed me to analyze my empirical material using Foucault's concept of disciplinary techniques and instruments outlined earlier. In the following, I discuss my selection of research participants and my data collection methods.

3.2.1 Sample

The research participants included one high-performance university cross-country running team. The team consisted of one head coach (who I have given the pseudonym Cliff)

and 20 endurance running athletes (10 male, 10 female). I used purposeful, criterion-based sampling (Patton, 2002) to select the athlete participants. The most important selection criterion was that the athlete participants must have attended the 12 less disciplinary practices (one per week for three-months) that were implemented. In addition, I looked for participants with whom I had gained a positive rapport based on the five months that I spent with them in the field. A total of 14 athletes (eight males, six females) participated in this study.

3.2.2 Methods

The five-month coach development collaboration consisted of a two-month familiarization phase and a three-month application phase. During the familiarization phase, I observed Cliff's practices to understand his everyday use of discipline while we also began to discuss potentially less disciplinary practices that he could incorporate into this training program. In the application phase, Cliff and I worked collaboratively to develop and implement 12 less disciplinary practices on a weekly basis. In general, Cliff and I met each Monday to design a practice that aimed to challenge the disciplinary logic surrounding the control and regulation of athletes' bodies and their performances both in training and in competition. Instead of using a predetermined list of less disciplinary practices, Cliff and I worked together to design practices that made sense in Cliff's context based on the disciplinary techniques that we identified in his practices. Cliff then implemented the new practice on a Tuesday, Thursday, or Saturday of the same week. I observed Cliff and his athletes while they participated in the new practice.

At the end of the five-month cross country running season where the athletes participated in 12 new practices, I conducted one semi-structured interview with 14 athletes. I used semi-structured interviews to gain an in-depth understanding of my participants' experiences through open-ended questions that allowed them to discuss their experiences of the new practices in

detail (Kvale, 1996; Markula & Silk, 2011; Patton, 2002). The questions that formed the interview guide were developed during the three months that I observed the new practices, and my ongoing familiarity with the athletes and their training and competition contexts. To begin the interviews, I asked the athletes some personal background questions for context and to help them ease into the interview process. In the next set of questions, the athletes were asked to recall each of the 12 less disciplinary practices. Then the athletes were asked questions about why they thought Cliff made the changes and what, if any, new experiences the practice might have presented. The final set of questions asked the athletes to describe more specifically any changes to their understanding of their bodies, to their decision-making and preparation for competitions, and to their relationship with their coach. My interview questions were all framed through Foucault's (1995) analysis of discipline and were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. For this paper I choose to only analyze four of the twelve less disciplinary practices. I did this because the athletes appeared to have a high level of interest in these four practices, as they were able to recall and discuss them more so than others. As a result, I believe these four practices provide the most depth to their overall experiences of the new practices.

3.2.3 Data Analysis

In this study, I utilize Foucault's (1995) disciplinary techniques, instruments, and docility to analyze the experiences of a group of endurance running athletes. Foucauldian analyses require an ongoing conceptualization of research findings by drawing heavily from Foucault's theoretical framework (Markula & Silk, 2011). To ensure the quality of this research at all points of the data collection and analysis process, I performed continuous readings of Foucault's *Discipline and Punish*, with particular attention to the chapters, 'Docile Bodies' and 'The Means of Correct Training.' Specifically, I used a Foucauldian theory-based analysis technique

comprised of the following steps: 1) identify all possible themes, 2) analyze the intersections and discrepancies between themes to identify new themes, and 3) connect these themes to Foucault's (1995) concepts (outlined earlier), and previous Foucauldian coaching research (Markula & Silk, 2011). It is important to note that there was crossover between the steps. For example, initial extracts were only selected if they had potential to connect with my Foucauldian framework. In addition, emerging themes were discussed with my supervisor, a Foucauldian-informed coach researcher, throughout the analysis to ensure they were theoretically sound. Once my themes were set, they were organized to tell a theoretically informed research story that illustrated the athletes' experiences. In what follows, I will present the athletes' experiences of less disciplinary practices.

3.3 Results and Discussion

Throughout the course of this study Cliff implemented 12 less disciplinary practices. In what follows, I discuss four practices that I feel are illustrative of my two main themes—'Fitting In' and 'Getting Fit.' Under the first theme, Fitting In, I will examine two less disciplinary practices and the impact they had on the athletes' experiences in relation to Foucault's (1995) concept of *normalization*. Then in the second theme, Getting Fit, I will examine two less disciplinary practices in relation to Foucault's (1995) concept of *objectification*. I then extend the findings of my two themes to discuss the relationship between athlete docility and Cliff's communication of these less disciplinary practices to his athletes. Finally, I conclude with recommendations for coaches to problematize the effects of discipline.

3.4 Fitting In: Normalizing Endurance Running Bodies

For Foucault (1995), normalizing judgment is one of the "great instruments of power" (p. 184) that works to sustain disciplinary techniques. In addition, normalization is part of an

ensemble of tactics meant to exert maximum control over individuals in a way that does not require excess force and physical punishment. According to Foucault, "normalization imposes homogeneity; but it individualizes by making it possible to measure gaps, to determine levels, to fix specialties, and to render the differences useful by fitting them one to another" (p. 184). To help facilitate the process of normalization, disciplinary techniques are used as tools to control and shape individuals into docile bodies, and by extension, into efficient and productive working machines. I will now present examples of two new practices that Cliff and I developed to encourage his athletes to understand their bodies in less normalizing ways and discuss how they experienced these practices.

3.4.1 Practice #1: A New Ranking System

Foucault (1995) argued that individuals who are consistently held in a specific rank can come to internalize their rank as a truth. In observing Cliff's practices during the first two-months of the study, I noticed that he typically sorted his athletes into specific training groups where each athlete occupied a distinct rank. In this way, when athletes' bodies circulated in various training practices, Cliff could maintain control of his athletes' spatial arrangement by comparing and judging his athletes according to their usual rankings. This also meant that the athletes would always know their respective positions in relation to each other. In endurance running, as I alluded to in the introduction, this makes moving into any other rank or position in a race difficult for athletes as they can too easily internalize their ranking as the place they must occupy. Based on these observations, Cliff and I worked together to design and implement a new practice that aimed to destabilize the effects of rank.

In a series of mile repetitions, instead of organizing his athletes into their typical training groups, Cliff asked all of his athletes to proceed to the starting line together at the beginning of

the practice. Then Cliff disrupted rank by sending individual athletes to complete each repetition in a different order to what they normally ran in. For example, Cliff sent a male athlete who typically finished practices in the sixth position out first to complete the repetition. Following this, he sent a female athlete who typically finished in the third position out to complete the repetition. This continued through each mile repetition. The intention of the practice was to destabilize the organization of athletes by rank so that Cliff and his athletes would be less reliant on comparison and judgment.

Some athletes indicated that this change reduced the constraints of the rank. For example, Paul stated:

> For me when I was running, it made me feel like there was less pressure when everyone was spread out. So instead of just needing to hang on, I was running at the front with less concern about when I was going to be dropped. Instead I was running with no idea of where these people are in relation to me. So, you're not concerned about where do I need to be. You just run.

Paul was typically ranked at the back of the fastest group. Therefore, when the ranking or position he usually occupied was disrupted to something that was unknown, he was able to experience running with less pressure to *fit into* a specific rank.

Similarly, Ashley said, "I liked it because otherwise I would already know the order we would all finish in. It would be this person...followed by this person...followed by this person…." Ashley continued by saying that this practice was her best practice of the season because she did not have to worry about whether she was running in the *right* place or not. Furthermore, Katrina commented, "That [the practice] was great. It gave me more of an opportunity to focus on how I felt because there was less comparison to other people in the group and always feeling like I had

to be right next to certain people all the time. So you could really just focus on yourself." Based on the testimonies of the athletes it is apparent that some felt less constrained by comparing and judging the performance of each repetition to their past performances or to their teammates' performances when the practice was not organized based on predetermined rank. While the destabilization of rank certainly broadened the range of practice outcomes for the athletes previously mentioned, I will now illustrate how the continued presence of normalizing processes prevented some athletes from experiencing this practice differently.

Given that normalizing judgments have been such a key feature in the athletes' everyday practices, it is not that surprising that a practice that did not allow Cliff or the athletes to make any judgments was hard to fathom. In fact, some athletes developed theories to explain why Cliff might have sent them out to complete their repetition in the order that he did. This was illustrated in the following conversation with Paul where he attempted to detect the logic behind what he perceived as Cliff's *new ranking system*:

> Paul: Cliff sent the slow people first and then the fast people later, because it doesn't make any sense to send the fast ones first.
>
> Me: Was it that way for every repetition?
>
> Paul: Well, I think usually he would send slower people first. Or maybe he would put really slow, kind of slow, first. But he also did mix some people up that kind of surprised me. For one or two people it was kind of surprising as to why they would be there.

In addition, Katrina explained how she spent the practice thinking about how Cliff might have devised his new ranking system: "The whole time I was trying to figure out the method for why he sent runners in the order that he did." Amanda said, "I feel like it was random but there was also some order to it. He seemed to send out the weaker girls first and then let the two

strongest girls go last." Together, these comments highlight the confusion the athletes experienced when normalizing judgments, which have become such a strong feature in their everyday practices, made it difficult for them to notice that their rank was deliberately being destabilized.

Adding to the continued dominance of rank, Nick believed the new practice represented Cliff's perceptions of how his performances had been progressing. He said:

> When he [Cliff] sent me off near somebody much slower than me, I thought, 'well based on who he put me close to that must be how he thinks how I am doing today. So since I am near this guy, Cliff must think this is where I need to be.'

Nick's comment is problematic because it shows that he was unable to think about his performance without some notion of rank. For Nick, rank has become so deeply embedded that he continued to look to Cliff to verify where he 'fit in' overall.

As these results suggest, the need for a number of athletes to know their rank to determine the progress of their performances proved to be too strong for any new effects to occur. That is, many athletes continued to search for ways to make judgments about themselves and their bodies by creating and internalizing a logic to what can be conceptualized as Cliff's new ranking system. In other words, when this familiar way of judging their bodies was removed, the athletes struggled to understand a less disciplinary alternative. As a result, while the less disciplinary practices might have appeared different, it still ended up operating within the same disciplinary framework and with the same overall purpose: to organize and control.

3.4.2 Practice #2: Disrupting the Disciplinary Machine

Foucault (1995) argued that the composition of forces was critical to ensure one could maximize the extraction of forces from all individuals to achieve the most efficient total effect.

In this way, the placement or function of each individual's body became privileged over any sort of unique quality or skill he or she might possess. For the most part, endurance running coaches believe that to optimize their athletes' performance gains they have to train their athletes "as part of a group that operates according to precise commands, rituals, and customs of the coach" (Denison, Mills, & Jones, 2013, p. 394). However, from a Foucauldian perspective, training athletes together as a complete unit might also normalize athletes' bodies: the athletes push their bodies to *fit* within the overall training group or machine. As a consequence, athletes might have difficulty understanding their bodies' unique capabilities and capacities, which could prevent them from pushing themselves to the point of exhaustion independent of the group as they must do in races.

After problematizing these effects, Cliff and I designed a new practice that destabilized the naturalization of having athletes train together in a group as one complete unit or machine. To do this, Cliff let each athlete determine the overall structure or timetable of his or her recovery practice (i.e., a practice that was still considered somewhat hard, yet aimed at helping recovery from the preceding Saturday's race). As a general guideline, each athlete was able to organize his or her practice according to what he or she needed to do to feel recovered within no more than 20 minutes of tempo running. For example, as two extremes, one athlete could do 20 minutes of straight tempo running, whereas another athlete could do 40 x 30-second repetitions. Importantly, this practice was unique because Cliff allowed the athletes to do the entire practice on their own. Therefore, this practice unsettled the dominance of the disciplinary training machine by allowing the athletes to train on their own, instead of following Cliff's predetermined practice plan.

Some of the athletes' interview responses showed that this less disciplinary practice did present the potential for them to experience their bodies and their performances in new ways. For example, Paul said:

> Because of the structure of the workout I didn't have to feel bad about doing something different. When you have control over what you're doing then I can say, 'well I can do this without anyone around.' So I could go and time it so I wasn't racing anyone and I could just relax and run how I wanted to because I was in control.

In a similar way, Katrina stated, "We could judge how we were feeling based on our own bodies and make our own decisions. Then we weren't pressured to run too hard and not recover. We could just run how we wanted." Echoing this was Luke who believed that, "...the practice gave you a chance to get in what you needed. It was helpful to have options. I was able to actually do what I wanted to do." These comments demonstrate that designing their own recovery workout allowed some of the athletes to potentially develop their bodies' own habits, cues, behaviours, idiosyncrasies, and uniqueness (Foucault, 1995). However, I will now show how a number of athletes still experienced the effects of normalizing processes due in part to the continued presence of hierarchical observation (Foucault, 1995).

Foucault (1995) determined that hierarchical observation enabled the disciplinary machine to continue to operate even when the head supervisor was not present. Since many of Cliff's practices take place out of his sight, his senior and/or fastest athletes often became his new eyes, in true Foucauldian fashion; they become part of the "perfect eye that nothing would escape" (Foucault, 1995, p. 173). For example, in the absence of any practice structure, these senior or fastest athletes ensure that all of the other athletes make the *right* decision about what

they should do. Amanda illustrates the presence of hierarchical observation in this new less disciplinary practice when she said:

> So Brittney and Angela seem to be the most extroverted and dominant people so they said what they wanted to do and then the rest of us bought it and agreed with whatever they said. So I found that the practice didn't actually become that individual. Instead it became about doing whatever the loudest people wanted to do.

Importantly, the loudest athletes, who were coincidently the fastest runners, were afforded the opportunity to speak because they had achieved performance results all the other athletes were meant to aspire to. They were the athletes with the highest rank. For example, as one of the fastest athletes Nick said, "I told the group what I wanted to do and then they decided whether to come with me or not." In this situation the strength of hierarchical observation prevented some athletes from being able to fully engage with the new practice because instead of making decisions about what they wanted to do, they were forced to make decisions about what they *should* do.

In a similar vein, a strong hierarchical relationship also existed between Cliff's established program (i.e., training norms, behaviours, and practice traditions) and his athletes. To illustrate, Patrick commented:

> For that practice, I was basically trying to do what I thought Cliff would want me to do. Or maybe not what he would want me to do because he was not there, but what I thought his training program would want me to do. And since I had been following his program for a few years I had a good idea of what he would expect and what sort of markers I should be aiming for.

Patrick's quote highlights how hierarchical observation did not only function through the fastest athletes who were able to be heard, but also through a series of *best practices* that determined what practices should be done to become a winning athlete. Even when athletes were able to design their own practice, many believed they had to make the *right* decisions that aligned with Cliff's established best practices. To illustrate, Amanda said, "Trying something different was tricky because there are established practices and they are the way it has always been done so of course there is a hesitation to change things." As a result, albeit unknowingly to Cliff, the continued presence of normalizing processes through hierarchical observation made it very difficult for some athletes to make their own decisions and break away from the deeply embedded disciplinary machine to discover something new about their bodies and their performances. In my next theme, I will examine how objectifying processes, in addition to normalizing processes, continued to operate even when the new practices Cliff and I developed were specifically designed to destabilize these forces.

3.5 Getting Fit: Objectifying Endurance Running Bodies

According to Foucault (1995), discipline works so effectively because of how it discreetly and meticulously controls individuals' bodies. In *Discipline and Punish*, Foucault (1995) showed in detail how in the late eighteenth century there was a move away from torturing the body in a public spectacle to a new social order that trained the body to be productive, obedient and cooperative. With this shift, the body became seen as an object of knowledge that could be controlled by joining "the analyzable body and the manipulable body" (p. 136) to the point of docility. In endurance running, Mills (2012) and Mills and Denison (2013) have shown that the dominance of scientific knowledge has led endurance running coaches to view their athletes' bodies primarily as energy converting and producing machines. Consequently, this view

has led endurance running coaches to constantly monitor and objectify their athletes' bodies and performances to precisely know its progress; this in turn proves the legitimacy of their training practices (Denison, 2007, 2010). Such a view of the endurance running body, however, leaves little room for athletes to think or feel outside of their coach's strict scientific framework. This is most problematic when in competition where athletes need to be able to respond (e.g., speed up, slow down) to their bodies' unique needs in order to achieve greater performances. Similar to my first theme, I will now present examples of two new practices that Cliff and I developed to encourage his athletes to understand their bodies in less objectifying ways.

3.5.1 Practice #3: To Be Fit or Not to Be Fit

For Foucault (1995), to increase the precision of discipline's hold, the manipulation of an object, such as a weapon or an instrument, can be used as a 'body-object articulation' to objectify or code the body in a particular way. Through the careful and regular monitoring of training times through the stopwatch, endurance running coaches use time to reduce the complexity of their athletes' performances into a workable form that can be judged against scientific training norms. In a similar vein, athletes use training times to differentiate and judge themselves in relation to their teammates and their past training times. Of course, this is not to discount the importance of training times as valuable feedback for both coaches and athletes. However, research in endurance running (Denison, 2007; Mills & Denison, 2013) has highlighted how reducing athletes' performances to the attainment of various time checkpoints can lead coaches and athletes to dismiss other important cues related to progress, such as posture, breathing, and ground contact (Allen-Collinson & Hockey, 2007; Denison, 2010; Allen-Collinson, 2006). From my observations over the course of the season working with Cliff, I noticed that he closely monitored and judged his athletes' training efforts using a stopwatch to time each and every

repetition and recovery period (i.e., work and rest periods). Therefore, to destabilize time, Cliff developed a practice where his athletes would run three to five mile repetitions on a trail without the use of a stopwatch. The intention of the practice was to provide an opportunity for the athletes to learn something new about their response to work and recovery 'in the moment' instead of relying on past repetition times from similar practices, or predetermined practice goal times set by Cliff.

Interviews with the athletes revealed that many of them enjoyed the freedom of running without training times. For example, Luke commented, "I found that I just ran to feel good instead of trying to hit a certain time. With no watch it was just no pressure." In addition, John explained how he felt relieved that he did not have to run at the *right* pace:

> The watch is definitely a stressor. I always expect the worst. If you're going too fast you are going to die, if you're going to slow your feeling terrible. So when you take it off then you don't have to worry about that.

In a similar way, Brittney explained:

> I liked running without a watch. It made me think about running in a different way. I was so used to always checking my times but when I had to run without it I just focused on running instead of focusing on the times I was trying to hit.

In the absence of training times, Brittney was able to focus on how her body was feeling in the moment, which allowed her to make her own decisions about whether to speed up or to slow down. She was able to experience taking control over her running, as opposed to running each repetition according to the times prescribed by Cliff. That is, times that are external to her and with the strength to determine how she should feel, and by extension, the actions she should take.

In another example, Marianne said, “you really had to go by feel rather than saying I need to push harder for 10 seconds because that’s what my watch is telling me to do.” Marianne’s quote shows how she was now able to make different judgments about her body’s progress because her training times were now taken out of the equation. Evidently the absence of a stopwatch assisted Marianne in moving closer to listening to her body more effectively. However, while some athletes found the practice useful, I will now show how the strong desire to know their bodies’ progress led other athletes to experience this practice as more of a ‘one-off novelty,’ instead of a practice intended to destabilize the effects from the control of time.

For example, Nick explained the importance of collecting training times so that he and Cliff could precisely know how his body was progressing when he said, “I get that the practice was supposed to help us listen to our bodies…but times matter. They tell you how you’re feeling and with them Cliff can govern what I should do based on what my times are.” On the one hand, Nick was able to articulate the popular cliché in endurance running cultures: ‘listen to your body.’ But on the other hand, Nick strongly believed that Cliff needed to know all of his training times in order for Cliff to effectively determine Nick’s future practice plan. Therefore, removing athletes’ stopwatches and using simplistic coaching clichés such as, listen to your body, will do little to disrupt the effects of discipline that can result from temporal control beyond a superficial level. Along similar lines, Patrick explained:

> It was supposed to help us listen to our bodies. But I find that hard. When the coach tells me what to do (gives me times), then it will fit a lot better with his plan throughout the season so we peak at the right time. So it’s important he is controlling practices. The coach needs to know what you’re doing so he can help you fix it when things go wrong.

Moreover, Paul said, "I think it's important that he (Cliff) knows all our times. Because he has a better idea of what the workouts mean and what they could do to our fitness then we do." Together, Nick, Patrick, and Paul, all considered that Cliff had to use time to assess and control their progress.

Other athletes described their desire to objectify their own bodies' progress using training times. For example, John said, "It (the new practice) was good but it is really hard to run without the numbers. I am really a numbers guy. I don't know why, but I really care about the numbers." In another example, when asked about her experiences of running without her stopwatch, Ashley stated:

> I didn't like running without a watch because I like to track things and I like to be able to compare one week to another. I like having the data at the end. If I don't then I'm always wondering what I ran, and times give you a benchmark on whether you actually ran as hard as you think you did.

Although some athletes enjoyed the novelty of removing their watches, many athletes struggled with not knowing how to judge their bodies' fitness without training times. The dominance of judging practice performances by using training times to confirm who is fit and how fit, outweighed any benefits that might have come from practicing without the use of time. I will now analyze one last practice that Cliff and I developed.

3.5.2 Practice #4: The Physical and the Mental Side

To Foucault (1995), enclosures are "the protected place of disciplinary monotony" (p. 141) that enabled production to become more concentrated, to "derive the maximum advantages and…neutralize the inconveniences." (p. 142). In endurance running, coaches typically design practices that consist of a series of repetitions that enclose athletes in a specific place where they

must complete a given number of timed repetitions in a predetermined period of time. This is known as repetition-based training. Endurance running coaches typically implement repetition-based practices in spaces that are regular and useful with exact measurable distances (Mills & Denison, 2013). Coaches then set the starting and finishing points and the time to complete each repetition so that they can closely supervise and judge each athlete's performance. This leaves athletes with no decisions to make about where and how they practice. As a result, repetition-based practices use space and time to control and fix athletes' bodies, which can too easily lead athletes to become docile (Denison, 2007).

Through observing Cliff's practices, I noted that almost all of them contained various forms of repetition-based training. After I explained some of the problematic effects that might result from this type of training, Cliff and I designed a new practice that did not specify distances or times to complete a series of six repetitions. Rather, in groups of six, each athlete was given a number from one to six, which was to determine his or her order. Then when it was his or her turn he or she could choose how long the rest period from the previous repetition would be by deciding when to start his or her assigned repetition, what direction to run the repetition in, and when the repetition was complete. As a result, the new practice resembled a series of spontaneous surges directed by the athletes, as opposed to a series of controlled repetitions that were predetermined by the coach. The main intention for this new practice was to disrupt the disciplinary monotony of repetition-based practices that normally take place in fixed enclosures, while also destabilizing the temporal control.

When asked about their experiences of this new practice, a number of the athletes described how they enjoyed having greater control over their practice outcome. For example, Luke explained:

> I noticed that when I was the one taking the lead it felt easy. I guess because I knew when I was starting and I knew when I was going to slow down. It just felt different. It was easy when I was in control of the repetition, and I noticed a lot of the guys also seemed like they were a lot more confident and could go faster when they were in control of the repetition, too.

From my observations throughout the season, Luke typically found himself at the back of the training group constantly trying to hold on from being dropped. Therefore, this practice acted as a valuable experience that may have helped him gain a new sense of his body's performance. In a similar way, Katrina said she enjoyed the practice because she "got to have control and make decisions. Everyone else got to experience that control too, whereas usually just one person in the group takes control and that's it."

Along with the opportunity to practice taking control, many of the athletes described how the practice enabled them to be engaged and think more about what they were doing. For example, Ashley explained: "You just became more aware of what you were doing. When you know exactly what you are doing you kind of just zone out. But I had to think, which is what you have to do in a race." Furthermore, Kate said, "That was fun. It added a different element. I think it was a really engaging practice because you always had to be ready for people to make a move at any point." These quotes illustrate that the athletes saw merit in the practice because it enabled them to have more control over previous repetition structure. In particular, they described a new awareness and confidence in their practice performances that was made possible by practicing in a way that closer reflects the realities of racing. However, in what follows, I will show how some athletes continued to experience the presence of objectifying processes.

To become a winning athlete, there is a common belief that coaches must help athletes become proficient at not only the 'physical' aspects of their sport, but also the 'mental' aspects (Avner, Markula, & Denison, 2016). In the subsequent practice, many of the athletes drew heavily on sport psychology, which is a dominant sport science knowledge that describes aspects of sport performance that do not concern the material body, to make sense of their experiences of the increased control the practice allowed. For example, Patrick commented, "A lot of time your brain does play tricks on you. So this practice was useful because as much as we talk about the physical stuff the mental stuff matters too." Adding to Patrick's comment, Luke said, "I feel like that workout helped with the mental side of training. So now I can just change my mental mindset for future practices to try and recreate that situation." Some athletes, thus, believed that this practice was intended to work on the psychological aspects of endurance running. The opportunity to make one's own decisions, however, was meant to do more than simply change one's mindset: to help the athletes gain an understanding of how fixed training spaces can prevent them from fully engaging with their bodies, not to separate performance into the physical and the mental sides.

In describing their experiences as working on the 'mental side' of things, the athletes remained in the confines of dominant knowledges instead of thinking outside of disciplinary practices. In this case, physiological (i.e., scientific) and psychological (i.e., individualizing) knowledges have become so dominant in endurance running cultures that it is difficult for athletes to understand the practice changes as informed by an alternative knowledge, such as Foucault's knowledge. It is interesting to note that Cliff did not say that the practices were informed by sport psychology. However, since the changes could not easily be explained using the traditional scientific knowledges that concern the material body (i.e., physiology), the

athletes assumed they were based on sport psychology. In this way, I would argue that while this practice lead some athletes to experience making more decisions, the athlete's long-term understanding of the practice was interpreted as more of a 'psychological training gimmick' that exercised their mental fitness than a practice designed to destabilize an aspect of discipline.

Similar to the three other aforementioned practices, this practice still contained normalizing and objectifying processes that prevented many athletes from experiencing the full scope of the less disciplinary practices. As a result, my results have illustrated that the athletes had become so accustomed to only knowing how to be disciplined through disciplinary techniques and instruments that any alternative outcomes available through the implementation of so-called less disciplinary practices were easily overlooked. In what follows, I will now provide some direction for how coach developers can help coaches develop more effective practices that aim to help their athletes counter docility.

3.6 Conclusion

After a decade of Foucauldian coaching researchers (e.g., Denison, 2007, 2010; Mills & Denison, 2013) theorizing about the problematic effects of disciplinary practices, this study is significant because, for the first time, research shows empirical insight into athletes' experiences of less disciplinary practices. More specifically, this study adds to previous literature that has examined athletes' experiences (see literature review) by exploring what it might mean when athletes are introduced to a number of new less disciplinary coaching practices that have been designed to allow athletes to experience their bodies and performances in less docile-making ways. In order to counter docility, therefore, my results have shown that athletes could use additional training that gives them the necessary tools to understand the sociological knowledge that is informing their practices. Furthermore, athletes could be encouraged to have more open

communication with their coaches so they can question what they are doing and ask for clarification when needed. But importantly, in order to give athletes the opportunity to understand their bodies and their performances differently through less disciplinary practices, coach developers must help coaches problematize the notion of *the coachable* (read docile) athlete as one who can easily and automatically learn and be aware of new practice intentions and possibilities. Indeed, coaches have come to celebrate the notion of the coachable athlete as one who completes practices without recourse, never questions a coach's decision-making, and sets a good example by consistently doing the 'right' thing. A coachable athlete can therefore be considered a deeply normalized, and objectified athlete—a docile body. In what follows, I will focus on coaches and what they might do based on my results to help their athletes experience less docility.

While I worked as the Foucauldian-informed coach developer to help Cliff design and implement less disciplinary practices, we paid little attention to how the new practices would be communicated to his athletes. For example, according to my observations, in some cases Cliff simply read his athletes the instructions for the new practice, or presented it to the athletes with little enthusiasm, explanation, or emphasis on key changes. However, for Foucault (1995), one of the main outcomes of docility was that prison inmates could be 'easily taught'. The consistent and careful use of disciplinary techniques and instruments ensured the inmates would automatically learn in a linear, systematic and controlled way. Referring to the classroom, Foucault (1980) argued that, "power not only operates on people but also in their actions, attitudes, their discourses, learning processes and everyday lives" (p. 37). Furthermore, Foucault (1978) clearly demonstrated that interactions between individuals contain power relations that are simultaneously connected to systems of knowledge. Indeed, Foucault (1995) showed that

"power and knowledge directly imply one another; that there is no power relation without a correlative constitution of a field knowledge" (p. 175). Thus, if one accepts Foucault's (1995) assertion that knowledge is subjective and intimately tied to the workings of power including our learning processes, then important questions arise for coach developers and coaches, such as: how might new practices informed by an alternative coaching knowledge that follows a much different structure and logic be communicated to athletes?

According to Foucault (1980), scientific knowledge "has a rational structure and that therefore its propositions are the outcome of verifiable procedures" (p. 84). Having a rational structure that can be repeatedly verified through precise scientific methods can make scientific knowledge understood as an undisputable universal truth. As a consequence, scientific knowledge has a very specific outcome; it is made up of clear-cut, single truths, which can make it easier to communicate because it often requires less of an argument to get athlete 'buy-in'. Subsequently, endurance running coaches often use dominant bio-scientific knowledges (i.e., exercise physiology, motor learning, biomechanics) to justify and verify their implementation of highly disciplinary practices (Denison, Mills, & Jones, 2013; Mills & Denison, 2013). In other words, scientific truths can help justify coaches' actions. However, practices based on social science knowledge, such as less disciplinary practices, require coaches to communicate a different type of knowledge to their athletes. Social scientific knowledge does not have a linear structure consisting of single truths that can be repeatedly verified through objective methods. Instead, social scientific knowledge is made up of multiple truths, which allows for multiple meanings to emerge (Markula & Silk, 2011). In this way, social scientific knowledge is not always as 'black and white' as scientific knowledge. But I must stress, it is very important that coaches are able to teach their athletes about these sociological terms (e.g., objectification,

normalization) and do so in a way that is suitable for 'beginners' who have not had a lot of experience with sociology. I believe this has important ramifications for Foucauldian coach developers who must now teach coaches how to effectively communicate less disciplinary practices, which are based on a much different knowledge, to their athletes in an easily accessible way.

Reimaging new communication or pedagogical strategies will not be an easy task. It will require coach developers to help coaches gain a sound understanding of how discipline might also interfere with their athletes' learning and how social scientific knowledge is different from scientific knowledge. But if the end goal for implementing less disciplinary practices is to improve performance, until less disciplinary practices are more effectively communicated, I believe athletes will remain in the dark about their full performance potential.

The findings from this study suggest that changing practices to be less disciplinary alone is simply not enough to counter the complex relationships that sustain athlete docility. To be more effective at communicating the manifold possibilities of less disciplinary practices, I recommend Foucauldian coach developers to work closely with coaches to design appropriate and explicit communication or pedagogical strategies that are more reflective of an end goal of less disciplinary practices, which is to promote diverse learning outcomes. In this regard, I hope to provide future research that details what Foucauldian-informed coach pedagogies could look like in the field. Teaching coaches how to apply new pedagogies will first require coaches to be comfortable and confident with Foucault's alternative knowledge, which will take more time, effort, open-mindedness, and a great deal of patience. But if researchers and coaches truly value countering the effects of athlete docility, we must also problematize the deeply ingrained pedagogical assumptions that have come to underpin coaches' practices. That is, we must

embrace how relations of power-knowledge make what coaches do not say or do just as important as what they actually do say or do.

Chapter 4.0

Paper #3 Introducing a Coach to an Alternative Coaching Knowledge: An Analysis of My Experiences as a Foucauldian-informed Coach Developer

4.0 Introduction

It is well known that effective coach development programs are needed in order to broaden coaches' knowledge and cultivate more progressive and innovative coaches. Coach development programs can follow different structures, and can be comprised of various coaching knowledges, such as exercise physiology and psychology. Recently, a number of Foucauldian-informed coaching researchers (e.g., Denison, Mills, & Jones, 2013; Denison, Mills, & Konoval, 2015) have argued that Foucault's knowledge can be useful in helping coaches gain a greater understanding of how power influences what they do as coaches. More specifically, Denison and Mills (2014) and Mills and Denison (2013) have used Foucault's (1995) analysis of disciplinary power to show how endurance running coaches' uncritical use of a range of disciplinary techniques and instruments in their practices limits their effectiveness. Subsequently, they suggested coaches change their practices to be less disciplinary. However, since change is never an easy endeavor, Denison, Pringle, Cassidy and Hessian (2015) highlighted the importance of Foucauldian-informed coach developers collaborating with coaches to help them connect Foucault's knowledge to their everyday coaching practices.

According to Jones, Denison, and Gearity (2016), it is important for coaching researchers to consider the practices of coach developers, who are actually implementing coach development programs or collaborations, as they can too easily come to dominate the coach learners' actions and lead to coach disengagement. As a result, analyzing the experiences of Foucauldian-informed coach developers can be critical to provide future coach developers with recommendations to design and deliver more effective collaborations. In an effort to understand what implementing a Foucauldian-informed collaboration might entail, in this paper I use a post-structuralist approach to examine my experiences—the tensions, struggles, contradictions,

moments of resistance, opportunities, and possibilities—acting as a Foucauldian-informed coach developer in collaboration with one male university endurance running coach to develop a number of less disciplinary coaching practices.

In what follows, I provide an overview of the Foucauldian-informed coach development research, followed by a review of the research on coach developers. Next, I will outline the methodology that informed my data collection and analysis, followed by my results and discussion. I will then conclude with recommendations for Foucauldian-informed coach developers to consider in future coach development collaborations.

4.1 Foucauldian-informed Coach Development

For over a decade, Foucauldian coaching researchers (e.g., Denison, 2007; Denison et al, 2013; Denison et al, 2015) have drawn from Foucault's (1995) analysis of discipline to critique the problematic effects of highly disciplinary coaching practices. In the context of endurance running, Mills and Denison (2013) showed how coaches uncritical use of a range of disciplinary techniques and instruments, which are exceedingly present in endurance running coaches' practices, can too easily lead athletes to experience a state of docility (see Chapter 2 for a more detailed review on these concepts). Many Foucauldian sport studies have linked docility to a number of problematic effects, such as eating disorders, overtraining, drop out, depression, early retirement, and underperformance (e.g., Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010; Johns & Johns, 2000; McMahon, Penny, & Dinan-Thompson, 2012). As a result, Mills and Denison (2013) argued that to become more effective endurance running coaches could learn how to constantly problematize the unquestioned use of disciplinary techniques and instruments in their coaching practices. Problematizing the use of disciplinary practices will enable coaches to challenge the established training truths and expand their limits around what can and cannot be practiced. The next step,

therefore, is to apply this critique in the field by having Foucauldian-informed coach developers support coaches as they learn how to coach in a less disciplinary way.

To date, there has been a paucity of research that has examined the experiences of those who implement coach development programs (i.e., coach developers) (Trudel, Culver, & Werthner, 2013). One exception is from a group of constructivist-informed coach development researchers (e.g., Hussain, Trudel, Patrick, & Rossi, 2012; Paquette, et al., 2014; Trudel, Gilbert, & Werthner, 2010; Trudel, et al., 2013) who aimed to support coach development programs by understanding how the most successful coaches learn. Collectively, these researchers have drawn from Jarvis (2006) and Moon (2004) to show that coach learning is idiosyncratic and context-dependent. As a result, they concluded that coach development programs could use constructivist-learning principles to enable coach developers to use a range of learning activities to help coaches learn how to reflect on their individual coaching experiences.

Expanding on this recommendation, Hussain et al. (2012) applied constructivist-learning principles to Triathlon Canada's competitive coach development program. Rather than following a standardized curriculum, the coach development program was designed to meet the unique needs of each coach learner by embracing the concept of lifelong learning (Moon, 1999) and emphasizing, "what the learner is becoming" as a result of the program (Jarvis, 2006, p. 6). This was done in part by asking coaches to prepare a portfolio of their past experiences and preferences, which allowed the coach developer to use this information to develop learning activities that acknowledge the coaches' interests and individual learning styles. Since this was a new program, Hussain et al. concluded that the coach developer encountered some moments of resistance in regards to getting 'buy-in' from the coach participants and other stakeholders, particularly due to the program's de-emphasis on typical evaluation practices.

To further Hussain et al.'s (2012) analysis, Paquette et al. (2014) analyzed the structure and implementation of Triathlon Canada's constructivist-informed coach development program to give future coach developers' concrete suggestions for how to improve the delivery of their programs. First, Paquette et al. suggested coach developers "create protocols to support the ongoing, joint understanding and adoption of constructivist learning principles by all" individuals involved in the program (p. 83). This is to ensure a shared vision of constructivist principles. Second, they suggested coach developers use diverse delivery methods, for example, small group discussions and role play, to help coaches' makes sense of the content relative to their coaching context. Third, they suggested that too much structure in curriculum design could lead to a belief that there is only one way to coach, which can limit individuals from choosing their own learning journey. Fourth, they stressed the importance for the coach developer to maintain constructivist ideals in order "to support coaches in their creation of knowledge, rather than attempting to take ownership over the provision of knowledge" (p. 84). Finally, they recommended coach developers avoid the emphasis on 'right or wrong' answers in assessments, and instead ask coaches to represent their learning by displaying competencies through their coaching practices.

Overall, the constructivist-informed coach development research has resulted in great insight into how effective coaches learn and ways that coach developers can deliver programs that are tailored to coach learners' unique contexts. However, by narrowly focusing on how individual coaches learn, this research does not consider how broader social influences might also affect the coach learning and how dominant knowledge can put limits around how coaches can and cannot practice. To allow for an analysis that views coach development as indelibly influenced by the social and sees knowledge as produced 'through' the coach development

process, some coach development researchers have turned to a post-structuralist Foucauldian perspective.

Unlike past research on constructivist-informed coach developers (e.g., Paquette et al., 2014), for a Foucauldian-informed coach developer it is critical to be highly collaborative when helping coaches change their practices. To develop coaches in a collaborative way, Jones, Denison, and Gearity (2016) illustrated how the work of post-structural learning theorist Robin Usher (1994, 1997, 2007) might foster learning environments that enable coaches to become more 'actively engaged subjects'. In the area of adult education, Edwards and Usher (1994) argued that modernist educational approaches to learning can easily result in normalized, uncritical, docile learners. Instead, Usher emphasized the importance of developing learning approaches that challenge the stability of one single truth and cautioned educators to always be aware of the power relations that accompany their roles.

Drawing from Usher (1994, 1997, 2007), Jones et al. (2016) provided suggestions for how coach developers might question taken-for-granted coach development practices to create more actively engaged coach learners. One of their suggestions was for coach developers to design learning activities that challenge the dominant knowledges that uphold the modernist logic of sport. In the case of endurance running, this would entail developing pedagogical strategies that challenge the dominance of scientific-based knowledges (e.g., exercise physiology, biomechanics) to open up a space for coaches to change their use of disciplinary techniques and instruments. However, in doing so, Jones et al. cautioned coach developers to 'tread carefully' by always being respectful of the coach's area of expertise, long-held memories, traditions and beliefs. Jones et al. also suggested coach developers be weary of implementing highly structured curriculums comprised of ready-made practices because this might force

coaches to fit into a pre-determined mould of what coaching should look like. Instead, they suggested coach developers' work collaboratively with coaches to develop coaching practices that make sense given their unique backgrounds and interests.

In contrast to past research on coach developers (e.g., Paquette et al., 2014), the work Foucauldian-informed coach developers do is different because they help coaches learn how to problematize dominant knowledges in order to change their use of problematic coaching practices. This makes it important to introduce Foucault's knowledge "in a critically reflexive manner and with a caring respect for one's self and the rights of other" (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 196). In this way, ongoing problematization of dominant knowledges and their impact on coaching practices could ensure power is played out in a way that minimizes any problematic effects that might come from governing the actions of others. Undoubtedly, the task for Foucauldian-informed coach developers is not an easy one. However, until there are attempts to help coaches change their practices, coaching development researchers will remain unaware of the applied possibilities of coaching in a less disciplinary way.

According to Lather (1993), as researchers we have the obligation of "theorizing our practices" (p. 674) by making a commitment to self-reflexivity in our research practices. Therefore, to answer the call by Denison and colleagues (Denison et al., 2015; Denison & Mills, 2014) for research that examines the possibilities of Foucauldian-informed collaborations between coach developers and coaches, in this paper I examined my experiences as I acted as a Foucauldian-informed coach developer to collaborate with one male university endurance running coach to assist him in learning how to use Foucault's concepts to coach in a less disciplinary way. More specifically, I analyzed my experiences—the tensions, struggles, possibilities, contradictions, opportunities, and moments of resistance—from a post-structuralist

perspective to understand what it might mean for a Foucauldian-informed coach developer to introduce and teach Foucault's concepts to an endurance running coach. In what follows, I will now outline the methodology I used for this paper.

4.2 Methodology

To examine my experiences acting as a Foucauldian-informed coach developer, post-structuralism will guide the entire design of this study, including the selection of methods, the data collection process, and the data analysis technique. Instead of searching for one fixed meaning through objectivity, post-structuralist researchers assume a subjective epistemology as they see knowledge as a social construction and meanings as constantly changing through a complex array of influences in a specific context. Furthermore, post-structuralist researchers reject the idea of one true objective reality in the world as they assume a multiple ontology, which considers realities to be fragmented and contested (Markula & Silk, 2011). A post-structuralist perspective is particularly well suited for this study because its tenets enabled me to use the conceptual tools of post-structural theorists, such as Foucault.

4.2.1 Sample

The study was conducted with one high-performance university cross-country running team consisting of one male head university endurance running coach and 20 athletes (10 male and 10 female). The research took place over one entire cross-country running season (5-months). The participants in this paper were myself, as the Foucauldian-informed coach developer, and the head coach. My 20 years of experience in endurance running contexts as an elite athlete and as a Canadian university coach has allowed me to become very knowledgeable about endurance running cultures. This is important to this study because it allowed me to more easily build rapport with the coach by being knowledgeable about the sport of endurance

running, and to better understand the complexities inherent in endurance running contexts. Moreover, through three pilot studies that I conducted with various endurance sport coaches (triathlon, Nordic skiing, swimming), I developed useful skills for how to introduce coaches to what are in many ways challenging ideas.

To select the coach participant for this study, who I will identify using the pseudonym Cliff, I used criterion-based sampling (Patton, 2002). Specifically, the criteria involved a willingness on the part of Cliff to: engage with an alternative coaching knowledge, implement different coaching practices, provide me with access to all of his training practices, and meet with me regularly to introduce, recapitulate, and discuss his implementation of Foucault's concepts (i.e., discipline's techniques). I deemed Cliff to be an appropriate participant through three informal meetings where we discussed his interest and suitability. Cliff has coached at a national coaching institute, achieved a master's degree in motor learning, and has worked both at a regional and national level as an endurance coach educator.

4.2.2 The Foucauldian-Informed Coach Development Collaboration

The collaboration was split into two phases—the familiarization phase (2-months) and the application phase (3-months). During the familiarization phase, I observed eight of Cliff's typical training practices and conducted two meetings. Following Jones et al.'s (2016) post-structuralist approach to coach development, I took time at the beginning of the collaboration to build rapport with Cliff, understand the structure of his typical practices, and experience his daily training environment. During the application phase, I observed 12 of Cliff's practices and conducted 10 meetings. Cliff and I generally followed a 3-step process to change his practices: 1) We typically met on a Monday to develop new practice(s) in practice development meetings. 2) I then observed Cliff's implementation of the new practice(s), typically on a Tuesday, Thursday or

Saturday of the same week. 3) During the week that followed the new practice, Cliff and I met to discuss our evaluations of his most recent implemented practice(s) in debrief meetings.

4.2.3 Methods

This paper was informed by 20 observations of Cliff's practices throughout the 5-month season, and 10 audio-recorded meetings between Cliff and I. One way I captured my coach development practices was through detailed field notes of 20 practices throughout the 5-month study (Angrosino, 2005; Markula & Silk, 2011). Field notes were recorded within an hour of practice, which took place two to three days per week in different parks around the city (6 to 10 hours per week). My field notes included all my experiences working with Cliff, including the tensions, struggles, possibilities, successes and failures that related specifically to my post-structuralist framework. It is important to note that all field notes were reviewed daily to ensure I was staying true to my post-structuralist sensibility by helping inform the direction of all my future coach development practices. In addition to my field notes, I collected my empirical material through 10 meetings with Cliff that took place throughout the season. I spent one or two days per week in meetings with Cliff (2 to 4 hours per week) that resembled more of a conversation, as they were highly collaborative. All meetings were 60 to 90 minutes long. Ethics approval was gained from a Research Ethics Board to conduct this research.

4.2.4 Data Analysis

Post-structuralist research is subjective which means that researchers are constantly interpreting their own and other individuals' accounts about what they did and why to produce informed and theoretically driven analyses (Denzin & Lincoln, 2008). To complete a rigorous analysis of my empirical material I drew heavily on my post-structuralist lens (Markula & Silk, 2011). I used a post-structuralist analysis technique to guide my analysis, which comprised the

following steps: 1) I identified all possible themes within my empirical material by referring to my post-structuralist perspective. 2) Once I established possible themes, I analyzed the intersections and discrepancies between the themes to identify the most prominent themes. 3) I then connected these prominent themes to applicable post-structuralist readings, theory, and previous literature (Markula & Silk, 2011).

To ensure that my coach development practices were relevant to Cliff's context, I regularly consulted with Dr. Jim Denison. Furthermore, following the recommendations from Markula and Silk (2011), I continually analyzed all empirical material throughout the research process to ensure the collaboration remained true to my Foucauldian sensibility. In what follow, I will provide a post-structuralist analysis of my experiences acting as a Foucauldian-informed coach developer. I will then conclude with a number of recommendations for future Foucauldian-informed coach developers.

4.3 Results and Discussion

This section will draw attention to the highly collaborative nature of the work Foucauldian-informed coach developers do by highlighting a number of interactions between Cliff and I. My results are organized in chronological order in relation to the collaboration. The first theme, *Legitimizing Foucault*, will examine my experiences as I attempted to connect Foucault's knowledge to Cliff's everyday coaching practices. The second theme, *Negotiating Foucault*, will examine my experiences as Cliff and I made changes to his practices. Following these two themes, I will conclude with practical recommendations that can be used to help guide prospective Foucauldian-informed coach development collaborations.

4.4 Legitimizing Foucault

Given the high stakes surrounding any high-performance training context, it was not surprising that finding a starting point to begin my conversations with Cliff about changing his practices would be difficult. As a way to ease into these conversations, I spent the familiarization phase (first 2-months) simply attending practices and building rapport with Cliff. During this time, I struggled in my role as a volunteer coach to participate in the disciplinary practices that I would soon be trying to help Cliff problematize, disrupt and change. From my field notes, during one of the first practices Cliff asked me to watch the athletes with binoculars—read survey them—and tell him what order they were in—read rank them. He also asked me to use the stopwatch during a number of practices to monitor their progress—read the temporal elaboration of the act (Foucault, 1995). I had conflicting thoughts about doing this, however, following Jones et al. (2016), I believed it was important to establish this relationship as operating in both directions to show that I am not dismissing all of his practices as ineffective from the beginning.

As I became more familiar with Cliff, we began to engage in small meaningful conversations surrounding the purpose of his practices. For example, as Cliff and I waited for his athletes to arrive to a practice in the second week of training practices, we discussed why he had chosen the specific practice on that day. More specifically, I asked Cliff what knowledge he had drawn from to make decisions about each particular part of his practice to begin to illuminate the dominance of scientific knowledge used to underpin his coaching practices. These conversations embedded with critical questions were meant to be primers for Cliff to begin to consider aspects of his practices that he might not have previously considered.

Similarly, during practice downtimes in the familiarization phase, I used small learning challenges to draw Cliff's attention to how he was organizing his practices around various disciplinary techniques. To illustrate, while biking to a practice in a nearby city park, I challenged Cliff to think about the ways that he used time in the upcoming practice. I followed this by saying that we would use this as a way to begin a discussion about changing the way he uses time in his future practices. In another instance after a practice, I challenged Cliff to consider why he often returned to the same park for most of his practices, and why he had his athletes run on the same path and in the same direction? This challenge was used to open up a dialogue around Cliff's use of space that I hoped would make discussing aspect of Foucault's (1995) art of distributions easier in the future. Looking back at the discussions that took place before and after Cliff's practices, I found conversations in more natural settings to be very fruitful. This might have been because Cliff was more comfortable in his coaching environment and he could more easily imagine the possibilities of changes to his practices. It can be a useful strategy for individuals to use visualization strategies to imagine what a situation might be like before it becomes a reality (Martin, Moritz, & Hall, 1999).

As another way to help Cliff be more aware of the taken-for-granted problems of his practices, at various times in the familiarization phase I presented Cliff with a number of 'what if' scenarios. Drawing on my field notes, I asked Cliff, "what if you didn't time any of the repetitions in today's practice?" I felt like at times these questions helped 'break the ice' so Cliff could identify how his practices were not set in stone and that they could easily be made less disciplinary. During the familiarization phase, these strategies appeared to set a solid foundation for future changes in the application phase. However, the application phase showed how changing one's practices in the field is certainly not a smooth process.

4.4.1 Connecting to a Scientific Knowledge

Attempting to connect a less established or legitimate knowledge into a coach's existing framework or logic is a complex endeavour. Subsequently, near the end of the familiarization phase, I sought to connect Foucault's thinking to 'trendy' and more legitimate training ideas that were already familiar to Cliff. As an example, according to Mills and Denison (2013), coaching in a less disciplinary way means reducing the use of disciplinary techniques that often create coaching practices that are too far removed from the spontaneous, uncertain nature of endurance running races. Therefore, to help me legitimize Foucault's knowledge to Cliff I connected Foucault to the idea of 'uncertainty training', a new concept of training he was familiar with. Put simply, based on neuroscience, uncertainty training aims to 'program athletes' brains to make it easier for them to adapt to the uncertainties of racing. To Cliff it was important to produce athletes who could respond on their own to the changing conditions in a race. As I recorded in my field notes, "Cliff was excited to hear me say that we were going to be playing around with the organization of his practices by making them less certain so that they would more accurately reflect the realities of racing." While uncertainty training gave Cliff a legitimate and tangible knowledge (read scientific) that he could use to connect to Foucault (Denison et al., 2015), it also proved difficult for me to get him to implement the idea of uncertainty training in a Foucauldian way.

As the collaboration progressed, I began to feel uncomfortable when I realized that in legitimizing Foucault I was connecting to a knowledge—uncertainty training—that was grounded in the same modernist logic I was trying to distance Cliff from. Although Edwards and Usher (2007) argued that teaching often requires the use of diverse practices that may at times contradict each other, this paradigmatic or philosophical incongruence led many of my future

attempts at changing Cliff's practices to become framed as scientific experiments. As one example from my field notes, Cliff designed a practice that destabilized Foucault's (1995) art of distributions (i.e., enclosure) by asking his athletes to explore a new space for a 20-minute tempo run. Specifically, the athletes ran in a particular direction then turned around after 10-minutes to return to the start using the same path. But as an additional stipulation that we did not discuss, Cliff asked all of his athletes to run down a long steep hill at the beginning of the tempo run. As a result, on the way back the athletes would have to run back up the big hill, which meant that their times on the way back would be much slower than on the way out. As a consequence, when his athletes were on their way back to the start where Cliff was waiting, he watched to see 'who' stopped when 20-minutes was up and 'who' continued to run all the way back to where they started even though they would be running beyond the allotted 20-minutes.

In our discussion after the practice, Cliff praised the athletes who continued after 20-minutes as he said it showed him which athletes were able to get beyond the effects of time and which athletes were not. However, Cliff was also unknowingly using another one of Foucault's (1995) disciplinary techniques known as temporal control or time, to judge and 'test' athletes to see how committed (read docile) they were to his training regime. Importantly, I saw conceptualizing new practices as scientific experiments as red flags, since coaching in a less disciplinary way actually means the coach examining and judging athletes' bodies (read the examination and normalizing judgments) less as opposed to using different disciplinary techniques to test them in new, more discreet ways. The emphasis of the practice changes being framed as scientific experiments proved to be difficult to break away from throughout the rest of the collaboration.

As the first month of the application phase came to an end, I noticed that Cliff's primary focus in our conversations become more centered around how he thought his 'athletes' might respond to new practices, rather than about his actual coaching. For example, at the end of one of Cliff's team practices before a race Cliff said that he was excited to see how his athletes performed after a number of experiments. To illustrate, Cliff often described the new practices as "a series of experimental days" aimed at "messing with the athletes' minds". In other words, Cliff conceptualized the work we were doing as experiments connected to a hypothesis that led to his athletes gaining greater performance results. I then explained that we should be careful not to frame new practices as scientific experiments because it can shift focus away from his coaching and the plurality of new possibilities the practices intend to allow athletes to experience. Cliff agreed, but this idea can be hard to break away from because sport science research projects typically employ experiments that set out to test various hypotheses on athletes' bodies (e.g., VO2 max testing). As a result, I knew moving away from creating experimental conditions out of the new practices would take me more time and effort to help Cliff understand.

Cliff's strong scientific, and more specifically, physiologically oriented background made penetrating his modernist desire for rational and logical knowledge to legitimize Foucault challenging for me as the coach developer. In fact, through some of our initial conversations surrounding his practices it seemed as though we were speaking two different languages—a language of control and management as opposed to a language of care and critical thinking. For example, Cliff often referred to his coaching in terms of managing bodies. He said, "I am responsible for managing bodies", "what am I even doing if I am not managing athletes", and "it is just that without time practices will get to chaotic and I won't be able to manage bodies." Conceptualizing the coach as a manager is of course not all bad (Washington & Reade, 2013),

but thinking rigidly in organizational terms can be problematic as it might interfere with coaches' ability to problematize their use of disciplinary practices. In fact, destabilizing many of Foucault's disciplinary techniques and instruments actually requires much less coach management. As a result, I explained to Cliff, "many of my suggestions for new practices actually require you to manage your athletes much less, which means you can turn your attention to learning something new about your athletes and giving different types of feedback." But Cliff remained skeptical.

In presenting a marginalized or alternative knowledge, Foucault (1978) was aware that there would be a myriad of different outcomes. Accordingly, Foucault urged researchers with political intentions to be open-minded of how the new knowledge might be used by other individuals, their "tactical productivity...and their strategical integration" (Foucault, 1978, p. 102). However, I found in this case that initially connecting Foucault's concepts to uncertainty training that is meant to train athletes' brains to adapt to greater external stimuli in performance contexts may have caused discrepancies in our subsequent meetings. Regardless, I had to keep pushing forward with new strategies that would not just connect Foucault's knowledge, but also sell Foucault's knowledge as a powerful tool that might help him become more effective.

4.4.2 Selling an Alternative Coaching Knowledge

Through my search for new ways to legitimize Foucault, I often felt like a salesman trying to pitch a new product to a hesitant buyer. To demonstrate, after a lengthy interview with Cliff about how he might reduce his use of various surveillance techniques to monitor and regulate his athletes, Cliff exclaimed, "Give me a very good reason and show me profoundly that this change will lead to a better outcome". Furthermore, Cliff rejected many of my suggestions for change because I was not able to produce any concrete evidence that guaranteed my

suggested changes would directly impact on his athletes' performances. Put simply, his athletes short-term performance results. Cliff said, "This is where I do not agree with you. There is no literature in any field that says by making these changes you are suggesting that my athletes will run faster." And of course Cliff was right. I did not have objective proof that showed how these changes would increase his athletes' performances. This led all of my conversations with Cliff to begin with a new sales pitch aimed at connecting Foucault's theory with his practices in a more relevant way. Importantly, during the second month of the application phase, I found out how tricky it can be to make Foucault's knowledge relevant to the realities of coaching (i.e., produce winning athletes), while also maintaining integrity of Foucauldian thinking.

Without Cliff having an understanding of how the product (i.e., Foucault's knowledge) I was pitching might lead to more effective coaching practices, the collaboration had less chance of having a real impact. To help Cliff 'buy-in' to the relevance of Foucault, with the help of a Foucauldian-informed coach researcher, I determined it would be beneficial for Cliff and I to collaborate to create a costs-benefits analysis. The idea was to help Cliff become more aware of the costs or limitations to using disciplinary techniques that make athletes' docile. But this turned out to be much more difficult in practice than I expected.

To explain, when I asked Cliff to describe a benefit or cost that he had noticed, he said, "A negative cost of all these practices (Foucauldian-inspired practices) is that they are taking away from my ability to have conversations with the athletes about how they felt, when I don't know what they did. I have nothing to compare too." However, I actually saw this as a benefit because not always knowing what athletes did can allow the athletes to explain what they did and why they did it, instead of Cliff predetermining these aspects from the onset. As another cost, Cliff explained how he did not have enough time to "manage the efficiency", or the effective

ratio of time and effort, of his practices. But I also saw this as a benefit because, as I previously mentioned, many of the new practices would not require Cliff to manage anything. Instead, he could spend more time asking different questions, getting different feedback, which can give him a different perspective of his athletes' preferences; a real benefit to any coach. In essence, the costs Cliff described were my benefits, and vice-versa. This activity highlighted how Cliff and my competing logics around what Foucault's knowledge (i.e., the product) could and should do, was an important point of incongruence that made selling Foucault's knowledge very difficult.

In the aforementioned practice, Cliff appeared to view the changes through a modernist lens, where he believed the new practices could be used in a rational, logical, and systematic way to produce a specific outcome in his athletes. Consequently, Cliff preferred clear concepts (i.e., uncertainty training, scientific concepts) to reduce knowledge into something that made sense to him. This of course is an effective strategy when we need to take something that is complex and break it down into more workable chunks. Nevertheless, this reduction resulted in a narrow or 'disciplinarian' view of the outcomes or possibilities that Foucault's knowledge was meant counter. In contrast, I was following a post-structuralist perspective, which meant I was operating in a much more broad and open-ended way, without a set destination where the new practices should end (Jones et al., 2016). At this point it is important to note that Cliff has coached a number of international calibre athletes and national medalists. He is also a well-respected coach educator. Simply put, Cliff is a very successful coach. But at times, our competing logics made connecting and selling Foucault's knowledge an ongoing struggle. Nonetheless, I had to keep trying because my job as a Foucauldian-informed coach developer was to help Cliff question normal, scientifically-informed coaching (Denison, et al., 2013) to see

his practices through a wider socio-cultural lens. I just did not realize how difficult it would be to break through the great wall of post-positivism.

Undoubtedly, these experiences lead me to re-evaluate my own expectations about how the remaining project might play out. I assumed we would be having conversations about how Foucault's theory can be used to make Cliff's practices less disciplinary, not conversations that revolved around selling and justifying Foucault's knowledge. Nevertheless, the emphasis of Foucauldian-informed coach developers legitimizing Foucault's knowledge cannot be underestimated because without coaches having a fundamental understanding about what Foucault's knowledge can do, practice changes can turn out to be paradigmatically incongruent. As a result, I felt as though I needed to reevaluate and dial back my expectations of what 'Foucauldian practice outcomes' we might achieve. The exploration for more effective strategies to help Cliff make sense of Foucault was a never-ending one and often led me to feel like I was part of an ongoing negotiation.

4.5 Negotiating Foucault

Up to this point my findings have shown that for a Foucauldian-informed coach developer, social problems and power relations are not easy to observe and quick fixes do not exist. Rather, to suggest a coach change his use of disciplinary techniques also means that a coach must challenge the dominant logic that has produced specific truths about what it means to be an effective coach. Unlike a sport psychology intervention where, for example, Cliff might have to make a quick fix by having athletes follow a predetermined set of steps to their routines, coaching in a less disciplinary way requires a coach to question their deeply-ingrained coaching logic and actually 'coach differently' (Denison et al., 2013; Denison et al., 2015). Imagine for a moment that all you have learned to be true about your profession was in fact more open to

interpretation than you had thought. This can be a daunting realization, and not one that is easy to accept. While Cliff agreed to stay open-minded to critique, this can be much more difficult in practice since endurance running coaches are often defined by the technical quality and scientific prowess of their practices (Mills & Denison, 2013)

As we moved into the midway point of the application phase (3.5-months into the collaboration), the collaboration shifted to resemble more of a process of negotiating Foucault, rather than only legitimizing Foucault. In this way, my role as a coach developer began to involve 'bargaining' with Cliff using Foucault's concepts against the canon of universal truths that bio-scientific knowledge provides. A central aim for Foucauldian-informed researchers is to reveal the contradictions within individuals' everyday practices (Markula & Pringle, 2006). In doing this with Cliff, I was well aware that there could be times when he might feel offended or uncomfortable. There were times when I had to push Cliff to see his coaching differently. There were also times when I had to back off and respect his boundaries, beliefs, and desires. To reveal the contradictions found in Cliff's everyday coaching practices without threatening the established apparatus of his coaching, I often found myself carefully and continually walking across the tightrope.

4.5.1 Walking the Tightrope

Through my efforts to negotiate the relevance of Foucault's knowledge to Cliff's practices, I found it challenging to suggest changes in ways that did not come across as threatening Cliff's effectiveness. For example, as a learning activity meant to help me discuss one of Foucault's (1995) disciplinary techniques (i.e., the composition of forces), I referred to an article written by Foucauldian coaching scholars that have focused on endurance running coaching (Denison & Mills, 2014). The idea was that Foucault's concepts can be challenging,

and therefore, it can be beneficial to explain them through multiple sources, including written text. After re-reading the article and drawing out examples of highly controlling and questionable quotes by the coach participants, Cliff laughed and asked, "I hope that I don't come off the way that some of the coaches in that study did." Yet in a way he did. But after reflecting on my position within power relations, I felt as though could not say this without coming across as 'blaming' Cliff and not the practices. This would contradict the logic I hope to communicate as a Foucauldian-informed coach developer. It is important to note that power relations, not Cliff, have made it so normal for coaches to control their athletes through training practices (Denison et al., 2013). As a result, this example highlights the need for Foucauldian-informed coach developers to be reflexive of the deep effects simple learning activities might have and to act in ways that do not undermine or disregard all that a coach knows and understands to be true about how to be an effective coach.

The aim of the Foucauldian-informed collaboration was essentially to push Cliff towards becoming 'abnormal' by learning how to think and coach differently. However, similar to many other coaches, Cliff already considers himself to be an innovative coach that regularly pushes the boundaries of what is considered 'normal' coaching. As a consequence, I often found myself in a contentious position because I was trying to help Cliff push back against what is normal when he thinks that he already abnormal. To illustrate, when I explained how research has shown that normal coaching operates within such a specific disciplinary framework or keyhole, he became irritated and said "you have been to a dozen of my practices now so can't you see that they always change...don't you think I operate outside of this keyhole?" While Cliff certainty offered variety in his practices and he was able to discuss less disciplinary practices in our practice development meetings, actually coaching in a less disciplinary way proved to be a very difficult

task when in the field. Therefore, I was left with a difficult decision to make. Do I proceed with a long-winded explanation of how he is actually not coaching outside of this keyhole or do I pull back and avoid confrontation because he might be too uncomfortable at the moment? In this case, I decided it was best to refrain from further dialogue because I felt pushing any further may have caused Cliff to withdraw from the study and push me off the tightrope.

I often felt like I was walking the tightrope when explaining new Foucauldian concepts to Cliff because my suggestions could be misinterpreted as an overhaul of his previous practices, which was not my intention. After I implemented a learning activity that did not go as I expected, in the next meeting I admitted to Cliff that I might have introduced the potential changes to his practices in an all-encompassing way. Cliff responded by saying that "Yes, it was more of an all-encompassing type of explanation." He then added, "But I don't think that is your fault. I think if you had an exercise physiologist come in and say this is what you do and you need to change this, I would say based on what, prove it." Even though I often reminded Cliff that we were not trying to replace all of his existing practices with new less disciplinary ones, at times he still felt like we were. Importantly, Foucault's (1978) intention was never to diminish the usefulness of science. Therefore, when introducing Foucault's concepts it is important for Foucauldian-informed coach developers to celebrate, not overly condemn, the usefulness of scientific practices and always remember that what constitutes change can take many forms.

In another example of walking the tightrope, following a less disciplinary practice that Cliff struggled to implement in a complete way, I thought it would be a useful to push Cliff towards a greater understanding of Foucault by giving him more background knowledge. Specifically, I used part of a meeting to give Cliff an introduction to how discipline's instruments (i.e., hierarchical observation, normalizing judgments, and the examination) work to secure the

hold of discipline's techniques. To do this, at the beginning of one of our evaluation meetings I described how Foucault's (1995) disciplinary instruments work with disciplinary techniques to maintain discipline's hold. But, to my surprise, this did not go as expected. Cliff appeared perplexed by my use of sociological terms, such as objectification and normalization. I read this as moving too far towards a theoretical understanding of Foucault, and too far away from a practical understanding of Foucault. The notion of presenting theoretical concepts in more holistic ways has received a great deal of attention in education research (e.g., Dewey, 1904; Korthagen & Kessels, 1999; Usher & Bryant, 1987). For Foucauldian coach developers, many of the sociological concepts discussed will likely be new to many coaches. Therefore, concepts need to be presented in an appropriate way so that those unfamiliar with social knowledge can more easily grasp a conceptual understanding. This experience highlights how striking an acceptable balance between theory and practice is an element that requires ongoing negotiation by coach developers.

After discussing this situation with another Foucauldian coach development researcher, we felt as though Cliff had felt caught off-guard by my overly theoretical explanation, and I had to regain my balance on the tight rope. Even entertaining Foucault's abstract and complex concepts, shows that a coach has a great desire to further their coaching craft. Therefore, in the next meeting with Cliff, I began with a strategy that aimed to help reaffirm Cliff's trust and interest by declaring his effectiveness or as I call it, 'pumping his tires'. Specifically, I made sure Cliff knew that he was "a very innovative and progressive coach to even be participating in this project." I continued by saying that "I have been very impressed by practices have seen so far, and I am excited for future changes." Importantly, I added that discussing change is never easy, especially when it means destabilizing long-held beliefs about what 'works' in coaching. Cliff

said he appreciated the acknowledgement and the rest of the conversation appeared to move along much more fluently than our previous meeting. The point to accentuate here is that sociologically work challenges coaches in a way that can intimidate and threaten their effectiveness, especially if they are unfamiliar sociological terms. Coaches should often be reminded that this work is not easy.

According to Jones et al. (2016), coach developers should implement learning activities that challenge dominant knowledges that overshadow alternative knowledges from impacting coaches' practices. Drawing on my field notes, in the last month of the collaboration Cliff and I reviewed one of his past practices in an effort to reveal how each part had been informed by certain physiological truth claims that are not fixed. But through this process, I noted that Cliff may have felt that his expert coaching knowledge, and in turn his coaching effectiveness (read his coaching identity) was being threatened. Cliff responded by becoming defensive of the practice I was critiquing and proceeded to give me a lesson in what he knew about physiology. Since I had previously taught three years of a University upper level applied endurance training course, I was well versed in applied physiological knowledge. But to be truly collaborative, both the coach and coach developer need to have the "freedom to reciprocally and respectfully express concern, opinions, knowledge and emotions." (Denison, et al., 2015, p. 7). Therefore, to maintain rapport with Cliff, and stay on the tightrope, I felt it best to accept the physiology lesson and let Cliff teach me something as opposed to me always acting as the teacher. Instead of this learning activity highlighting the dominance of science in his practices, it may have been interpreted as pointing out the inefficiencies in his coaching, which would unlikely sit well with any coach.

In the final two-weeks of the collaboration, I felt tired from the number of attempts to both legitimize and negotiate Foucault's knowledge to Cliff all while maintaining my place on the tightrope. According to Usher and Edwards (1994), learning is not linear; rather it is context dependent and involves real work. This means that relying on 'best strategies' to illicit and promote change in a way that will not threaten a coaches' identity do not exist. In this way, Foucauldian-informed coach developers need to always be adaptable and cautious in how they introduce Foucault's knowledge. Nonetheless, the most difficult aspect of the collaboration was to negotiate ways to frame the changes to be only about Cliff's practices, while dissociating them from himself. But as the collaboration progressed, I realized that this was so hard because to implement changes effectively Cliff actually does have to transform himself. I will now conclude with some practical recommendations for Foucauldian coach developers to consider in future Foucauldian coach development collaborations.

4.6 Conclusion

The purpose of this paper was to understand what it might mean for a Foucauldian-informed coach developer to introduce Foucault's alternative coaching knowledge to a coach. This research is significant because it provided, for the first time, an indication of the complexities involved when transferring an alternative knowledge that challenges the normalized idea of effective coaching. Drawing on the tenets of post-structuralism (Markula & Silk, 2011), this work highlighted how Foucauldian-informed coach developers need to make a number of decisions for when to push a coach with a new knowledge and when to pull back, that had not been considered in past coach development research (e.g., Hussain et al., 2012). To summarize, my findings highlighted that finding ways to start conversations about Foucault's knowledge can be difficult. Furthermore, they highlighted how the coach developer needs to spend more time

helping the coach gain an appropriate understanding of what practice outcomes Foucault's knowledge intends to achieve or what paradigmatic incongruences may occur. The findings also indicated that even simple learning activities that might seem harmless can in fact have problematic effects.

In addition, my findings showed how Foucauldian-informed coach developers might have to take on different roles, such as a sales person, a tightrope walker, and a negotiator. Indeed, these roles can be arduous, which can result in a number of uncomfortable moments. However, it is important to consider these roles as not having start and end points. Instead, these roles are fluid roles and can occur simultaneously throughout the coach development collaboration. To help navigate these new roles I had to develop a number of new qualities.

I had to be open-minded and flexible. Based on past research (e.g., Denison & Mills, 2014) that had outlined what Foucauldian-inspired endurance running coaching practices might look like in practice, without knowing it I entered the collaboration with a preconceived notion of what new practices would be considered ideal. However, as we moved through the season, I occasionally had to revisit my expectations and be more open to different practices that might not have been 'truly' Foucauldian. That is, there may have still been trace elements of Foucault's' disciplinary techniques or instruments. Discipline has been a central part of coaches' practices for many decades, and therefore, it can be hard to disrupt all of its tools right away.

I had to exercise humility, empathy and respect. A constant thread running through this paper, and the entire collaboration, was that change is hard. Every coach is located in a unique context that is made up of a number of pressures; for example, to meet specific performance standards (Cassidy, Jones, & Potrac, 2015; Potrac, Gilbert, & Denison, 2013). Foucauldian-informed coach developers must learn to recognize these tensions, influences and coach

histories, and ensure coach development practices do not put the coach in a vulnerable or precarious position. It was important to be sensitive to when Cliff may have felt threatened or forced to change something he might not have been comfortable with.

I had to be patient and optimistic. Learning is an organic process that can follow a number of different paths (Usher & Edwards, 2007). This means that as a Foucauldian-informed coach developer, it was important to celebrate change, no matter how subtle the change might be. I want to emphasize that while I was working on developing these qualities, I still require more time and effort to incorporate them into my coach development practices. But since this was the first time any coaching researcher had attempted to introduce a coach to an alternative coaching knowledge, I did not know what to expect. Now that we have a working understanding of what Foucauldian-informed coach development might entail, I want to present those interested in future collaborations with some recommendations to consider.

One way to support Foucauldian-informed coach developers to reveal the inconsistencies in a coach's practices design and to minimize the discrepancies in philosophical alignment could be to focus on practice learning outcomes. To explain, to develop less disciplinary coaching practices, coach developers or coaches must first identify a less disciplinary or 'Foucauldian practice learning outcome'. For example, for athletes to become less reliant on judging their efforts only using only a stopwatch, and then design practices that aligns with this outcome. According to Collis and Biggs (2014), aligning outcomes, learning activities, and evaluations, takes an approach to teaching that believes "knowledge is constructed by the activities of the learner" (p. 9) instead of being directly transferable from teacher to student. Of course, Biggs was discussing university teaching, but along with many other coaching scholars (e.g., Cassidy, Jones, & Potrac, 2008; Jones, 2006; Potrac, Gilbert, & Denison, 2013), coaches could be held to

the same requirements as those in the teaching profession. Importantly, the learning outcome approach can also be applied to the coaches so that they can be more aware of what learning outcomes are expected of them. This can be in terms of the overall collaboration, and on a practice-to-practice basis. I believe, if done carefully, this approach might also help coaches construct practices that are more attuned to learning, process, and growth, rather than just performance and skill assessment.

Another way to help future Foucauldian-informed coach developers avoid inconsistencies between views of change might be through taking a more explicit 'toolbox approach' throughout the collaboration. Foucault (1980) encouraged individuals to modify and adapt his conceptual tools to develop more innovative ways of thinking and practicing. In this way, a toolbox approach can see Foucault's knowledge as a multi-functional tool that could be changed and used in concert with all other tools or knowledges. With this approach, a Foucauldian-informed coach developer can help coaches conceptualize sport science knowledges (e.g., biomechanics and exercise physiology) as tools that may or may not always be the best tools to achieve various practice outcomes. As a further recommendation, Foucauldian-informed coach developers could consider meeting coaches in more naturalistic environments. Drawing on Foucault's (1995) disciplinary technique the art of distributions, enclosures, such as classrooms or boardrooms, can easily be used as disciplinary spaces. Indeed, as mentioned earlier, the most fruitful and thought-provoking conversations appeared to occur before and after Cliff's practices. As a result, meetings could be carried out in spaces that reflect the coaches' everyday coaching realities, such as at the track or a training field.

This study has opened up a number of doors for future Foucauldian coach development researchers to explore. Future researchers could use Foucault's (1988) concept technologies of

the self to get a deeper understanding of how coach developers transform themselves through coach development collaborations. Researchers might also build on the work of Jones et al. (2016) to outline a range of coach development learning activities and Foucauldian-inspired practice learning outcomes that can be used as strategies to delicately and constructively highlight inconsistencies that will likely surface throughout any collaboration. I hope this research can serve as an initial foundation for more Foucauldian-informed coach development collaborations to use to enhance the great work sport coaches already do.

Admittedly, introducing a coach to Foucault's alternative knowledge was much more difficult in practice than I initially anticipated. As post-structuralist research is far from being an objective and dispassionate activity, I have found that this research challenged me in several ways. In this regard, through this research I have not only been attempting to transform a coach, but I have also been transforming myself.

Chapter 5.0

Conclusion

The purpose of this thesis was to explore the impact of a Foucauldian-informed coach development collaboration between an endurance running coach and a Foucauldian-informed coach developer. My thesis marked a significant moment in post-structuralist coaching research because it moved beyond mapping and critiquing endurance running coaches' practices to explore the process of change using Foucault's concepts in an applied setting (Markula & Silk, 2011). My thesis has contributed to the Foucauldian-informed coach development research by identifying key challenges and barriers to teaching a coach how to coach in a less disciplinary way. It has also contributed to the field of coaching by expanding the focus of coach development beyond only the coach. That is, to also acknowledge the critical role coach developers' practices can have in shaping how a coach might learn to problematize his or her use of disciplinary practices. Furthermore, this work illuminated a number of research areas for Foucauldian-informed coaching researchers to examine to help enhance the impact of future Foucauldian coach development collaborations.

The overarching research question that guided my thesis was: *What might be the impact of a Foucauldian-informed coach development collaboration between an endurance running coach and a Foucauldian-informed coach developer?* In what follows, I summarize the main findings from my three papers. Following this, I will describe some of the implications of my thesis. Next I will outline a number of directions for future Foucauldian-informed coach development researchers. I will then close with a final statement of my thesis.

5.1 Chapter 2.0 Key Findings

There have been numerous calls by coaching researchers (e.g., Denison, et al., 2015; Mills & Denison, 2013) for Foucauldian-informed coach developers to help coaches change their practices to be less reliant on discipline's techniques and instruments. Therefore, my first paper,

The Cyclical Relationship Between Physiology and Discipline: One Endurance Running Coach's Experiences Problematizing Disciplinary Practices, aimed to explore what it might mean for a Foucauldian-informed coach developer to work collaboratively with Cliff (my coach participant) as he learned how to problematize the use of discipline in his practices. More specifically, framed through Foucault's (1995) analysis of discipline, this paper examined some of the barriers, challenges, and opportunities that Cliff experienced as he attempted to learn how to question the unintended consequences of discipline's techniques and instruments and rethink the total effects of his coaching practices.

The results revealed that Cliff was able to show a degree of problematization by identifying some problems with disciplinary techniques in his practices, such as how time can be used through the stopwatch to control athletes' bodies, and by developing new less disciplinary practices. However, in the field, many of these practices proved too difficult to implement in a truly Foucauldian way. For example, when he implemented a practice to destabilize temporal control by asking his athletes to remove their stopwatches, Cliff still facilitated temporal control as he continued to time his athletes. As another example, when Cliff implemented a practice to destabilize the organization of genesis by asking his athletes to run until they felt they had reached exhaustion, Cliff unknowingly maintained indirect control through the presence of discipline's instruments, such as hierarchical observation, that ensured his athletes still ran the 'right' number of repetitions. In this way, elements of discipline's apparatus remained intact and discipline had not been destabilized in a meaningful way.

One reason why this may have been so difficult might be because the power of physiology, as the dominant knowledge underpinning what constitutes an effective endurance running coach (Mills & Denison, 2013), could have prevented Cliff from reimagining how he

might coach without using disciplinary techniques that support a strong physiological orientation to coaching. Put differently, changes not informed by physiology still found a way to occur "within the borders of what was deemed acceptable" (Mills & Denison, 2016, p. 12). Of course, the dominance of physiological knowledge in endurance running coaching has been shown in previous research (e.g., Mills & Denison, 2015). However, I outlined how physiological knowledge is so difficult to challenge because it both *supports and is supported by* coaches' emphatic use of discipline's techniques and instruments in their practices.

To conclude, I recommended Foucauldian-informed coach developers to be careful not to replace one truth with another by dismissing dominant knowledges. Instead, I suggested that coach developers' *work with and explicitly complicate* dominant coaching knowledges to develop practices that are less dominated by, not absent of, physiology. To do this, Foucauldian-informed coach developers could develop learning activities, such as small learning challenges that delicately critique the stability of scientific truths, to help coaches problematize the never-ending cyclical relationship between disciplinary techniques and physiology to implement less disciplinary practices in a more complete way. Indeed, physiology applies only to the functioning of the material body often in controlled, laboratory settings, which means it cannot help with the psychological, cultural and social aspects of endurance running coaching. Therefore I ask: why has physiology become the dominant knowledge that is held responsible for all aspects of endurance running coaching?

5.2 Chapter 3.0 Key Findings

Over the last two decades a number of sport and coaching researchers have used Foucault's (1995) analysis of discipline to show how the unquestioned use of overly disciplinary practices can undermine athletes' performance potential and limit their development (e.g.,

Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010; Denison, 2007; Shogan, 1999). Accordingly, my second paper, *Changing Practice Is Not Enough: Endurance Running Athletes' Experiences of Less Disciplinary Coaching Practices*, explored the impact that less disciplinary coaching practices might have on athletes' learning to gain a greater understanding of their bodies, to make more informed decisions, and to be more engaged with their practices and performances. Specifically, I interviewed 14 endurance running athletes following a five-month cross-country running season where they participated in a number of less disciplinary coaching practices. Framed through Foucault's (1995) analysis of discipline, I analyzed how new less disciplinary coaching practices might help athletes learn something new about their practices and/or themselves.

Despite Cliff and my efforts to change these practices, my results revealed that the continued presence of normalizing and objectifying processes might have prevented some athletes from understanding the full scope of the less disciplinary practices. For example, when discussing a practice that allowed each athlete determine the overall structure or timetable of his or her practice, a number of athletes explained how difficult it was to actually do something different in the group environment. Consequently, the continued presence of normalizing processes, such as normalizing judgments (Foucault, 1995), made it difficult for some athletes to make their own decisions and break away from the deeply embedded disciplinary machine to discover something new about their bodies and their performances. In another example, the athletes were asked about a practice that disrupted space by not specifying distances or times to complete each repetition. While a number of the athletes appreciated having greater control of the practice design, many of the athletes drew on sport psychology to make sense of their experiences of the increased control the practice allowed. In this way, objectifying and individualizing processes remained present as the athletes' interpreted the practice as more of a

psychological training gimmick that exercised their mental fitness than a practice designed to destabilize an aspect of discipline.

This study showed that simply implementing less disciplinary practices is not straightforward because these practices challenge the contemporary understanding about how to be a good athlete (read coachable athlete) that has become so natural to both coaches and their athletes. In other words, the athletes may have become so accustomed to only knowing how to be controlled through disciplinary practices that any alternative outcomes available through less disciplinary practices were easily overlooked. Subsequently, I explained that, as a social science, Foucault's knowledge can be more difficult to communicate than scientific knowledge, such as exercise physiology, because it is not made up of clear-cut, objective, verifiable truths, that can be simply communicated to athletes through one-way transactional pedagogies. Moreover, many coaches are simply not used to social science knowledge. Therefore, I argued that to be more effective at communicating the manifold possibilities of less disciplinary practices, Foucauldian-informed coach developers could work closely with coaches to design appropriate and explicit pedagogical strategies that are more aligned with the various intentions of less disciplinary practices. In sum, changing practices to be less disciplinary alone was simply not enough to counter the complex relationships that sustain athlete docility. Future research could explore what might happen if athletes also gained a general understanding of some of Foucault's concepts.

5.3 Chapter 4.0 Key Findings

According to Jones, Denison, and Gearity (2016), it is important for coaching researchers to consider the practices of coach developers, who are actually implementing coach development programs or collaborations because they can dominate the coach learners' actions and lead to

coach disengagement. As a result, my third paper, *Introducing a Coach to an Alternative Coaching Knowledge: An Analysis of My Experiences as a Foucauldian-informed Coach Developer*, aimed to understand what it might mean for a Foucauldian-informed coach developer to introduce and teach Foucault's concepts to an endurance running coach. Specifically, I used a post-structuralist approach (Markula & Silk, 2011) to examine my experiences—the tensions, struggles, contradictions, moments of resistance, opportunities, and possibilities—collaborating with an endurance running coach to assist him in learning how to use Foucault's concepts to coach in a less disciplinary way.

The results highlighted how finding ways to help Cliff make sense of Foucault's knowledge can be difficult because social science knowledge is not seen as legitimate as most traditional sport science knowledges (e.g., motor learning). Indeed, in many instances, I felt like I had to take on the role of a salesman who had to repeatedly pitch a product to a hesitate buyer. In addition, my findings showed that Cliff preferred to view Foucault's concepts through a modernist (read scientific) lens, where he could reduce the knowledge into something more manageable. However, this reduction resulted in a narrow or 'disciplinarian' view of the outcomes or possibilities that Foucault's knowledge was meant counter. For example, Cliff often conceptualized less disciplinary practices as scientific experiments that could be used to test the new practices impact on athletes' bodies. My findings also showed that negotiating the relevance of Foucault's knowledge to Cliff can be perceived as questioning the 'truthfulness' of his existing practices, and by extension, threatening his coaching identity. For example, in a learning activity where I used many sociological terms (e.g., objectification and normalization), Cliff appeared perplexed and aggravated. As a result, I read this as moving too far towards a theoretical understanding of Foucault, and too far away from a practical understanding of

Foucault, which I realized was a critical balance for Foucauldian-informed coach developers to sustain. In addition, coach developers might learn how to introduce coaches to sociological terms in ways that are more appropriate to those who may not have previously worked with this sociological knowledge.

Based on my results, it was clear that finding ways to start conversations about Foucault's knowledge can be difficult, and even simple learning activities that appear harmless can be problematic. To help in this regard, I provided recommendations for Foucauldian-informed coach developers who want to be more effective. As one recommendation, Foucauldian-informed coach developers could spend more time helping coaches gain an in-depth understanding of what practice outcomes Foucault's knowledge actually intends to achieve. To do this, the development of 'Foucauldian-inspired practice learning outcomes' can be used as strategies to delicately and constructively highlight inconsistencies that might surface throughout any collaboration. I also suggested coach developers use a more explicit toolbox approach to see Foucault's knowledge as a multi-functional tool that could be changed and used in concert with what the coach normally does or is comfortable doing. In conclusion, I proposed that Foucauldian-informed coach developers might benefit from training opportunities that help them develop new qualities, such as a open-mindedness, patience, and empathy, that this study highlighted.

5.4 Research Limitations

I recognize that while my thesis was significant in that it attempted to make Foucault's knowledge relevant in a coaching context, it was not free of limitations. Since applying social theory in a coaching context is so new, a number of important insights were garnered throughout. For example, as the project progressed, I found a limitation to be the length of the collaboration.

Altogether, the collaboration (5-months) included a 2-month familiarization phase and a 3-month application phase. However, I believe it could have been useful to have an 'education phase' that acted as a bridge between the two phases. In this phase, the coach and coach developer could engage in educational exchanges about the philosophical underpinnings of Foucault's knowledge, which was shown to be missing throughout the project. Establishing a strong understanding of what is required to be changed, what the practice plan might look like, and how it might play out in practice, is critical to ensure practices are implemented in a truly Foucauldian way. As a result, a longer collaboration of 8 to 12-months with the addition of an education phase, could have given us greater time to have a more sustainable impact.

The most important limitation of my thesis was my own performance as a relatively new Foucauldian-informed coach developer. To illustrate, when considering my thesis as a whole, it is possible that the athletes may have been confused about less disciplinary practices (see Chapter 3.0) because Cliff did not always implement a number of the practices in a complete way (see Chapter 2.0). However, I also acknowledge that this could be partly because it was up to me to effectively present Foucault's knowledge to Cliff in a way that made sense to him. Therefore, the 'trickle down effect' may have played a factor in Cliff's implementation, and by extension, the athletes' ability to notice changes. As a relatively new Foucauldian coach developer, my inexperience may have limited the impact of this collaboration. But while I acknowledge my performance as a Foucauldian-informed coach developer as a limitation, I believe this would be true when implementing any new coach development program or collaboration. In addition, it is important to establish a starting point from which future work can build upon.

Importantly, any interaction between individuals or groups of individuals where the aim is to transmit knowledge to guide another's actions, power is always at play (Foucault, 1978). According to Foucault, power is omnipresent, anonymous, and operates through relationships. Relations of power are indelibly interconnected with knowledge and learning that can be used to control coach development within any context (Jones et al., 2016). This is important because it means that no two coach development collaborations will be the same and anything can happen. Furthermore, each high performance coaching context is part of a political network of power relations. In high performance contexts, pressures to win may bring coaches to experience excess control by those in positions of authority (e.g., University Athletic Director, Club President). In this way, bio-political forces that apply "numerous and diverse techniques for achieving the subjugations of bodies and the control of populations" (Foucault, 1978, p.140), can prevent or enable coach development programs from having their intended effect. Moreover, since coach learning is not a linear process (Jones et al., 2016), it is difficult to know whether or not learning has taken place. Therefore, there is no way to predict if coaches will learn and how they might respond to the coach development process. In sum, the point to accentuate here is that there will always be a degree of uncertainty in any coach development collaboration.

5.5 Future Research Directions

There are a number of potential pathways for future researchers to explore. One of the main findings of chapter 2.0 was how dominant coaching knowledges might prevent less disciplinary practices from being implemented in a complete way. Therefore, future research could examine multiple sporting contexts to map what the dominant knowledges are in other sports, and to understand how Foucault's knowledge interacts with the dominant knowledges. For example, exploring the use of Foucault's (1995) analysis of discipline in soccer, a popular

team sport played across the world, might be interesting because soccer is largely a 'tactical-oriented' sport, which means traditional bio-scientific sport science knowledges (e.g., motor learning) are not always seen as dominant.

Chapter 4.0 clearly showed how introducing Foucault's knowledge to a coach one-on-one could threaten a coach's effectiveness (read identity) because Foucault's concepts reveal inconsistencies in coach's knowledge to discredit established ways of practicing. To help in this regard, future research might investigate Foucauldian coach collaborations with multiple coaches within the same sport or in different sports. For example, Foucauldian coaching researchers might consider the work of Jones, Morgan, and Harris (2012) and Kuklick and Gearity (2016), who used Wengers's (1998) 'communities of practices' to help facilitate an "explicit nexus between theory and practice" (Jones et al., 2012, p. 314) with a small group of coaches. The idea of communities of practice, according to Wenger, is to bring a group of individuals together to discuss activities and practices to reflect and mutually engage with new ways of practicing. This framework could facilitate multiple coach perspectives might open up diverse and less individualizing discussions about coaches' practices that would not exist when a Foucauldian-informed coach developer works one-on-one with a coach.

While communities of practice are often used in constructivist-informed coaching research (Culver & Trudel, 2008) where coach reflection drives the learning process, I argue that this approach might not be suitable for a Foucauldian-informed project. For Cushion (2016), simply facilitating reflective practices in coach development programs "can be used as a means to discipline coaches and normalize practice" (p. 91). That is, reflective practices can be used in coach development programs as a form of surveillance (Foucault, 1995) that encourages coaches to only discuss and reflect upon 'what is already known.' In other words, facilitating reflective

practices on its own might not give coaches the necessary tools to critically question the knowledge that has come to underpin their practices, which in the end means the same disciplinary coaching practices will likely prevail. Instead, I suggest a Foucauldian alternative where reflection does not drive the learning process, but rather 'problematization' of coaching knowledges drives the process. Specifically, Foucauldian-informed coach developers could tie elements of Foucault's (1978, 1980) power-knowledge into learning activities to challenge coaches to collaboratively articulate and critically question the knowledge foundations of their practices. Therefore, a Foucauldian alternative to a community of practice might be called a 'knowledge innovation group', where the coach developer acts as a 'disruptor of knowledge' to help coaches collectively reimagine what is not yet known.

In chapter 2.0, I highlighted that changing practices to be less disciplinary might have been so hard for Cliff because it actually required him change or transform himself as a coach. As a result, I am interested to explore, for example, how Foucault's (1988) technologies of the self can be used to examine "the way a human being turns him- or herself into a subject" (Foucault, 1983, p. 208). To Foucault (1988), individuals are not a fixed substance, rather they are a form that can be engaged and changed through various processes. In this way, Foucault's technologies of the self might be used to understand how the coach, the coach developer, or the athletes, might actively transform themselves through Foucauldian-informed coach collaborations. For example, similar to Jacobs, Claringbould, and Knoppers (2014), who used technologies of the self to examine how a group of coaches problematized their practices through a course based on critical self-reflection, I might use technologies of the self to analyze how a coach might transform himself or herself through a Foucauldian-informed coach development collaboration. I might also examine my experiences as a Foucauldian-informed coach developer

using technologies of the self to understand how I may have transformed myself as the collaboration progressed.

My thesis pointed to a number of complex relations that might prevent coaches from changing their practices and coaching differently. According to Avner, Markula, and Denison's (2017) recent paper that examined the discourses of key coach education texts to understand what is means to be an effective coach in Canada, the "present set of choices for coaches to practice 'effectively' is narrow and that correspondingly the potential for change and innovation is limited in scope" (p. 101). Therefore, to provide a more complete picture of how the entire coaching apparatus, including coach education, works to sustain coaches' understanding of effective coaching, researchers could apply Foucault's (1978) concepts of biopower. More specifically, future collaborations might use Foucault's (1978) governmentality. For example, Kerr and Barker-Ruchti (2015) used governmentality to explore how the Australian and New Zealand women's artistic gymnastics governance systems influenced the micro-level relations between coaches, gymnasts, and parents. Similarly, Foucault's governmentality could help understand how endurance running coaches might be controlled "through a set of governmental institutions and a production of knowledge that supports the existence of such an apparatus" (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 138) and subsequently, lock individuals into fixed identities. In this way, furthering Avner et al.'s discourse analysis of coach education by analyzing how coaches might be subjected to governmentality, for example, through government led coach education initiatives, could help Foucauldian-informed coach developers develop programs that account for government controlled influences that might prevent coaches from challenging the current apparatus that establish truths about effective coaching.

In light of my findings from Chapter 2.0 that highlighted how difficult it can be to legitimize Foucault and how easy it can be to demean scientifically-informed coaching practices, Foucauldian-informed coaching researchers might try engaging more with contemporary sport science researchers (e.g., physiologists, sport psychologists). Foucault (1980) was very clear, that he wanted researchers to use, disrupt, and modify his ideas to promote new ways of thinking and being. I believe a way for Foucauldian researchers could work with scientific scholars knowledge to gain more traction and legitimacy in the traditional bio-scientific fields. Of course, to do this would not be easy, as it would require deep epistemological, ontological, and axiological discussions to make each of the researchers values and research aims known to clarify biases and the value ascribed to data collected in the field. To help with this, new materialist philosophies (DeLanda, 1995) could be used to help researchers understand the complexities of 21st century biopolitics and emerging technologies that question embodied experiences of humans in the material world.

As a potential collaborator, Foucauldian coaching researchers might work with Kiely (2012, 2017) who, as an established sport physiologist, has critically questioned one of the fundamental elements of physiology in endurance sport—periodization. Specifically, he has written about how models of periodization continue to be unquestioningly championed by endurance and strength coaches, even though the scientific knowledge that unpins it has been shown to be problematic. As a result, Kiely (2012) called for periodization theories to be reimagined to make sense within contemporary coaching practices where it is established that responses to training vary substantially. I believe working with Kiely to reimagine periodization through a post-structuralist lens could help post-structural thinking gain some legitimacy as a valued knowledge that can be used in various scientific fields. The point to emphasize here is

that Foucauldian researchers might benefit from working within and through scientific knowledge to show Foucault's relevance to the traditional sport sciences.

Recently, Taylor, Potrac, Nelson, Jones and Groom (2015) examined the use of technologies in sport, such as video analysis, and how they can be used as a tool to dominate athletes' bodies. Specifically, Taylor et al. used Foucault's (1995) surveillance to illustrate how video technology can impose a critical gaze on athletes' bodies and as a result normalize their behaviours. While not explicitly discussed in chapter 3.0, during the athletes' interviews, many of them described their attachment and attraction to new technologies in endurance running, such as GPS watches that link to online data management trackers (e.g., Strava). As the use of technological devices becomes more popular in endurance sport, Foucauldian coaching researchers could investigate how various technologies might disrupt and/or enable the implementation of less disciplinary coaching practices. In addition, coaching researchers can build off Kerr (2014) who extended Foucault's (1978) view of power by demonstrating how Latour's (1993) power is enacted in gymnastics through nonhumans, such as video cameras. Kerr concluded, "that nonhuman actants, such as video cameras, are equal creators of action and must be acknowledged as facilitators in the exercising of power" (p. 97). Of course, we cannot assume from the onset that technology is all bad and will automatically restrict the impact of less disciplinary practices. In educational settings, technological advancements have been very effective at facilitating student engagement at all levels of education (e.g., Bates & Poole, 2003). In this way, maybe technology could be used in a way that helps athletes learn about, for example, the problematic effects of data overload in training?

To help Foucauldian-informed coach developers cultivate more opportunities for transformational experiences in their practices, I believe researchers could adapt Markula and

Pringle's (2006) work on critical pedagogy, and extend Jones et al.'s (2016) Usherian approach to coach learning. For example, Markula and Pringle explored a lecturer's practices as he developed and presented a collective story to a group of students to help them problematize their current understanding of masculinities and rugby identities, and enable transformative possibilities to the students' selves. While critical pedagogy is typically used with Marxist forms of critical inquiry that aim to emancipate students (e.g., Kirk, 2004; Wright, 2004), I argue that aspects of it could be adapted using post-structuralism to understand how relations of power-knowledge are important to consider in all pedagogical practices (Foucault, 1980). Moreover, Foucauldian coaching researchers could extend on the work of Jones et al. to develop new learning resources that can help Foucauldian-informed coach developers show the relevancy of Foucault's knowledge. Examples of this could include: collective stories that highlight coach and athlete transformational change by practicing differently with Foucault, satirical illustrations that reveal some of the taken-for-granted aspects of contemporary coaching, or a series of videos that help coaches visualize what less disciplinary practices actually look like in practice. I believe new resources could promote more transformative possibilities in a manner that is "more attractive and fascinating" (Foucault, 1987, p. 20).

Key findings from my thesis pointed to a number of suggestions for coaching researchers who will design future Foucauldian coach development curriculums. For example, now that we have a general understanding of how Foucauldian coach collaborations might play out, Foucauldian coaching researchers could design a more effective curriculum. For example, I believe a curriculum could be structured around problem-based learning techniques that might help coaches gain a more in-depth understanding of key 'Foucauldian-inspired problems' in coaching (e.g., little opportunity for decision-making). Once the problem is set, coaches can then

be provided with the tools (i.e., discipline's techniques) to help solve these problems, while also being reminded that they must consider contextual factors and the influences of discipline's instruments as potential deterrents. In addition, coaching researchers could develop workshops where a coach developer works with a number of coaches to help them challenge some of coaching maxims, such as body as a machine, to promote alternative games of truth. For example, recent work by Kerr, Barker-Ruchti, Schubring, Cervin, and Nunomura (2017) showed the possibilities that can emerge when a group of gymnastics coaches actively changed their practices by challenging dominant truths about how to coach that had become embedded in gymnastics coaching cultures.

As a valuable resource that could complement a new curriculum, Foucauldian coaching researchers could develop an online hub that contains a number of knowledge translation tools that outline how coaches can integrate Foucauldian knowledge into their everyday practices in practical ways. More specifically, knowledge translation initiatives might be a series of online tools, such as podcasts, videos, and infographics that illustrate the practical application of social concepts. In doing so, my thesis findings showed the importance of introducing sociological concepts in a way that is meaningful for those coaches who might be 'beginners' or new to social science knowledge. This means explaining them in a way that shows how they interact, intersect, and interweave with other more dominant coaching knowledges, such as physiology and psychology. Of course, illuminating the gaps in dominant coaching knowledge is not an easy or straightforward task. In fact, through my own experiences of implementing Foucauldian-informed coaching practices in endurance running, I can attest to how difficult it can be to implement less disciplinary practices in a way that deemphasized a physiological understanding of the body while still making sense to the athletes. Athletes expect a physiological explanation

of their practices, so coaches will need to more easily show how physiology is important, but it is only one dimension of sport performance.

Importantly, sociological knowledge can be so difficult because the 'applied or practical' aspects of this work are new and coaches are uncomfortable with it. As a result, all knowledge translation tools should include a number of practical examples of how practicing coaches have designed and implemented programming and pedagogy that has aimed to resolve various problems. I also believe the tools could benefit from having a number of interviews with coaches from different sports who have implemented less disciplinary practices, and experts from a variety of disciplines that discuss how Foucault's knowledge can be practically used with other knowledge. In particular, questions about the coaches implementation and the barriers and opportunities they may have encountered. In sum, there are many new contexts, concepts, and collaborations that myself and other Foucauldian coaching researchers might explore to help enhance the impact of future Foucauldian-informed coach collaborations.

5.6 To Close

Overall, my thesis has showed that change is hard. Each of my papers has illustrated the difficulties that participants (i.e., coach, athletes, myself as coach developer) might experience when social-driven change is the goal. Creating change to the long-held apparatus of coaching was, I admit, a lofty goal for my thesis. And indeed, for some, it may seem like it was not successful. But while there were plenty of challenges experienced by all who participated in the collaboration, I see these challenges as possibilities for future work. Therefore, this thesis serves as a starting point. That is, a starting point to help springboard and enhance the delivery and implementation of future Foucauldian-informed coach development collaborations. I am hopeful

that with more creative and strategic research, we can slowly break away from ‘normal’ coaching to discover the possibilities of coaching differently.

Chapter 6.0

References

Abraham, A., Collins, D., & Martindale, R. (2006). The coaching schematic: Validation through expert coach consensus. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 24*(6), 549-564.

Andrews, D. L. (2001). *Michael jordan, inc.: Corporate sport, media culture, and late modern america* SUNY Press.

Andrews, D. L. (2008). Sport, culture and late capitalism. *Marxism, Cultural Studies and Sport,* 213.

Angrosino, M. V. (2005). Recontextualizing observation: Ethnography, pedagogy, and the prospects for a progressive political agenda. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, 3*, 729-745.

Allen- Collinson, J. (2009). Sporting embodiment: sports studies and the (continuing) promise of phenomenology. *Qualitative research in sport and exercise*, *1*(3), 279-296.

Allen Collinson, J., & Hockey, J. (2007). 'Working out'identity: Distance runners and the management of disrupted identity. *Leisure studies*, *26*(4), 381-398.

Atkinson, P., & Coffey, A. (2002). Revisiting the relationship between participant observation and interviewing. In J.F. Gubrium & J.A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research*, (pp. 801-813). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Avner, Z., Jones, L., & Denison, J. (2014). Poststructuralism. In L. Nelson, P. Potrac and R. Groom (Eds.), *Research methods in sports coaching*, (pp. 42-51). London: Routledge.

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.

Barker-Ruchti, N., & Tinning, R. (2010). Foucault in leotards: Corporeal discipline in women's artistic gymnastics. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 27*(3), 229-249.

Bates, A. W., & Poole, G. (2003). *Effective Teaching with Technology in Higher Education: Foundations for Success*. Jossey-Bass, An Imprint of Wiley. 10475 Crosspoint Blvd, Indianapolis, IN 46256.

Bell, C. C. (1997). Promotion of mental health through coaching competitive sports. *Journal of the National Medical Association, 89*(8), 517-520.

Biggs, J. B., & Collis, K. F. (2014). *Evaluating the quality of learning: The SOLO taxonomy (Structure of the Observed Learning Outcome)*. Academic Press.

Blase, J. (1991). *The politics of life in schools: Power, conflict, and cooperation.* ERIC.

Bompa, T. O., & Haff, G. G. (2009). *Periodization: Theory and methodology of training*. Human Kinetics Publishers.

Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice.* Cambridge University press.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). Force of law: Toward a sociology of the juridical field. *Hastings LJ, 38*, 805.

Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social space and symbolic power. *Sociological Theory, 7*(1), 14-25.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology.* University of Chicago press.

Callary, B., Werthner, P., & Trudel, P. (2011). Shaping the way five women coaches develop: Their primary and secondary socialization. *Journal of Coaching Education, 4*(3), 76-125.

Cassidy, T. G., Jones, R. L., & Potrac, P. (2009). *Understanding sports coaching: The social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice*. Routledge.

Cassidy, T., Potrac, P., & McKenzie, A. (2006). Evaluating and reflecting upon a coach education initiative: The CoDe^ 1 of rugby. *Sport Psychologist, 20*(2), 145.

Chapman, G. E. (1997). Making weight: Lightweight rowing, technologies of power, and technologies of the self. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 14*(3), 205-223.

Chelladurai, P., & Doherty, A. (1993). Styles of decision making in coaching. *Applied Sport Psychology. Personal Growth to Peak Performance, 2*, 99-109.

Chelladurai, P., & Haggerty, T. (1978). A normative model of decision styles in coaching. *Athletic Administrator, 13*(1), 6-9.

Chelladurai, P. (1990). Leadership in sports: A review. *International Journal of Sport Psychology,* 21(4), 328-354.

Cooper, J. N., & Hawkins, B. (2014). The transfer effect: A critical race theory examination of Black male transfer student athletes' experiences. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sport*, *7*(1), 80-104.

Coppola, A. M., Ward, R. M., & Freysinger, V. J. (2014). Coaches' communication of sport body image: Experiences of female athletes. *Journal of applied sport psychology*, *26*(1), 1-16.

Côté, J., & Gilbert, W. (2009). An integrative definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching,* 4(3), 307-323.

Coté, J., Salmela, J., Trudel, P., & Baria, A. (1995). The coaching model: A grounded assessment of expert gymnastic coaches' knowledge. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology,* 17(1), 1-17.

Crocket, H. (2015). Foucault, flying discs and calling fouls: Ascetic practices of the self in ultimate frisbee. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 32*(1), 89-105.

Culver, D., & Trudel, P. (2008). Clarifying the concept of communities of practice in sport. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, *3*(1), 1-10.

Cumming, S. P., Smith, R. E., & Smoll, F. L. (2006). Athlete-perceived coaching behaviors: Relating two measurement traditions. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 28*(2), 205-213.

Cushion, C., & Kitchen, W. (2011). Pierre bourdieu: A theory of (coaching) practice. *The Sociology of Sports Coaching*, 40-53.

Cushion, C. J., Armour, K. M., & Jones, R. L. (2006). Locating the coaching process in practice: Models 'for'and 'of'coaching. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 11*(1), 83-99.

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.

Cushion, C. J., & Jones, R. (2001). A systematic observation of professional top-level youth soccer coaches. *Journal of Sport Behaviour, 24*(4), 354-376.

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), 142-158.

Cushion, C. (2001). Coaching research and coach education: Do the sum of the parts equal the whole? (Part 1). *The New PE & Sports Dimension,*

Cushion, C. (2010). Coach and athlete learning: A social approach. In R. L. Jones, P. Potrac, C. Cushion and L. T. Ronglan (Eds), *The sociology of sports coaching* (pp. 166-178). London: Routledge.

d'Arripe-Longueville, F., Fournier, J. F., & Dubois, A. (1998). The perceived effectiveness of interactions between expert french judo coaches and elite female athletes. *Sport Psychologist,* 12, 317-332.

Denison, J. (2007). Social theory for coaches: A foucauldian reading of one athlete's poor performance. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 2*(4), 369-383.

Denison, J. (2010). Planning, practice and performance: The discursive formation of coaches' knowledge. *Sport, Education and Society, 15*(4), 461-478.

Denison, J., & Avner, Z. (2011). Positive coaching: Ethical practices for athlete development. *Quest, 63*(2), 209-227.

Denison, J., Gilbert, W., & Potrac, P. (2013). *Routledge handbook of sports coaching* Routledge.

Denison, J., & Mills, J. P. (2014). Planning for distance running: Coaching with foucault. *Sports Coaching Review, 3*(1), 1-16.

Denison, J., Mills, J. P., & Konoval, T. (2015). Sports' disciplinary legacy and the challenge of 'coaching differently'. *Sport, Education and Society, 22*(6), 772-783.

Denison, J., Pringle, R., Cassidy, T., & Hessian, P. (2015). Informing coaches' practices: Towards an application of Foucault's ethics. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, *2*, 72-76.

Denison, J., & Scott-Thomas, D. (2011). Michel foucault: Power and discourse: The 'loaded' language of coaching. *The Sociology of Sports Coaching,* 27-39.

DeLanda, M. (1995). The geology of morals: A neo-materialist interpretation. *Virtual Futures*, *95*.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2008). *Collecting and interpreting qualitative materials* Sage.

Dewey, J. (2004). *Democracy and education*. Courier Corporation.

Edwards, R., & Usher, R. (1994). Disciplining the subject: The power of competence. *Studies in the Education of Adults, 26*(1), 1-14.

Edwards, R., & Usher, R. (2001). Lifelong learning: A postmodern condition of education? *Adult Education Quarterly, 51*(4), 273-287.

Edwards, R., & Usher, R. (2007). *Globalisation & pedagogy: Space, place and identity* Routledge.

Fasting, K., Brackenridge, C., & Sundgot-Borgen, J. (2003). Experiences of sexual harassment and abuse among Norwegian elite female athletes and nonathletes. *Research quarterly for exercise and sport*, *74*(1), 84-97.

Figgins, S. G., Smith, M. J., Sellars, C. N., Greenlees, I. A., & Knight, C. J. (2016). "You really could be something quite special": A qualitative exploration of athletes' experiences of being inspired in sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *24*, 82-91.

Foucault, M. (1972). The archaeology of knowledge (AM sheridan smith, trans.). New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1978). The history of sexuality, volume 1: An introduction (R. Hurley, trans.). New York: Vintage.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972-1977.* New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1983). *This is not a pipe* Univ of California Press.

Foucault, M. (1987). *The use of pleasure: The history of sexuality volume two*. Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault* (pp. 16-49).

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison,* New York: Vintage.

French, J. R., Raven, B., & Cartwright, D. (1959). The bases of social power. *Classics of Organization Theory*, 311-320.

Frey, M., Czech, D. R., Kent, R. G., & Johnson, M. (2006). An exploration of female athletes' experiences and perceptions of male and female coaches. *The Sport Journal*, *9*(4).

Galli, N., & Vealey, R. S. (2008). "Bouncing back" from adversity: Athletes' experiences of resilience. *The Sport Psychologist*, *22*(3), 316-335.

Gearity, B. T. (2012). Poor teaching by the coach: A phenomenological description from athletes' experience of poor coaching. *Physical education & sport pedagogy*, *17*(1), 79-96.

Gearity, B. T., & Mills, J. P. (2013). Discipline and punish in the weight room. *Sports Coaching Review,* 1(2), 1-11.

Gearity, B. T., & Murray, M. A. (2011). Athletes' experiences of the psychological effects of poor coaching. *Psychology of sport and exercise*, *12*(3), 213-221.

Gibson, W. J., & Brown, A. (2009). Working with qualitative data. London, UK: Sage.

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: Outline of the theory of structuration* Univ of California Press.

Gilbert, W. D., & Trudel, P. (2004). Analysis of coaching science research published from 1970–2001. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 75*(4), 388-399.

Gilbert, W., Côté, J., & Mallett, C. (2006). Developmental paths and activities of successful sport coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 1*(1), 69-76.

Gilbert, W., Lichtenwaldt, L., Gilbert, J., Zelezny, L., & Côté, J. (2009). Developmental profiles of successful high school coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 4*(3), 415-431.

Goffman, E. (1959). The presentation of self in everyday life. *Garden City, NY: Anchor*.

Goffman, E. (1963). Behavior in public place. *Glencoe: The Free Press, New York,*

Gordon, D. (2009). *Coaching science.* SAGE.

Halas, J., & Hanson, L. L. (2001). Pathologizing billy: Enabling and constraining the body of the condemned. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 18*(1), 115-126.

Heikkala, J. (1993). Discipline and excel: Techniques of the self and body and the logic of competing. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 10*, 397-397.

Hussain, A., Trudel, P., Patrick, T., & Rossi, A. (2012). Reflections on a novel coach education program: A narrative analysis. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, *7*(2), 227-240.

Jacobs, F., Claringbould, I., & Knoppers, A. (2016). Becoming a 'good coach'. *Sport, Education and Society*, *21*(3), 411-430.

Jarvis, P. (2006). *The theory and practice of teaching.* Routledge.

Jenks, J. M. (1993). The pattern of personal knowing in nurse clinical decision making. *The Journal of Nursing Education, 32*(9), 399-405.

Johns, D. P., & Johns, J. S. (2000). Surveillance, subjectivism and technologies of power: An analysis of the discursive practice of high-performance sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 35*(2), 219-234.

Johnson, U. (2011). Athletes' experiences of psychosocial risk factors preceding injury. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *3*(1), 99-115.

Jones, L., Denison, J., & Gearity, B. (2016). Robin Usher: A post-structuralist reading of learning in coaching. *Learning in sports coaching*, 161-173.

Jones, R., (2000). Toward a sociology of coaching. *Sociology of Sport: Theory and Practice*, 33-43.

Jones, R. (2006). Dilemmas, maintaining "Face," and paranoia an average coaching life. *Qualitative Inquiry, 12*(5), 1012-1021.

Jones, R. (2006). The sports coach as educator: Reconceptualising sports coaching. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 1*(4), 405-412.

Jones, R., Armour, K. M., & Potrac, P. (2004). *Sports coaching cultures: From practice to theory* Psychology Press.

Jones, R., Morgan, K., & Harris, K. (2012). Developing coaching pedagogy: Seeking a better integration of theory and practice. *Sport, Education and Society*, *17*(3), 313-329.

Jones, R., & Wallace, M. (2005). Another bad day at the training ground: Coping with ambiguity in the coaching context. *Sport, Education and Society, 10*(1), 119-134.

Jones, R., Armour, K. M., & Potrac, P. (2003). Constructing expert knowledge: A case study of a top-level professional soccer coach. *Sport, Education & Society, 8*(2), 213-229.

Jones, R., Glintmeyer, N., & McKenzie, A. (2005). Slim bodies, eating disorders and the coach-athlete relationship. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport, 40*(3), 377-391;395;398;401;404.

Jones, R., Potrac, P., Cushion, C., Ronglan, L., & Davey, C. (2011). Erving goffman: Interaction and impression management: Playing the coaching role. *The Sociology of Sports Coaching*, 15-26.

Jones, R., & Wallace, M. (2006). The coach as 'orchestrator': More realistically managing the complex coaching context. *The Sports Coach as Educator: Reconceptualising Sports Coaching*, 51-64.

Kerr, R. (2014). From Foucault to Latour: gymnastics training as a socio-technical network. *Sociology of sport journal*, *31*(1), 85-101.

Kerr, R., & Barker-Ruchti, N. (2015). Women's artistic gymnastics in Australia and New Zealand: A Foucauldian examination of the relationship between sport governance and consumption. *Journal of sport and social issues*, *39*(5), 396-411.

Kerr, R., Barker-Ruchti, N., Schubring, A., Cervin, G., & Nunomura, M. (2017). Coming of age: coaches transforming the pixie-style model of coaching in women's artistic gymnastics. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1-18.

Kiviniemi, A. M., Tulppo, M. P., Hautala, A. J., Vanninen, E., & Uusitalo, A. L. T. (2014). Altered relationship between R- R interval and R- R interval variability in endurance athletes with overtraining syndrome. *Scandinavian journal of medicine & science in sports*, *24*(2).

Kiely, J. (2012). Periodization paradigms in the 21st century: evidence-led or tradition-driven?. *International journal of sports physiology and performance*, *7*(3), 242-250.

Kiely, J. (2017). Periodization Theory: Confronting an Inconvenient Truth. *Sports Medicine*, 1-12.

Kirk, D. (2004). Towards a critical history of the body, identity and health. *Body knowledge and control: Studies in the sociology of physical education and health*, 52-67.

Korthagen, F. A., & Kessels, J. P. (1999). Linking theory and practice: Changing the pedagogy of teacher education. *Educational researcher*, *28*(4), 4-17.

Kuklick, C., & Gearity, B. (2016). A Foucauldian Intervention Implemented for Strength and Conditioning Coaches. *North American Sport Sociology Conference Presentation,* November 2016.

Kvale, S. (1996). *InterViews: An introduction to qualitative research interviewing*. London: Sage.

Lacy, A. C., & Darst, P. W. (1984). Evolution of a systematic observation system: The ASU coaching observation instrument. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 3*(3), 59-66.

Lather, P. (1993). Fertile obsession: Validity after poststructuralism. *The sociological quarterly*, *34*(4), 673-693.

Latour, B. (1993). We Have Never Been Modern (Porter, C. (trans.)). Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press

Lawrence, S. M. (2005). African American athletes' experiences of race in sport. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, *40*(1), 99-110.

Mallett, C. J. (2005). Self-determination theory: A case study of evidence-based coaching. *Sport Psychologist, 19*(4), 417.

Mahoney, J., & Hanrahan, S. J. (2011). A brief educational intervention using acceptance and commitment therapy: Four injured athletes' experiences. *Journal of Clinical Sport Psychology*, *5*(3), 252-273.

Markula, G.Denison,(2001). *Qualitative Research and Aging and Physical Activity: Multiple Ways of Knowing.Journal of Physical Activity and Aging, 9*(3), 245-264.

Markula, P., Martin, M., & Denison, J. (2007). Ethical coaching: Gaining respect in the field. *Coaching Knowledges: Understanding the Dynamics of Sport Performance*, 51-82.

Markula, P., & Silk, M. (2011). *Qualitative research for physical culture* Palgrave Macmillan.

Markula-Denison, P., & Pringle, R. (2006). *Foucault, sport and exercise: Power, knowledge and transforming the self.* Routledge.

McMahon, J., Penney, D., & Dinan-Thompson, M. (2012). 'Body practices—exposure and effect of a sporting culture?' stories from three australian swimmers. *Sport, Education & Society,* 17(2), 181-206.

Mills, J. P. (2012). Soldiers, Animals and Machines: A Foucauldian Analysis of the Making of the Contemporary Endurance Running Body.

Mills, J. P., & Denison, J. (2013). Coach Foucault: Problematizing endurance running coaches' practices. *Sports Coaching Review,* 2(2), 136-150.

Mills, J. P., & Denison, J. (2015). Charting the development of contemporary endurance running training theory. In *Endurance Running: A Socio-Cultural Examination*, 50-60.

Mills, J. P., & Denison, J. (2016). How power moves: A Foucauldian analysis of (in) effective coaching. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 1012690216654719.

Meeusen, R., Duclos, M., Foster, C., Fry, A., Gleeson, M., Nieman, D., & Urhausen, A. (2013). Prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of the overtraining syndrome: joint consensus statement of the European College of Sport Science and the American College of Sports Medicine. *Medicine and science in sports and exercise*, 45(1), 186-205.

Moon, J. A. (1999). *Learning journals: A handbook for academics, students and professional development*. Routledge.

Moon, J. A. (2004). *A handbook of reflective and experiential learning: Theory and practice* Psychology Press.

Nash, C., & Collins, D. (2006). Tacit knowledge in expert coaching: Science or art? *Quest, 58*(4), 465-477.

Nash, C., & Sproule, J. (2009). Career development of expert coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 4*(1), 121-138.

Nash, C. S., Sproule, J., & Horton, P. (2008). Sport coaches' perceived role frames and philosophies. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching, 3*(4), 538-554.

Nelson, L. J., Cushion, C. J., & Potrac, P. (2006). Formal, nonformal and informal coach learning: A holistic conceptualisation. *Coach,* (35), 59-69.

Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Paquette, K. J., Hussain, A., Trudel, P., & Camiré, M. (2014). A sport federation's attempt to restructure a coach education program using constructivist principles. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, *1*(2), 75-85.

Pensgaard, A. M., & Roberts, G. C. (2002). Elite athletes' experiences of the motivational climate: The coach matters. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, *12*(1), 54-59.

Phillips, M. G., & Hicks, F. (2000). Conflict, tensions and complexities: Athletic training in Australia in the 1950s. *International Journal of the History of Sport, 17*(2), 206-224.

Potrac, P. (2001). A comparative analysis of the working behaviours of top-level English and Norwegian soccer coaches. *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Brunel University, UK.*

Potrac, P., Brewer, C., Jones, R., Armour, K., & Hoff, J. (2000). Toward an holistic understanding of the coaching process. *Quest, 52*(2), 186-199.

Potrac, P., & Jones, R. (2011). Power in coaching. *The Sociology of Sports Coaching*, 135-150.

Potrac, P., & Jones, R. (2009). Power, conflict, and cooperation: Toward a micropolitics of coaching. *Quest, 61*(2), 223-236.

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.

Potrac, P., & Jones, R. (1999). The invisible ingredient in coaching knowledge: A case for recognising and researching the social component. *SOSOL: Sociology of Sport Online, 2*(1)

Potrac, P., & Jones, R. (2009). Power, conflict, and cooperation: Toward a micropolitics of coaching. *Quest,* 61(2), 223-236.

Pringle, R., & Crocket, H. (2013). Coaching with foucault: An examination of applied sports ethics. *Routledge Handbook of Sports Coaching*, 16-27.

Pringle, R., & Markula, P. (2005). No pain is sane after all: A foucauldian analysis of masculinities and men's experiences in rugby. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 22*(4), 472-497.

Purdy, L., & Jones, R. L. (2011). Choppy waters: Elite rowers' perceptions of coaching. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 28*(3), 329-346.

Purdy, L., Potrac, P., & Jones, R. (2008). Power, consent and resistance: An autoethnography of competitive rowing. *Sport, Education and Society, 13*(3), 319-336.

Rapley, J. (2004). *Globalization and inequality: Neoliberalism's downward spiral* Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Ritzer, G., & Goodman, D. J. (1996). *Classical sociological theory* McGraw-Hill New York.

Rubin H. J., & Rubin, I. S (2005). Qualitative interviewing the art of hearing data (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Salmela, J. (1995). Learning from the development of expert coaches. *Coaching & Sport Science Journal, 1*(2), 3-13.

Santos, S., Jones, R. L., & Mesquita, I. (2013). Do coaches orchestrate? The working practices of elite Portuguese coaches. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 84*(2), 263-272.

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.

Schempp, P. G., McCullick, B., & Mason, I. S. (2006). The development of expert coaching. *The Sports Coach as Educator: Re-Conceptualizing Sports Coaching*, 145-161.

Shogan, D. (1999). *The making of high performance sport: Discipline, diversity and ethics*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L., & Hunt, E. (1977). A system for the behavioral assessment of athletic coaches. *Research Quarterly.American Alliance for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 48*(2), 401-407.

Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L., & Cumming, S. P. (2007). Effects of a motivational climate intervention for coaches on young athletes' sport performance anxiety. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 29*(1), 39-59.

Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (1989). Leadership behaviors in sport: A theoretical model and research paradigm. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19*(18), 1522-1551.

Stirling, A. E., & Kerr, G. A. (2013). The perceived effects of elite athletes' experiences of emotional abuse in the coach–athlete relationship. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11(1), 87-100.

Taylor, W. G., Potrac, P., Nelson, L. J., Jones, L., & Groom, R. (2017). An elite hockey player's experiences of video-based coaching: A poststructuralist reading. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, *52*(1), 112-125.

Tinning, R. (2002). Engaging siedentopian perspectives on content knowledge for physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 21*(4), 378-391.

Tomlinson, A. (2004). Pierre bourdieu and the sociological study of sport: Habitus, capital and field. *Sport and Modern Social Theorists,* , 161-172.

Tomlinson, A. (2004). Pierre bourdieu and the sociological study of sport: Habitus, capital and field. *Sport and Modern Social Theorists*, 161-172.

Trudel, P., Culver, D., & Werthner, P. (2013). Looking at coach development from the coach learner's perspective: Consideration for coach development administrators. *Routledge Handbook of Sports Coaching*, 375-387.

Trudel, P., Gilbert, W., & Werthner, P. (2010). Coach education effectiveness. *Sport Coaching: Professionalisation and Practice*, 135-152.

Tsang, T. (2000). Let me tell you a story: A narrative exploration of identity in high-performance sport. *Sociology of Sport Journal,* 17(1), 44-59.

Turner, D., Nelson, L., & Potrac, P. (2012). The journey is the destination: Reconsidering the expert sports coach. *Quest, 64*(4), 313-325.

Usher, R. (1997). Telling a story about research and research as story-telling: Postmodern approaches to social research. *Social Research and Educational Studies Series*, *16*, 27-41.

Usher, R. S., & Bryant, I. (1987). Re-examining the theory-practice relationship in continuing professional education. *Studies in Higher Education*, *12*(2), 201-212.

Washington, M,. & Reade, I. (2013) Coach as Open Systems Manager. In Potrac, P., Gilbert, W., & Denison, J. (Eds.). (2013). *Routledge handbook of sports coaching*. Routledge.

Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge University press.

Werthner, P., & Trudel, P. (2006). A new theoretical perspective for understanding how coaches learn to coach. *Sport Psychologist, 20*(2), 198-212.

Werthner, P., & Trudel, P. (2009). Investigating the idiosyncratic learning paths of elite canadian coaches. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 4*(3), 433-449.

Woodman, L. (1993). Coaching: A science, an art, an emerging profession. *Sport Science Review, 2*(2), 1-13.

Wright, J., Burrows, L., & MacDonald, D. (Eds.). (2004). *Critical inquiry and problem-solving in physical education*. Psychology Press.

Chapter 7.0

Appendices

7.1 Appendix 1: Information Letter and Informed Consent for Athletes

Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation
W1-34 Van Vliet Centre
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2H9

INFORMATION LETTER and CONSENT FORM
(For Athletes)

Study Title: Effective Coaching and the Ways of Knowing: Exploring the impact of a Foucauldian-inspired collaboration with a sport team.

Research Investigator:
Timothy Konoval, PhD Student
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB T6G 2H9
konoval@ualberta.ca
780-862-3511

Supervisor:
Dr. Jim Denison
433 South Academic Building
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB, T6G 2G7
jim.denison@ualberta.ca
780-492-6824

Background

You are being asked to be in this study because of your position as an athlete on a sport team, which I would like to explore. The results of this study will be used in support of my PhD dissertation.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of the possibilities and challenges of introducing Foucauldian-inspired ideas to a sport team.

It also looks to explore how athletes can become more engaged with their bodies and potentially improve performance through changing a range of controlling and disciplining techniques.

Please feel free to ask any questions you may have at any time.

*You will be given a copy of this form for your records.

Study Procedures

1) You have been asked to periodically participate in a semi-structured interview, ranging from 30 minutes to 1.5 hours. If you agree, interviews will be digitally recorded and can be done in person or over the phone. If in person, the interviews will take place in a location that is comfortable and convenient for you. Interviews will include conversations to better understand your current athletic experiences. All interviews will be audio recorded. Approximately 1-2 interviews will take place between September 1st and December 31st. If you agree, your interview transcripts will be used for analysis and dissemination (examples of dissemination: conference presentations or publications).

2) **IMPORTANT:**

> *Before* being published or used in public, you will be offered a chance to review the transcript from all of *your* interviews, the written materials from all of *your* practices, and any written material you have submitted to me. This will be done via in person, email, mail, or phone depending on which is most convenient and comfortable for you. You will have the option of not having any interview responses included in the analysis and/or academic presentation or publication. If you wish any material (interview responses, written) not to be included in the research, and if you inform the researcher of your wishes the material will not be included.

*The timeline of this study is 4 months, beginning in September 1, 2015 and ending approximately in December 31, 2015.

*You will have the option to have your identity represented on materials (or you can remain anonymous). Please inform the researcher as to your wishes in this respect.

*A copy of all your transcripts will be made available to you (by email or mail).

Benefits

There are no specific or guaranteed benefits to participating in this research. However, it is my hope that through the 4-month period you will gain a much deeper understanding and awareness of your sporting body, which can lead to greater performance potential.

Risks

There may be minor cognitive, or emotional health concerns with this research project. Research with humans almost always has elements of potential psychological, emotional, social and other risks and discomforts. Through interviews, you may feel mild discomfort from having to answer questions about your athletic experiences that may bring out sensitive issues from your past. In addition, you may feel minor anxiety when your coaches' practices and your athletic practices change. At any point during the process, you may choose not to answer any of the questions.

Voluntary Participation

You are under no obligation to participate in this study. Your participation is completely voluntary. And you are *not* obliged to answer any specific questions even if participating in the study.

Even if you agree to be in the study you can change your mind and withdraw at any time up until the final withdrawal date. I would honor your wishes to end, withdraw, or modify your participation, including the exclusion of your contributions retroactively. You can communicate these wishes to me at any time via email, mail, or phone before December 31st, 2015.

The final date for withdrawing any of your information from the study is **December 31, 2015** (this date is set for after the analysis is completed and the writing of the dissertation begins).

Confidentiality & Anonymity

- This research may be used for the following: PhD dissertation, research articles, conference presentations, teaching, and/or workshops. For written work, you will have the choice of whether or not you would like to be personally identified or if you would like to remain anonymous. You can choose to use pseudonyms in written work.
- All interview transcripts will be kept confidential. Only my Supervisory committee and myself will have access to this data. Your name will not be attached to the transcripts (unless you request for your name to be included).
- Data (interview transcripts, analysis) will be kept in a secure place for a minimum of 5 years following completion of the research project. This is a requirement from the university in case of an audit. Electronic data will be password protected. You can choose for your data to be destroyed (in a way that ensures privacy and confidentiality) up until the final withdrawal date, which is December 31st, 2015.
- You can choose to receive a copy of your interview transcript and/or a report of the research findings. You can indicate your interest in receiving such materials during the interview or at any time after that. These items can be sent to you through email or mail.
- I may use the data I get from this study in future research (in addition to this research), but if I do this it will have to be approved by a Research Ethics Board.

Further Information

If you have any further questions regarding this study, please do not hesitate to contact the Principal Investigator, Timothy Konoval at 780-862-3511 (email: **konoval@ualberta.ca**) or their Supervisor, Dr. Jim Denison at 780-492-6824 (email: **jim.denison@ualberta.ca**).

The plan for this study has been reviewed for its adherence to ethical guidelines by a Research Ethics Board 1 which is located at the University of Alberta, 308 Campus Tower, 8625 – 112 Street, Edmonton, AB, T6G 1K8. For questions regarding participant rights and ethical conduct of research, contact the University of Alberta's Research Ethics Office at (780) 492-2615.

Consent Statement

I have read this form and the research study has been explained to me. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered. If I have additional questions, I have been told whom to contact. I agree to participate in the research study in the following way(s) (please check all that apply):

_____to be interviewed and to have my interview transcripts be used for analysis.

_____to have my all of my interview responses used for dissemination (examples: conference presentations or publications).

Please initial your selection for if you would like to have all your responses to be anonymous _____ or non-anonymous _____.

_____I understand that the deadline to withdrawal myself and all of my information from this study is December, 31st, 2015.

I understand that by checking any items above I will still have opportunities to review and withdraw any specific materials. I will receive a copy of this consent form after I sign it.

_____	_____
Participant's Name (printed) and Signature	Date
_____	_____
Name (printed) and Signature of Person Obtaining Consent	Date

7.2 Appendix 2: Information Letter and informed Consent for Coach

Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation
W1-34 Van Vliet Centre
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2H9

INFORMATION LETTER and CONSENT FORM
(For Coaches)

Study Title: Effective Coaching and the Ways of Knowing: Exploring the impact of a Foucauldian-inspired collaboration with a sport team.

Research Investigator:
Timothy Konoval, PhD Student
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB T6G 2H9
konoval@ualberta.ca
780-862-3511

Supervisor:
Dr. Jim Denison
433 South Academic Building
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB, T6G 2G7
jim.denison@ualberta.ca
780-492-6824

Background

You are being asked to be in this study because of your experience and position as the coach of a sport team, which I would like to explore. The results of this study will be used in support of my PhD dissertation.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to gain a better understanding of the possibilities and challenges of introducing Foucauldian-inspired ideas to a sport team.

It also looks to explore how a coach can coach in ways that can better facilitate athlete engagement and performance through changing a range of disciplinary coaching practices.

Please feel free to ask any questions you may have at any time.

*You will be given a copy of this form for your records.

Study Procedures

1) You will be asked to periodically participate in semi-structured and unstructured interviews, ranging from 30 minutes to 1.5 hours. If you agree, interviews will be digitally recorded and can be done in person or over the phone. If in person, the interviews will take place in a location that is comfortable and convenient for you. All interviews will be audio recorded. Interviews will include conversations to help understand Foucault's ideas, debriefs to assess how practices are going, and conversations aimed at gaining a more specific understanding about certain topics or issues. During these interviews, you will be asked a variety of questions generally relating to the design and implementation of your coaching practices, your athletes experiences and performances, and your thoughts and feelings about your coaching practices. Approximately 25 interviews total will take place from July 6th to December 31st. If you agree, your interview transcripts will be used for analysis and dissemination (examples of dissemination: conference presentations or publications).

2) Some of your coaching practices will be observed and field notes will be taken. All observations will be non-obtrusive and you will get to choose when and where observations will take place. If you agree, all of the field notes collected may be used for analysis and dissemination (examples of dissemination: conference presentations or publications).

3) **IMPORTANT:**

> *Before* being published or used in public, you will be offered a chance to review the transcript from all of *your* interviews, the written materials from all of *your* practices, and any written material you have submitted to me. This will be done via in person, email, mail, or phone depending on which is most convenient and comfortable for you. You will have the option of not having any interview responses included in the analysis and/or academic presentation or publication. If you wish any material (interview responses, written) not to be included in the research, and if you inform the researcher of your wishes the material will not be included.

*The timeline of this study is 6 months, beginning in July 2015 and ending approximately in December 31, 2015.

*You will have the option to have your identity represented on materials (or you can remain anonymous). Please inform the researcher as to your wishes in this respect.

*A copy of all your transcripts will be made available to you (by email or mail).

Benefits

There are no specific or guaranteed benefits to participating in this research. However, it is my hope that through the 6-month period of learning and problematizing you will gain a much deeper understanding and awareness of your coaching practices. Additionally, your participation in this research will help build upon previous scholarly work on effective coaching.

Risks

There may be minor cognitive, or emotional health concerns with this research project. Research with humans almost always has elements of potential psychological, emotional, social and other risks and discomforts. Through interviews, you may feel mild discomfort from having your long held coaching practices and coaching knowledge challenged. In addition, you may feel minor anxiety through changing your coaching practices. At any point during the process, you may choose not to answer any of the questions.

Voluntary Participation

You are under no obligation to participate in this study. Your participation is completely voluntary. And you are *not* obliged to answer any specific questions even if participating in the study.

Even if you agree to be in the study you can change your mind and withdraw at any time up until the final withdrawal date. I would honor your wishes to end, withdraw, or modify your participation, including the exclusion of your contributions retroactively. You can communicate these wishes to me at any time via email, mail, or phone before December, 31st, 2015.

The final date for withdrawing any of your information from the study is **December 31, 2015** (this date is set for after the analysis is completed and the writing of the dissertation begins).

Confidentiality & Anonymity

- This research may be used for the following: PhD dissertation, research articles, conference presentations, teaching, and/or workshops. For written work, you will have the choice of whether or not you would like to be personally identified or if you would like to remain anonymous. You can choose to use pseudonyms in written work.
- All interview transcripts will be kept confidential. Only my Supervisory committee and myself will have access to this data. Your name will not be attached to the transcripts (unless you request for your name to be included).
- Data (interview transcripts, analysis) will be kept in a secure place for a minimum of 5 years following completion of the research project. This is a requirement from the university in case of an audit. Electronic data will be password protected. You can

choose for your data to be destroyed (in a way that ensures privacy and confidentiality) up until the final withdrawal date which is December, 31st, 2015.

- You can choose to receive a copy of your interview transcript and/or a report of the research findings. You can indicate your interest in receiving such materials during the interview or at any time after that. These items can be sent to you through email or mail.
- I may use the data I get from this study in future research (in addition to this research), but if I do this it will have to be approved by a Research Ethics Board.

Further Information

If you have any further questions regarding this study, please do not hesitate to contact the Principal Investigator, Timothy Konoval at 780-862-3511 (email: **konoval@ualberta.ca**) or their Supervisor, Dr. Jim Denison at 780-492-6824 (email: **jim.denison@ualberta.ca**).

The plan for this study has been reviewed for its adherence to ethical guidelines by a Research Ethics Board 1 which is located at the University of Alberta, 308 Campus Tower, 8625 – 112 Street, Edmonton, AB, T6G 1K8. For questions regarding participant rights and ethical conduct of research, contact the University of Alberta's Research Ethics Office at (780) 492-2615.

Consent Statement

I have read this form and the research study has been explained to me. I have been given the opportunity to ask questions and my questions have been answered. If I have additional questions, I have been told whom to contact. I agree to participate in the research study in the following way(s) (please check all that apply):

_____to be interviewed and to have my interview transcripts be used for analysis.

_____to have my all of my interview responses (audio recorded) used for dissemination (examples: conference presentations or publications).

Please initial your selection for if you would like to have all your responses to be anonymous _____ or non-anonymous _____.

_____to have my coaching practices observed and included for analysis.

_____to have my written materials included for analysis.

_____to have my observed coaching practices and written materials included for dissemination (examples: conference presentations or publications).

_____I understand that the deadline to withdrawal myself and all of my information from this study is December, 31st, 2015.

I understand that by checking any items above <u>I will still have opportunities to review and withdraw any specific materials</u>. I will receive a copy of this consent form after I sign it.

_____ _____

Participant's Name (printed) and Signature Date

_____ _____

Name (printed) and Signature of Person Obtaining Consent Date

7.3 Appendix 3: Athlete Interview Guide

Athlete Interview Guide

I will not be asking yes or no questions, try to talk about your experiences, take your time.

Context/Background Questions:

To begin, can you tell me the story of how you got involved in cross-country running?

Why did you become involved in 'University' cross-country running?

Describe your past experiences with cross-country training (coaching) practices. What is your favourite part about practice and why? What is your least favourite part and why?

Focused Questions (practices):

First, recall (see suggestions below) training practice.

1. Given no pace for tempo run (Hawrelak, U of A farm).
2. Told to take off watch (Rainbow road/track)
3. New partner, changed order (U of A farm, Rainbow road).
4. Each runner surged in small groups (U of A farm)
5. Run the opposite way (Goldbar).
6. Optional strides (Track).
7. Run in-group or on own (Recovery sessions).
8. Given range then allowed to decide entire session (Recovery)
9. You can go anywhere you want (Hawrelak, Goldbar)
10. Decide 1km worth of intervals on track. Organize any way you want (Foote)
11. No rest interval for 200's on grass (Hawrelak)
12. No rest or number of hill reps at the beginning of practice (Hawrelak)

**For each athlete I will key in on a few of the deliberate practices above.

Did you understand why Cliff made this change? Can you tell me about any new experiences this practice presented? Can you tell me about some of the challenges this practice presented?

In a sense the practices mentioned were designed to give you more decisions to make and to empower you to take more control over your practices, did you feel that way? Why or why not? Please be specific as possible.

If not, what types of practices do you think might lead you to feel more empowered and take more control over your training?

Do you feel like some of the practices engaged you (with your body) differently? Did you feel like you had to think more about how your body was feeling?

Do you think you all training sessions could have been run similar to the recovery sessions? Why or why not?

Did you like having more control over your training practices (ex. recovery session)? Was it hard to make decisions about what to do?

Do you feel like any of these practices gave you more confidence in yourself? Why or why not?

Did these practices help you in your races/performances? Did they change the way you approached races before, during? Did they make you feel more or less prepared? Why or why not?

Do you think you always need to train in a group? Do you often find that you just follow group? Could this be problematic?

In any way, did you feel like these new practices (ex. recovery sessions) changed your relationship with Cliff? If so, how?

Some of these practices may have led to different conversations with Cliff since you did not always have objective numbers to show him. How were these conversations different? Can you tell me about any of these conversations?

Throughout the season Cliff talked a lot about making practices more like races, which are unpredictable and spontaneous. Also he talked about you guys taking more control in practices as you ultimately must do in races. Did you feel like he achieved this through his practices? Why or why not?

For some of your sessions Cliff had no way of knowing what you did for the entire practice (ex. recovery session). Do you feel like he always needs to be at practice watching and monitoring everything? Do you feel like he needs to know everything you do? Why or why not?

Would you like to keep exploring new practices like the ones I have mentioned? Which ones and why? What else would you like to do?

Effective coaches are often seen as someone who can make you fit, what does being fit mean to you?

Is this always achievable? Can it be problematic if this is not achieved? How?

Beyond just making you fit, what else can a coach provide you with?

Further Questions (technology/body, log books/coach relationship):

Technology:

What technology do you use or have you used in your training (ex. Garmin, watch, ipod, HR monitor)? Do you always find these helpful?

(Reiterate) For some of the practices Cliff asked you to remove your garmin/watch, how did you feel about having to do this? Why?

These tools are meant to provide you with feedback about how your body is feeling. Do you think these tools can change how you feel about your body in problematic ways? For example, could always knowing your pace cause you to over train?

Can these tools change what it means to be fit or not?

Running Logs:

How do you use Cliff's training log?

Since in some these new practices (ex. no watch) you had less data, how did you record this in your log?

Did what these practices caused you to log work to strengthen your relationship with Cliff?

Do you feel like you have to record everything? Do you feel it being a problem in any way? If so, how?