Facilitating Youth Sport Coaches in Learning to Problematize

by

Crystal Watson

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

Master of Arts

Faculty of Kinesiology, Sport, & Recreation
University of Alberta

Abstract

Despite the commonness for coaching courses, manuals and websites to heavily emphasize conventional sport science concepts (such as physiology, biomechanics and sport psychology), sport scholars have suggested that coaches could benefit from learning about, and utilizing, social theory (Avner, Markula & Denison, 2017; Potrac & Cassidy, 2006). Irrespective of this scholarly support, the coaching literature seems to lack practical strategies for supporting coaches in exploring these concepts. Accordingly, I decided to develop and implement a coaching workshop that was intended to facilitate youth sport coaches in utilizing social theory, specifically the work of French social theorist Michel Foucault. My decision to draw upon Foucault was supported by Denison (2010), Jones, Denison, and Gearity (2016), and Shogan (1999), who have contextualized Foucault's work within sport and are now advocating for coaches to 'think with Foucault'. One way coaches can be facilitated in 'thinking with Foucault' is through learning to problematize, which involves critically questioning one's taken-for-granted assumptions and practices by assessing the workings of power and knowledge, to reveal the unintended consequences associated with their actions. Doing so can help coaches ensure that their actions align with their intentions, which has the potential to enhance coaches' effectiveness and in turn improve their athletes' performances.

Accordingly, my Foucauldian-inspired workshop consisted of two, 2.5-hour sessions that were separated by a one-week break. Through a variety of interactive learning activities, the coaches were challenged to problematize the taken-for-granted coaching logics that view the athletic 'body as a machine' and position the 'coach as an expert'. Afterwards the coaches were encouraged to problematize their own habitual coaching practices. Correspondingly, to

generate empirical material the participants' were asked to complete guided reflective journals. These journal responses in combination with my own field notes provided rich insights into how the four youth sport coaches' experienced both the Foucauldian-informed learning environment and content, where it became apparent that multiple, fragmented perspectives shaped the reality of this workshop. Furthermore, although a number of measures were taken to support the poststructuralist view of learning, as an active, social, collaborative process, these efforts ended up having a mixture of facilitative and constraining effects. As a result, the coaches engaged with the workshop's content to differing degrees. Nevertheless, the happenings within the workshop illustrated that Foucault's concepts can be introduced to coaches in understandable and relevant ways that prompt the development of readily implementable, innovative coaching practices.

Overall, I believe the insights gained from this research illustrate how 'thinking with Foucault', which involves challenging taken-for-granted assumptions, can create space for innovative practices to be developed by coaches, learning facilitators and coach developers. The fact that the workshop had both facilitative and constraining effects emphasizes the importance of adopting a poststructuralist lens, which reveals the workings of power and knowledge while also honoring reality as fragmented and multiple (Markula & Silk, 2011). In closing, I feel this research can be used as a springboard to prompt further exploration of innovative and enriching coach learning opportunities that acknowledge and accommodate for the distinct social, cultural and historical aspects of a given learning context.

Preface

This thesis is an original work by Crystal Watson. The research project, of which this thesis is a part, received research ethics approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board, Project Name "Facilitating Youth Sport Coaches in Learning to Problematize", No. Pro00079208, February 12, 2018. No part of this thesis has been previously published.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to all of those who have supported me while I worked towards completing the Masters of Arts program in Kinesiology, Sport, and Recreation at the University of Alberta. Specifically, I would like to extend a huge thank you to my supervisor, Dr. Jim Denison, for his ongoing support, thoughtful feedback and encouraging guidance throughout my entire time in this program. My supervisory committee member, Dr. Doug Gleddie deserves acknowledgement and appreciation for sharing his expertise and helping to ensure this project was both meaningful and of high quality. I also want to thank my fellow graduate students who always made time to have thought-provoking discussions and provided feedback when requested. Lastly, I would like to thank the Government of Alberta (QEII Graduate Award) and Alberta Learning (Alberta Graduate Student Scholarship) for the financial support that has made it possible for me to purse this thesis research project.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

A recent CBC news headline, leading up to the 2018 Winter Olympics, read 'Rachel Homan's [Canadian Olympian] secret weapon is a curling coach who doesn't really coach curling'. This headline likely shocked many fans, athletes and even coaches. How could a coach reach such a prestigious position in sport, without extensive knowledge of the game? As the article continued, sports journalist Devin Heroux clarified,

> while mental preparation is his specialty, Kingsbury [the coach] is also busy during games. He sits on the team bench behind the sheet of ice, often with multiple devices on the go, tracking every rock thrown. He inputs the information on his iPad, compiling a list of stats he goes over with the team after every game. (2017)

Relief, now this sounds more like an Olympic level coach!

Mental preparation, biomechanical analysis, game statistics, regular corrective performance feedback, these areas of focus align with our perception of high-performance coaches. Interestingly, even though only a few individuals have the opportunity to coach at the Olympics, most coaches (regardless of the level) rely on the same scientific training principles and adopt strikingly similar coaching practices. These common coaching practices are typically based on traditional sport science concepts, derived from physiology, biomechanics and psychology, as they are regularly disseminated in coaching courses, manuals and websites (Avner et al., 2017). For instance, Canada's National Coaching Certification Program (NCCP) extensively utilizes the Long Term Athlete Development (LTAD) model. The LTAD provides a

framework for coaches, at all levels, to systematically prescribe the 'right' training activities at the 'right' time in order to elicit sporting excellence in their athletes. More specifically, the LTAD outlines how to apply concepts such as periodization, windows of trainability and performance tracking, at every stage of development beginning from infancy (Balyi, Way, & Higgs, 2013).

Although coaches, from grassroots to the Olympic level, are encouraged to utilize scientifically informed practices, there is growing recognition that effective coaching involves more than the technical dissemination and/or prescription of scientific principles (Cushion, 2011; Denison, 2007; Jones, 2006; Potrac & Cassidy, 2006). For instance, Jones and Armour (2000) have advocated for a broader social understanding of coaching, warning that ignoring the social aspects of coaching creates "a tendency to routinize high-level social communicative tasks, leading to the de-skilling of the practitioners both in terms of cognitive and human interactions" (p. 8). This type of routinization can also promote the development of mechanistic coaches who are less able to adapt in the dynamic contexts, inherent within sport.

Despite the growing acknowledgement that coaching is a social, dynamic and context-dependent task, social theory continues to be underrepresented in coaching resources and under-utilized by coach practitioners. For instance, the NCCP, which "has been identified as a world leader in coach education" (Coaching association of Canada [CAC], 2018, para .1), only has three, out of their twenty-four, multi-sport modules go beyond conventional sport science constructs, to instead focus on cultural perspectives, inclusive environments and ethical conduct. Despite the underrepresentation of social theory within current coaching course

offerings, a number of sport scholars (e.g., Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010; Denison, 2010; Pringle, 2007; Shogan 1999) have recognized the value of socially informed coaching knowledge and thus have turned to the work of French social theorist, Michel Foucault, crediting his work with the potential to advance the field of coaching.

Foucault's work is particularly insightful as he was interested in the social factors that legitimize and 'naturalize' certain knowledges and practices. Importantly, he never suggested that 'naturalized' knowledges (such as sport science) were false or needed to be replaced. Instead Foucault aimed to understand how knowledges were formed, which allowed him to reveal the unseen effects associated with uncritically valuing certain knowledges and practices over others (Markula & Pringle, 2006). In an attempt to counter these unseen, unintended and potentially detrimental effects, Foucault advocated for the circulation of a greater range of knowledges, which he explained can emerge as relevant when we challenge our habitual assumptions. Correspondingly, questioning taken-for-granted knowledges, understandings and practices has the potential to reveal new opportunities for thinking, acting and feeling (Markula & Pringle, 2006).

Advocating for the emergence of these new opportunities within sport, Foucauldian sport scholars (e.g., Denison, 2010; Jones et al., 2016) have encouraged coaches to draw upon Foucault's work and to begin to critically question, or problematize, their own taken-for-granted coaching practices. Questioning habitual assumptions and practices can enhance coaches' effectiveness by increasing their awareness of the potential unintended consequences associated with their actions. Correspondingly, Denison (2007) explained that utilizing

Foucauldian-informed coaching practices could enhance athletes' engagement and their awareness of their bodies', as well as facilitate greater opportunities for athletes to make decisions, all of which have the potential to enhance athletes' performances.

Research Rationale and Purpose

Recognizing the potential for Foucault's work to enhance coaches' effectiveness and improve their athletes' performances, I have designed this research project to explore the ways in which coaches can be facilitated in 'thinking with Foucault'. My research has been driven by the gap that exists between the opportunities associated with 'thinking with Foucault', but the lack of information available to facilitate coaches in utilizing Foucault's work. Accordingly, my research is unique as it focuses on mobilizing social theory and uses an 'application-based' research design, which helps to ensure the utility of the findings (Lyle, 2018). Another distinguishing feature of my research project includes my use of a poststructuralist approach within coach development, an area that has predominantly been driven by modernist assumptions concerning teaching, learning and knowledge (Jones et al., 2016). Overall, the purpose of my research is to understand how youth sport coaches experience learning to problematize within a poststructuralist-informed coaching workshop, and to elicit further exploration of coach development courses as a potential means for enabling Foucauldian-informed thinking. In what follows I will provide an overview of my research project by outlining the subsequent chapters of this thesis.

Thesis Structure

I designed this research project to explore potential avenues for facilitating coaches in learning about Foucault's work. Accordingly, within the literature review chapter I will summarize the Foucauldian-informed coaching literature and explain how I intend to make a meaningful contribution to this field of study through my own research. I have narrowed my review of the literature to focus on Foucault's theories concerning the workings of power and knowledge, as these interwoven, omnipresent concepts can provide insights as to why certain practices become regarded as 'true' and 'right', even though these practices may have unintended consequences (Markula & Pringle, 2006). More specifically, with a Foucauldian view of power and knowledge I have looked more closely at the uncritically accepted coaching logics that position the 'coach as an expert', and view the athletic 'body as a machine'. These two logics have been thoroughly discussed in the literature, are readily reflected in everyday coaching practices, and exemplify Foucault's understanding that power is relational and that knowledge is subjective. Even with the many advantages and opportunities that are associated with learning to 'think with Foucault', the literature suggests that before coaches can readily utilize Foucauldian-informed practices, coaches will likely need to overcome a few challenges. Thus, I will explain these potential challenges in greater detail within my literature review chapter. In the last section of the literature review chapter I will address how through my research I intend to facilitate youth sport coaches in 'thinking with Foucault' through facilitating them in learning to problematize.

In the methodology chapter, I will clearly explain how my poststructuralist philosophical framework and Foucauldian theoretical perspective have guided my research decisions. Such

elaboration will include the rationale and justifications for my use of purposeful criterion-based sampling, choice of field methods, and will breakdown how I have utilized a poststructuralist theory-based analysis to make sense of the empirical material I collected. In addition to thoroughly explaining these decisions, I will describe how I structured my Foucauldian-informed coaching workshop by elaborating on the learning activities that were utilized. I will conclude the methodology chapter by reviewing the steps I took to assure the quality and meaningfulness of this research project.

In the analysis and discussion chapter, I will share the insights that were gained from the participants' guided reflective journal entries and my field notes. More specifically, the two main themes I identified were 1) implementing a Foucauldian-informed coaching workshop, and 2) engaging in problematization. To elaborate on these themes I discuss the participants' perspectives in light of Foucault's theories on power and knowledge, connect them to existing coaching literature and contextualize them within the current Canadian coaching context. Lastly, in the conclusion chapter I summarize these themes, suggest ways in which these findings can inform subsequent coach learning environments, and offer some potential directions for future research that encourages continued exploration of coach learning through a poststructuralist lens.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In a time when sport is infused with the concepts of productivity, efficiency and predictability, many coaches seek athletes who are 'coachable'. 'Coachable' athletes are seen as those who are obedient and strictly adhere to scientifically informed, coach-designed training plans (Denison & Mills, 2014). Interestingly, it is rarely questioned whether the rigid training progressions, adhered to by athletes and advocated by coaches, have any other effects outside their perceived linear correlation to performance. Rather, these associated rational coaching practices are commonly accepted as the 'right' way to train athletes (Denison, 2010; Mills & Denison, 2013).

Understanding how and why certain practices achieve unquestioned superiority, or become accepted as singly 'true' and 'right', was a particular interest of French social theorist Michel Foucault (Denison, 2010). Instead of simply promoting or condemning taken-for-granted practices, Foucault encouraged us to question our ingrained assumptions, which could allow us to recognize the effects of our actions and reveal new, previously unconsidered approaches, possibilities and understandings (Pringle, 2007). One way this can be done is through engaging in problematization, which involves 'making the familiar strange' by disrupting "people's mental habits, the way they do and think things, to dissipate what is familiar and accepted, to reexamine rules" (Foucault, 1988, p. 265). Accordingly, many Foucauldian sport scholars (Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010; Denison, 2007; Shogan 1999) have acted on Foucault's call to critically analyze, or problematize, taken-for-granted practices and assumptions by examining how a narrow range of coaching practices have become accepted as the 'right' way to develop 'successful' athletes.

Through extensively problematizing the development and acceptance of common coaching practices, a clear case exists emphasizing that sport coaches could benefit substantially from an enhanced understanding of Foucault's outlook on the body, power and knowledge. This actionable recommendation is evident by the "strong calls for coaches to coach with an awareness of the operations and effects of power in order to develop engaged and thinking athletes" (Denison, Mills, & Konoval, 2015a, p. 2). However, when Foucault's concepts have been introduced to coaches, coaches felt the ideas required 'decoding', expressing that the concepts were difficult to derive due to a "lack of tangible outcomes associated with the[m]" (Denison, Pringle, Cassidy, & Hessian, 2015b, p. 75). Accordingly, Denison and Mills (2014) and Mills and Denison (2013) have been addressing these issues of practicality and tangibility by developing prospective Foucauldian-informed coaching practices.

To support and expand on this work, my research will attempt to facilitate coaches in understanding and utilizing Foucauldian-informed thinking. Correspondingly, in this literature review chapter I will first highlight the benefits (or as some even argue the necessity) associated with 'coaching with Foucault'. To exemplify these benefits, I will explain some of the potential unintended consequences that can be associated with uncritically employing taken-for-granted coaching logics. Secondly, I will explore the challenges associated with introducing and utilizing Foucauldian-informed coaching practices. Next, I will review practical recommendations from coach education scholars who encourage the integration of poststructuralist concepts within coach education. Lastly, I will address how through my research, I will attempt to enable coaches to 'think with Foucault'.

Unintended Consequences Associated with Coaching Logics

It is undeniable that coaching is a practice informed by scientific principles. These principles are widely reflected in coaching courses, manuals, websites, and even through the portrayal of sport depicted in the media (Avner et al., 2017). In association with the scientific understanding of coaching, sport has been labeled as a productive, controlling and disciplining activity. Productive in the way that it elicits positive physiological adaptations, controls for disturbances, and disciplines athletes to ensure training efficiency (Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010). With these themes being so prevalent in sport, and tied to 'winning', it is common for coaches to unintentionally get caught up in prescribing and disseminating rationalistic, technocratic jargon to their athletes, and not realize all that their actions are doing.

A number of Foucauldian sport scholars, however, have reveled that while the actions typically and often unreflectively employed by coaches may contribute to 'wins' in sport, these same actions can also have unintended and possibly detrimental consequences that may undermine a coach's intentions and limit or constrain athlete development (Denison & Mills, 2014). Importantly, the coaching practices commonly employed in pursuit of sporting victory are not inherently 'bad' or 'dangerous', but they do have the potential to be problematic. For instance, despite a coach's best intentions, his/her actions may increase an athlete's susceptibility to over train, become injured, perform below expectations, burnout, lose motivation, or retire early from sport (Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010; Denison et al., 2015b; Pringle, 2007). Additionally, McMahon, Penney, and Dinan-Thompson (2012) used an ethnographic framework to understand and analyze how their experiences as elite adolescent athletes continue to influence them in their post-career adult lives. From this research it was

revealed that the unintended consequences associated with sport participation can have a sustained impact on athletes' long-term health and well-being. Importantly, unintended consequences such as these are not the result of a coach being purposely malicious, rather they have the potential to arise when one uncritically applies coaching knowledge and/or is unaware of all that his/her actions are really doing.

The possibility of unintended consequences arising when one uncritically employs rationalistic coaching practices was illustrated by Denison (2007). Denison, a former varsity cross-country running coach, explained that despite his well-intended emphasis on a rigid, linear training program, his efforts failed to produce the predicted performance response in one of his athlete's. At the time Denison relied on traditional sport science knowledge to explain this unexpected result. However, this conventional analysis failed to suitably account for his athlete's underperformance, lack of motivation, reduced enthusiasm and apparent mindlessness. In this particular circumstance, a 'fix' was never found and the athlete ended up retiring from sport all together. This is only one example, where multiple accounts exist, that illustrates how despite a coach's genuine efforts, unintended and potentially avoidable consequences resulted. Since this event, Denison (2010) has reflected on his experiences expressing "interestingly, these practices I followed so strictly were not written in stone. So why did I act as if they were?" (p. 466). To answer this question Denison utilized his Foucauldian-informed understanding of the body, power and knowledge, which enabled him to reveal new, imaginative and previously unconsidered approaches that could have minimized the unintended consequences of his taken-for-granted coaching practices. Recognizing the value and importance for coaches to learn how to 'think with Foucault', Denison's work continues to

focus on this topic, while other Foucauldian sport scholars have also supported and expanded

this line of research (Avner et al., 2017; Barker-Ruchti & Tinning 2010; Pringle, 2007; Shogan,

1999). Consequently, there is now a strong rationale that asserts, "it would be useful for the

next generation of coaches to be taught more about Foucault so they could learn to critique

and problematize their knowledge of coaching and themselves" (Denison & Scott-Thomas,

2011, p. 38).

Although the benefits associated with coaches learning about Foucault are well

documented in the literature, coaches are tied to very specific ways of thinking and being.

Therefore, in order to engage in problematization, the coaches will likely have to question

traditional, long-held, entrenched understandings of the body and performance. However, Mills

and Denison (2013) pointed out that the unintended, potentially problematic consequences

associated with 'traditional' coaching knowledge "are largely invisible to those caught within its

intricacies" (p. 147). As such, without being prompted to engage in problematization, coaches

will likely remain unaware of the potentially problematic, or even constraining, consequences

associated with their actions. To address this and increase the visibility of these unintended

consequences, I will now illustrate how the common coaching logics that position the 'coach as

an expert' and view the 'body as a machine' can be constraining.

The Coach as the Expert

Sport coaches are often seen as indisputable sources of knowledge, wisdom and

resources, and correspondingly become positioned as 'experts' (Pringle, 2007). While an

'expert', linear, predictable depiction of coaching is prevalent, coaches themselves are realistic

and know that it takes more than the linear application of scientific training principles to be effective. Accordingly, many coaches proclaim to seek multiple views however, uncritically adopting taken-for-granted coaching practices can lead coaches to unintentionally ignore or downplay the athletes' views (Denison et al., 2015a). This can occur for example, when a coach faithfully relies on a linear, parts-based approach to skill development insisting that athletes must achieve a certain level of skill mastery prior to advancing, or perhaps when a coach strictly outlines the plays or game tactics without consideration of athlete-developed plays. Actions such as these, where a coach uncritically employs practices that reinforce his/her position as an 'expert', can naturalize the view of the athletes as subordinates and can lend creditability to a hierarchical power relationship between a coach and the athletes (Cassidy, Jones, & Potrac, 2004).

While coaches do have a unique and important role in sport, an unequal, hierarchical relationship that positions athletes as 'subordinates' can hinder athletic development. The potential for this to be limiting was exemplified when sport scholars, Mills and Denison (2013) observed and interviewed a group of high performance endurance coaches. One coach in particular expressed "athletes may have their own opinions, but I'm in charge. They might voice their opinion because they want to take some ownership over their training and racing but, well, it is me who knows best" (p. 144). As evident through this quote, when athletes are positioned as marginalized recipients of knowledge they often have fewer chances to express their ideas and/or share their knowledge, which renders athlete-generated information to be less valuable and creditable (Cassidy et al., 2004; Potrac & Cassidy, 2006). Trivializing an athlete's knowledge can reduce his/her opportunities to learn, stifle creativity and has the

potential to encourage coach-dependency. Importantly, in competitions it is ultimately the athletes who need to perform, make decisions and adapt in accordance with the ambiguous, unpredictable demands of sport. Therefore, to be successful, athletes' need to be creative, aware of their bodies' and able to act and think independently (Denison & Mills, 2014).

In addition to unintentionally limiting athlete development, positioning the 'coach as the expert' can have constraining effects on the coaches themselves. When positioned as an expert, coaches are pressured to use the 'best' coaching techniques and to always have the 'right' answer. If sport was a predictable environment this might be possible however, sport is dynamic. Nevertheless, it is common for the dynamic nature of sport to be overlooked and for the 'coach as an expert' mentality to unquestionably be embraced, which can lead coaches to perceive uncertainty as a threat. For instance, when a colleague, athlete, and/or parent questions the coach's decisions, the coach could perceive it as a challenge to his/her authority, expertise, or even identity. Correspondingly, coaches often avoid uncertain and challenging situations in attempt to avoid showing weakness, incompetence, and/or losing the respect of their athletes (Denison, 2010). Avoidance strategies such as these however, can restrict coaches' actions and behaviours while also legitimizing the 'coach as an expert' mentality.

Lending further legitimacy to the 'coach as an expert' mentality, popular coaching dogma creates the illusion that there are 'best practices' in coaching, which are thought to protect coaches from having to deal with uncertainty. However, recognizing that there are numerous contextual ambiguities and complexities inherent within coaching, these 'best practices' will inevitably fall short. The insufficiency associated with 'best practices' occurs as

knowledge is socially-constructed, which renders the multiple truth claims made in relation to

coaching knowledge to be potentially problematic. For instance, despite the infeasibility of

permanent coaching knowledge, the portrayal of 'best practices' can lead coaches to feel as

though there is a single 'best' or 'right' way to think, act and be, which can limit, or narrowly

dictate, the actions available to coaches.

Recognizing the potentially constraining effects associated with 'best practices', Denison

(2010) explained that 'thinking with Foucault' could allow coaches to be relieved from the

burden of having to discover the 'right' way to coach. Freedom can surface from an enhanced

understanding of the interplay between power and knowledge. For instance, when a coach

understands knowledge to be subjective, instead of regarding a pre-determined warm-up as

the indisputable way to prepare athletes, s/he would be in a better position to recognize the

potential unintended consequences associated with enforcing set warm-ups. Such

consequences could arise from athletes being prompted to sequentially move through the

warm-up exercises, with 'textbook' form and in a timely fashion, without awareness of their

own bodily sensations and signals. This example reflects a coaching logic that privileges the

coach as the 'expert' and values 'objective' scientific knowledge, while downplaying the

importance of athletes learning to listen to their own bodies. Alternatively, when 'thinking with

Foucault', a coach could problematize his/her role, and be critical of the knowledge s/he draws

upon. Accordingly, a Foucauldian-informed coach may choose to embrace a more fluid warm-

up protocol that encourages athletes to listen to their bodies. This might involve having each

athlete determine his/her own warm-up exercises depending on the athlete's individual

mental, physical and social needs that day. Thus, understanding knowledge as subjective, and

power as relational can open-up space for coaches to experiment and adapt their practices. As such, the ability to coach with a Foucauldian understanding has the potential to enhance a coach's effectiveness and improve athlete development (Denison, Mills, & Jones, 2013). To further illustrate how questioning 'commonsense' coaching logics can reveal new opportunities for coaches, in what follows I will critically explore the coaching logic that views the 'body as a machine'.

The Body as a Machine

Sport science knowledge has been "formed, produced, disseminated and defended" (Denison and Avner, 2011, p. 211) as the 'natural' and 'right' way to develop sporting excellence. This 'status' associated with sport science knowledge leads coaches to believe that they can systematically, and unproblematically, breakdown movements, monitor performance and design training in linear, progressive ways. This fragmented, reductionist view, contributes to the widely accepted understanding that the body operates like a machine. The media further reinforces this mechanistic view by readily deploying, and in turn normalizing, body-machine analogies. Examples of these analogies include exclamations such as "look at the wheels on him" or "she's got one big engine". When the body is viewed as a machine, it can negate the existence of other important aspects of performance, such as communication, athlete ownership and learning and as such can become problematic.

One common coaching practice that has the potential to problematically reinforce the 'body as a machine' coaching logic includes the uncritical use of training plans. Training plans have been established as a 'best practice' in coaching and are seen to provide a blueprint for

achieving athletic success. Training 'blueprints' enable coaches to prescribe training

progressions, which are thought to effectively account for and utilize an athlete's effort and

energy (Denison et al., 2013). Accordingly, training plans contribute to the perception that

athletes are resources to be developed and/or objects that can be analyzed and manipulated to

achieve greater sporting productivity. In turn, sport becomes seen as a factory for producing

highly efficient, functional and mechanical performances (Denison & Avner, 2011).

Adopting some of these perceptions themselves, coaches begin to uncritically utilize

practices that minimize disturbances in order to optimize an athlete's 'machine', without

consideration for all that their actions are really doing. Denison and colleagues (2013) however

warned, "a non-contextual or rationalistic understanding of coaching and the body, where

athletes are treated in objective and instrumental ways, can result in athletes experiencing a

number of performance-related problems" (p. 390). Such a performance-related problem could

include athletes learning to analyze their own movements in mechanistic ways, leading to

robotic (not smooth, effortless, nor exquisite) performances. Similarly, athletes could be

prompted to distance themselves from their objectified bodies and to ignore fear and pain,

both of which could increase an athlete's susceptibility to injury. Consequently, an objectified

view of the body does not only have the potential to negatively influence performance, but it

can detrimentally impact athletes' short and long-term health (Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010).

Another potential consequence associated with viewing the 'body as a machine'

includes the potential to elicit docility. Pringle (2007) described docile athletes as being

productive, obedient and operating with machine-like efficiency. Denison and Mills (2014)

elaborated, warning that even if a docile athlete appears productive, s/he could very well be underperforming. Sub-optimal performance may occur when an athlete becomes docile to the state of mindlessness, reducing him/her to passively absorbing information and executing instructions within the prescribed parameters. Accordingly, a docile athlete often has fewer opportunities to actively learn and can become overly compliant. When an athlete is overly compliant and/or lacks the ability to make decisions, s/he will likely be unable to adapt in dynamic sport situations (Denison, 2007).

While many athletes eagerly accept and adhere to their coach's instructions, which is not inherently problematic, blind, prompt obedience may hinder, or constrain, an athlete's ability to reach his/her optimal performance potential and may decrease his/her enjoyment of sport. These constraining effects were exemplified in an ethnographic study conducted at an elite gymnastics club by Barker-Ruchti and Tinning (2010). The adolescent athletes in this study became very skillful, however the conditions and coaching strategies utilized in this particular context negatively influenced the athletes sporting experiences. These negatives effects were evident by the outward expressions of frustration and low levels of confidence amongst the athletes. Barker-Ruchti and Tinning partially attributed these effects to the lack of influence the athletes had, and their limited opportunities to exercise power. Nevertheless, Foucault explained that even when a body has been rendered docile, evident by having active, productive bodies but lacking opportunities to make decisions, s/he can still exercise power in the form of resistance. Resistance may include athletes refusing to meet training expectations, making gestures behind the coach's back and/or breaking team rules (Shogan, 1999). Barker-Ruchti and Tinning's concluded their study by explaining that at the end of the season, when

the athletes had a larger margin to make decisions and exercise resistance, the majority of the athletes decided to quit gymnastics.

Although coaching practices that embrace a mechanistic view have the potential to reduce athletes' decision making power and elicit docility, these practices continue to be uncritically utilized in sport. Consequently, the view of the 'body as a machine' perpetuates and reinforces the idea that performance can be perfect and automated, despite perfection being an unattainable ideal (Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010). Even so, coaching practices that objectify the body are often seen as the 'only' way to develop 'winning' athletes. It is important to recognize however, that 'winning' reflects a very narrow understanding of performance, as 'winning' is only relative to one's competitors and the sporting conditions on a given day. As such, 'winning' does not necessarily represent an athlete's optimal performance nor correlate with reaching one's full performance potential (Denison et al., 2015a).

Foucault's work, on the other hand, could encourage a broader understanding of athletic success through enabling coaches to problematize their role, critically assess their practices, and by encouraging the emergence of multiple knowledges. For instance, broadening 'success' beyond winning could include praising athlete learning, celebrating a 'plateau' as a new level of stable performance, or even applauding improved rest and self-care practices (Denison & Avner, 2011). Accordingly, Foucault's concepts can allow coaches to develop innovative strategies that positively support athlete development beyond just 'winning'. While 'thinking with Foucault' offers many optimistic possibilities, coaches will likely have to

overcome a few challenges in order to utilize Foucault's concepts. As such, in what follows I will explain some of these challenges in more detail.

Challenges Associated with Change

When it comes to coaches learning how to question taken-for-granted coaching logics, coaches may struggle to initially see value in learning to 'think with Foucault', accessing Foucauldian-informed content, applying such content, and understanding Foucault's work in the context of our modernist-driven society. Modernism refers to a broad, overarching organizational framework that provides a series of assumptions about our society. With a functionalist focus, modernism regulates and guides our thoughts, actions and feelings. Max Weber attributed the emergence of modernism to the religious and economic conditions in the 17th century, which led to greater societal emphasis on calculated, rationalized progress towards goal achievement. This focus on growth and progression coupled with industrialization bolstered the importance our society places on compliance, efficiency and productivity (Richie, 2015).

While some western societal contexts may have shifted beyond the underlying assumptions of modernism, it seems that within sport (including coaching and coach education), modernism has prevailed as the dominant guiding logic (Denison et al., 2013). For instance, typical coaching resources are constructed to speak to our modernist mindset, which further drives our desire for certainty and reinforcing our perceived need to be 'right'. This is apparent through the abundance of sport science-informed resources (such as the LTAD), which portray the idea that it is possible to completely plan, predict and control sport performances.

However, recognizing the infeasibility of this, an ingrained modernist mindset can limit the actions available to coaches, making modernism a prevalent challenge that coaches must address in order to truly 'think with Foucault'.

In addition to the friction points with modernism, embracing Foucauldian-informed thinking may involve coaches challenging some of their personal long-held beliefs, including the coaching logics they rely on and the practices they employ. This difficulty was revealed when Foucauldian coach developers including Denison and his colleagues (2015a) attempted to teach coaches how to 'think with Foucault'. When first asked to reconsider their practices, the coaches initially showed resistance by rejecting the ideas presented, becoming anxious, nervous and even defensive. Denison (2010) explained that this initial resistance can be expected, seeing as questioning taken-for-granted coaching logics may require coaches "to be critical of past mentors, cherished memories or indeed his or her own sense of self and identity as a coach" (p. 466).

Another challenge associated with learning to 'think with Foucault' relates to the ability to access these concepts. While Foucauldian sport scholars have created a strong case emphasizing that coaches could benefit substantially from an enhanced understanding of Foucault's outlook on the body, power and knowledge, there remains to be marginal representation of these social theories in coaching courses and manuals (Mills & Denison, 2013). The lack of Foucauldian-informed content in coaching resources could be associated with the value our modernist society places on 'evidence' and the difficulties associated with directly measuring the impact of social theory. These measurement difficulties relate to the

"premise that things—objects, people, events, in the world—do not have in themselves any fixed, final or true meaning" (Hall, 1997, p. 61). Instead, with a poststructuralist outlook, meanings are understood to be dynamic, continually evolving, and produced within specific historic and cultural contexts.

Even though 'thinking with Foucault' may be difficult to measure, it does not mean that it lacks value or that change is not occurring. In one example, Foucauldian sport scholar Tania Cassidy challenged and supported a varsity rugby coach, Paul, to integrate Foucault's concepts into his own coaching practices. Following this intervention, Paul explained that he was not able to directly identify tangible outcomes associated with learning to 'think with Foucault', but he noticed the concepts had a gradual influence on his coaching. He remarked, "what I did as a coach ten years ago, I would do a lot differently now and that is further influenced by my awareness of [Foucault's concepts including the] disciplinary technologies and their many taken-for-granted effects on athletes' bodies" (Denison et al., 2015b, p. 75).

Another challenge associated with coaches integrating Foucault's theories into their own coaching practices includes the perception that these concepts are too abstract to be applicable. In an effort to counter this, Foucauldian sport scholars have published work that showcases practical Foucauldian-informed coaching practices. In one example, Denison and Mills (2014) used Foucault's concepts to problematize the use of training spaces. This problematization revealed that repetitively using the same training space can become monotonous and may encourage athletes to become mindlessness, ignore their bodies' and/or may even elicit docility. These outcomes can arise when coaches repeatedly use the same

training space, as a means to ensure efficiency. In turn, control, predictability and productivity are promoted, valued and privileged over other performance factors such as athlete learning, interaction and innovation. In an effort to re-emphasis athlete learning, Denison and Mills (2014) suggested one potential Foucauldian-informed strategy would be to design cross-country running workouts that use "no specific distances at all. Instead, an athlete could run at a particular intensity until he or she became exhausted, or his or her concentration lapsed or his or her form deteriorated" (p. 5). The Foucauldian-informed workout, described here, was developed intentionally, after thorough context-specific problematization, to decrease the potentially problematic consequences (such as mindlessness) associated with the repeated use of coach controlled training spaces. In its place, athletes could be encouraged to monitor their own form and intensity, which has the potential to enhance athlete engagement, decision making and encourages athletes' to be aware of their own bodies'. This is but one example that showcases the practical application of Foucault's concepts within coaching.

Pirkko Markula is another Foucauldian movement scholar who has illustrated the practical use of Foucault's concepts within a fitness context. In an ethnographic study as a Pilates instructor, Markula (2011) drew on Foucault's work to problematize her role as an 'expert' in the context of an adult recreational fitness class. Through problematization she was able to recognize the potential of her role to be problematic. Accordingly, she developed innovative, Foucauldian-informed instructional strategies. One such strategy involved reducing the number of exercise demonstrations she gave, as she found that demonstrations prompted her participants to mindlessly mimic or imitate the Pilates movements, and reinforced her position as the 'expert'. Alternatively, in the class Markula would use verbal instructions to

encourage the participants to listen, feel, and know their own bodies and to illustrate that the participants are the true 'experts' of their own bodies. Furthermore, Markula problematized how her class reinforced the unquestioned use of exercise as a means to achieve "a better looking, illness-free body" (2011, p. 72). In an attempt to counter this, Markula designed her Pilates class to encourage her participants to think about their individual movement needs, the opportunities they have move differently in everyday life, their distinct physical strengths and limitations, as well as to encourage exercise to be viewed as an exploration of the participants' own movement preferences.

All in all, it is important to acknowledge that there are a number of prospective challenges associated with coaches valuing, accessing and utilizing Foucauldian-informed thinking. Nevertheless, there is strong rationale for coaches to learn how to 'think with Foucault', as this type of thinking has been credited with the potential to enhance coaches' effectiveness and advance the field of coaching (Barker-Ruchti & Tinning 2010; Denison, 2010; Pringle, 2007; Shogan, 1999). As such, through my research I will attempt to account for these challenges while facilitating coaches in learning to 'think with Foucault'. To do this effectively, I will need to ensure that the learning approach and strategies I use reflect the assumptions that underpin Foucault's work, which is informed by a poststructuralist outlook. Accordingly, in the next section I will review the work of a few well-respected sport scholars who encourage the integration of a poststructuralist outlook within coach education and development.

Poststructuralism in Coach Education

Foucault's ideas have been credited with the potential to expand the boundaries of education when used to "develop a pedagogical strategy that aims to distribute knowledge in a critical and ethical manner" (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 199), yet there is minimal information in the literature concerning practical strategies for implementing Foucauldian-informed pedagogical strategies to facilitate coach learning. Despite this deficiency, it is widely acknowledged that in order to truly utilize Foucault's work, one must adopt poststructuralist assumptions. However, adopting poststructuralist assumptions may require an altered understanding of how knowledge is formed, how power operates and even how reality is understood. Within the literature there are only a few coach-learning scholars who have drawn upon poststructuralist assumptions, and even fewer who have used Foucault's ideas to design coaching courses. Nevertheless, in what follows I will briefly describe the coach education literature that reflects a poststructuralist understanding of power, knowledge and reality.

Although Cushion is not strictly a poststructuralist, he understands coaching to be a social practice. Accordingly, he emphasised that the content taught in coaching courses should not be separated from wider discursive practices. This recommendation reflects the poststructuralist understanding that knowledge is constructed and context-dependent, where it "serves particular interests and carries certain values" (Cushion, Armour, & Jones, 2003, p. 220). Viewing learning as an active, social process that is facilitated through the social-construction of knowledge, Potrac and Cassidy (2006) suggested that learning environments be structured in a manner that promotes collaboration, encourages creative thought and allows for experimentation. Supportively, Cushion (2011) explained that coaching courses that

incorporate interactions, observations, negotiations and reflections are more likely to elicit learning. Jones (2006) credited reflection with the ability to increase coaches' consciousness of the previously unconsidered, for bringing awareness to the impact of their actions, and for encouraging coaches to think differently about their practices. While these recommendations from coach education scholars will inform the development of my coaching workshop, it is also valuable to gain insights from coaches themselves.

Fittingly, Piggott (2012) interviewed coaches to elicit their opinions on typical coach education courses. These interviews revealed that coaches perceived courses to be more valuable when genuine, open discussions, experimentation and questions were encouraged. Taking coaches' preferences into account, Jacobs, Claringbould, and Knoppers (2016) developed and implemented a poststructuralist-informed coaching course. During the design phase, these scholars had the attendees express what they wanted to learn. Choosing to design the course with the attendees' input challenged the traditional use of a set, predetermined curriculums. When it came to implementing the course, instead of disseminating 'best practices', this poststructuralist-informed course utilized learning facilitators who assisted the coaches in learning from their own experiences, developing critical thinking skills and creating their own problem-solving approaches. With these recommendations and preferences in mind, in what follows I will explain how I will use a poststructuralist understanding of knowledge, power, and reality to help coaches learn how to 'think with Foucault'.

My Research

As illustrated through this literature review, learning to 'think with Foucault' offers many optimistic possibilities, however, it also entails overcoming a number of challenges. As such, coaches cannot be expected to confront all of these challenges, in addition to 'deriving' and 'decoding' Foucault's concepts on their own. Instead, Denison et al., (2015b) suggested that a collaborative approach, where coach developers play an integral role in assisting coaches in connecting Foucault's concepts to their own practices, could be a viable avenue to explore. Accordingly, through my research I will design and implement a Foucauldian-informed coaching workshop that is intended to introduce and support youth sport coaches in learning to 'think with Foucault'.

My decision to focus on youth sport is informed by the position statement released by the American Alliance of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD), which identifies sport as a highly motivating and engaging context for youth (AAHPERD, 2013). The positive youth development literature emphasizes that the sporting experiences of youth athletes strongly influence the long-term benefits they will receive from participating (Miles, 2011; Turnnidge, Evans, Vierimaa, Allan, & Côté, 2015). While sport has been associated with many positive benefits, a substantial amount of "evidence also points to the poor psychosocial experiences and high attrition rates within youth sport" (Harwood & Johnston, 2016, p. 119), where as many as 70% of youth sport participants dropout during their adolescent years. Looking to improve these statistics, Turnnidge et al., (2015) explained, "coaches represent one of the most powerful sources of influence. Coaches wield the potential to elicit both positive and negative effects on youth's development" (p. 139). Recognizing the importance of youth

sport, my workshop will be directed towards facilitating youth sport coaches in critically analyzing their daily training environments, which are typically guided by 'coach as an expert' and 'body as a machine' coaching logics.

As shown through this literature review, training environments that are guided by 'coach as an expert' and 'body as a machine' logics, have the potential to render athletes passive, mindless and disengaged. In an attempt to counter this, my workshop will focus on enabling coaches in creating daily training environments that embrace athletes as engaged, active, creative and independent decision makers, which could positively impact their performance. With this goal in mind, my workshop, which was titled 'Designing Training Environments to Enhance Athlete Engagement', introduced coaches to the Foucauldian-informed skill of problematization. Problematization involves questioning that which appears 'true', not to simply label it as 'good', 'bad' or 'oppressive', but instead to assess how power is exercised to elevate some knowledges, and disregard others (Denison & Scott-Thomas, 2011). Accordingly, coaches who learn to problematize are better able to critically question the knowledges and logics they rely on, which includes understanding why certain practices are utilized over others, how these practices have achieved 'superior' status, and what as a result occurs.

Foucault advocated that it is possible to effectively initiate problematization by raising awareness of marginalized knowledges (Markula & Pringle, 2006). As such, through the learning activities in my workshop I will attempt raise the coach attendees' consciousness of marginalized knowledges by eliciting awareness of alternative narratives of these taken-for-

granted coaching logics. More specifically, these learning activities are intended to counter the commonly unquestioned coaching logics that position the 'coach as an expert' and promote the view of the 'body as a machine'. In addition to problematizing these coaching logics, the coach attendees will have opportunities to connect these logics to their own coaching practices, and will be encouraged to problematize their own training environments.

Overall, introducing and supporting coaches in developing the ability to problematize their everyday training environments with a focus on facilitating athlete engagement, has the potential to improve coaches' effectiveness. This occurs as 'thinking with Foucault' allows coaches to be in a more informed position to make decisions, enables them to move beyond long-held, entrenched coaching practices, and removes the pressure of always needing to be 'right' (Denison & Mills, 2014). With these positive opportunities in mind, in the next chapter I will describe my coaching workshop in more detail and will explain the other methodological considerations that have guided my research project.

Chapter 3: Methodology

After reviewing the literature it is clear that the unintended consequences associated with taken-for-granted coaching logics, and their related practices, have been thoroughly mapped and critiqued. Researchers are now advocating for the adoption of Foucauldian-informed coaching practices, which have been credited with the potential to enhance coaches' effectiveness and increase athlete engagement (Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010; Denison 2007). To build upon these critiques and recommendations, I will use a poststructuralist philosophical framework (paradigm) to guide my qualitative research with the intent of eliciting social change. This intended social change is directed towards facilitating coaches in problematizing their taken-for-granted coaching logics and practices, and to elicit further exploration of coaching courses as a potential means for enabling this. Accordingly, to initiate this change I designed and implemented a poststructuralist-informed coaching workshop.

Seeing as poststructuralism was developed in opposition to structuralism's "universally generalizable theories that represent the true 'reality'" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 46), it is not my intent to develop a universal learning approach, nor am I suggesting that my workshop becomes a 'gold standard' for coaching courses. Instead, I designed this workshop to initiate the application of innovative, Foucauldian-informed coaching practices and encourage exploration of alternative approaches to develop coach learning opportunities. Correspondingly, I feel the insights from this workshop will be invaluable for directing further change in these areas.

The purpose of my research is to understand how youth sport coaches experience learning to problematize within a poststructuralist-informed coaching workshop. Instead of looking for singular, testable truths or objective, measurable knowledge, as a positivist paradigm would facilitate, my poststructuralist interests lie in understanding the multiple, possibly contradictory, experiences of the workshop participants'. Accordingly, my research purpose aligns with my paradigm, as poststructuralists understand knowledge to be subjective (epistemology) and recognize the existence of multiple, ever-changing realities (ontology). In addition to these epistemological and ontological assumptions, Foucauldian poststructuralists understand that knowledge, truth and reality are intertwined within relations of power (Markula & Silk, 2011). Through a Foucauldian lens, power is not top-down, one-directional, nor solely oppressive (as viewed by critical researchers); rather power is understood to be relational, omnipresent and context-specific (Denison & Scott-Thomas, 2011). Acknowledging the subjective and power-laden nature of research, in what follows I will explain how utilizing a poststructuralist paradigm and a Foucauldian theoretical perspective have guided my decisions on sampling technique, ethical procedures, methods (including the workshop design) and data analysis.

Sampling

To select the participants for my study I used purposeful criterion-based sampling, as I designed and developed a workshop specifically for youth sport coaches. My "predetermined criteria of importance" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 94) included: 1) coaches who have likely been exposed to the dominant scientific discourse of coaching, evident by their enrollment in, or completion of, a university program related to Kinesiology, sport and/or recreation, 2)

participants who are employed as youth sport coaches over the duration of the workshop and thus have greater opportunities to apply the workshop's content, and 3) coaches who belong to the same sport club or organization in Edmonton, Alberta, which could encourage and facilitate collaboration during and after the workshop.

To recruit participants who met these criteria, I directly contacted the athletic directors from a few well-established sport clubs in Edmonton, Alberta. From my familiarity with the local minor sport scene, I knew that these clubs valued professional development and hired well-educated coaches, and thus would likely meet my sampling criteria. In my initial email to the athletic directors, I introduced myself and gave a brief overview of my research project. I then had a follow-up, face-to-face meeting with the athletic director, who had expressed interest in my research. During this meeting I elaborated further on my research and sought recommendations for identifying and contacting coaches who might be willing and interested in participating in my research project. Correspondingly, I drafted an email that announced the date, time and topics of my workshop, which the athletic director sent out to the coaches he thought would participate. If interested, the coaches responded back to me directly, via email, to ask questions and/or register for the workshop.

As there "is no clear rule in qualitative research regarding the sample size" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 95), I purposefully choose 4-8 participants to create an environment that is similar to typical NCCP courses offered in Canada. Through my recruiting efforts, that spanned over 2.5 weeks, including emails to the athletic director who then followed-up with the coaches, and providing lunch during the workshop sessions, I ended up having four coaches register for the

workshop. The coaches ranged in age from their mid 20's to early 30's. Each of the four participants (pseudonyms have been used) met my sampling criterion as they were all enrolled in a degree program related to Kinesiology, sport and/or recreation, and were currently coaching different sports, but worked for the same youth sport club. More specifically, Dean was completing a doctoral program and also coached in both male and female team sport. Phil and Michael were in masters programs and coached in male and female individual sport, and male team sport respectively. Stephanie was enrolled in a bachelors program and coached in a female team sport context. Having four participants was suitable, as I was aiming to create an environment that encouraged collaboration, sharing and debates. Furthermore, this sample size allowed me to obtain meaningful data that I was able to analyze within the scope of this masters thesis project.

Ethical Proceedings

To ensure an ethical research project, Markula and Silk (2011) advocated adhering "to the following principles: respect for dignity; free and informed consent; [protection of] vulnerable persons; privacy and confidentiality; justice and inclusiveness" (p. 14). In accordance with these principles, throughout my research project I treated all of the participants with dignity and respect. To do this I actively worked to minimize controlling influences. From a poststructuralist perspective this entailed recognizing the effects of power and attempting to minimize the dominating effects of my actions, to lessen any potential unintended consequences. Additionally, each participant was able to voice his/her opinions freely. This was emphasized at the start of my workshop, when I verbally explained the purpose of my research, the benefits and risks of participating, the participants' right to withdraw (at any time during

the workshop or within two weeks following its completion), provided assurance of the participants' privacy, as well as explained the justice and inclusiveness (benefits) of my research. The participants also received a written information sheet that addressed these same points. After having the opportunity to ask questions, each participant provided voluntary written consent.

Seeing as all of the participants were over the age of 18 and free of any "diminished competence to make decisions" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 18), there was no need for extra precautions to protect vulnerable persons. To respect the coaches' privacy, participants were assured of their anonymity and pseudonyms have been used in all research deliverables. Additionally, at the beginning of the workshop I emphasized that the information shared by the participants within the workshop was confidential and should not be discussed outside of the workshop, without consent from the involved parties. To further ensure confidentiality, the empirical material I collected was only accessible to myself and my academic supervisor, Dr. Jim Denison. Additionally, all of the empirical material has been kept in an encrypted database, on a password-protected computer. Any empirical material that contained identifying markers (such as names and/or email addresses) was scrubbed of the identifying markers upon completion the data analysis. The remaining empirical material will stay on the password-protected computer for five years, as per the University of Alberta's data retention guidelines.

The ethical criterion of justice and inclusiveness refers to the benefits of the research project (Markula & Silk, 2011). While I could not ensure that every participant would perceive learning to problematize as beneficial, the literature does suggest that this is a useful skill for

coaches. Moreover, my research provided the coaches with an opportunity to reflect on their practice, share their ideas and opinions, and participate in the social-construction of knowledge. In an attempt to not burden the coaches, I was mindful of the time commitment required of the participants. As such, there were only two workshop sessions that coaches were asked to attend (five hours in total), additionally they were asked to complete four guided reflective journal entries. Participating in this research project posed no foreseeable risk or harm to the coaches, beyond that in which the coaches would encounter within their everyday professional exchanges. Lastly, based on the gap in the literature, between the benefits associated with Foucauldian-informed coaching and the actual utilization of these practices, I am confident that my research can make an honorable contribution to this field of study.

Another way that I ensured my study was ethical was by obtaining approval from the University of Alberta's Research Ethics Board prior to the commencement of my research. Additionally, having completed eight hours of research ethics training and following the research ethics board's guidelines, contributed to the assurance that my research has been carried out in a highly ethical manner from its inception to completion. Overall, by respecting the dignity of the participants, obtaining free and informed consent, actively ensuring privacy and confidentiality, minimizing harm and maximizing the benefits of participating, and obtaining ethical approval, collectively contributed to the meaningfulness and assured ethical conduct throughout this research project (Markula & Silk, 2011).

Workshop Design

With a utility and dissemination research focus, I decided to design and implement a

Foucauldian-informed coaching workshop that was intended to facilitate youth sport coaches in learning to problematize. Despite coach education often being framed as a means for knowledge transfer, it has also been critiqued for lacking research-informed practice. Addressing this, Lyle (2018) explained that the perceived 'theory to practice gap' could be due to a "failure to conduct in situ intervention studies and to accommodate the particularity of context and application" (p. 13). He also termed these 'in situ intervention studies' as 'application-based research', praising their ability to "engage coaches in research, operationalizes research, generate understandings while also 'disseminating' research'" (p. 2). More specifically, application-based research is carried out in 'usual', real-life situations, not under 'ideal' conditions, which accounts for various contextual influences and as a result can enhance our understanding of what might work within a particular context. Recognizing the need and value of 'application-based research' I decided to design and implement a Foucauldian-informed coaching workshop. In what follows I will explain my workshop design in greater detail.

In order to effectively facilitate coaches in learning to 'think with Foucault', the learning approach I utilized within my workshop had to align with poststructuralist assumptions. However, as mentioned in the literature review, there is a lack of research pertaining to the application of poststructuralist-informed learning approaches within coaching courses. Furthermore, Cushion and Nelson (2013) warned against uncritically recycling learning approaches from other domains, instead insisting that approaches specific to coach learning should be developed. This cautionary annotation echo's the poststructuralist rejection of

universalism. Importantly, refusing to adopt learning approaches from other domains does not dismiss the use of theory all together.

Despite the multiple theoretical lenses that could, and have, been used to study coaching courses (such as Usherian and Deweyan), I decided to exclusively use a Foucauldian lens. Foucault's work has been credited with the potential to "challenge existing pedagogies and inform alterative teaching practices" (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 194). Moreover, a Foucauldian lens strongly coincides with my workshop's content. For example, Foucault (1995) explained that "there may be a 'knowledge' of the body that is not exactly the science of its functioning, and a mastery of its forces [and] that is more than the ability to conquer them" (p. 26), which supports the need to critically question the reductionist, science-driven coaching logic that views the 'body as a machine'. Foucault (1995) was also interested "in how power is exercised through strategic positions—an effect that is manifested and sometimes extended by the position of those who are dominated" (p. 27), which speaks to the need to problematize the coaching logic that positions 'the coach as an expert'. Both of these coaching logics were addressed through the learning activities in my workshop.

With a Foucauldian lens, content cannot simply be delivered to passive attendees (which reflects modernist logic); rather learning involves collaboration and requires recognition of various cultural, historic and political influencers. Accordingly, learning can be viewed as a composition of socio-culturally embedded practices that are complex, fluid, context-dependent, and thus require active participation (Jones et al., 2016). The need for collaboration and broader sociocultural awareness reflects the Foucauldian understanding that knowledge is

dynamic, socially constructed and political. Therefore, in order to stimulate learning within my workshop, instead of being a 'coach educator', I needed to be more of a 'learning facilitator' who guided discussions and led the learning activities. Additionally, as a learning facilitator I encouraged the participants to engage with the social, cultural and historic aspects of meaning making, as they related to becoming a coach who can problematize.

To engage the coach learners as active participants in their own learning, I tried to gradually increase their participation and comfort by using a structural scaffolding approach when sequencing my learning activities. Accordingly, I started with low risk learning activities where the participants' responses remained anonymous, progressed to individual activities, then pair sharing, and gradually built up to large group discussions. Supporting this decision, Lange, Costley and Han (2016), explained that participants generally perceive higher levels of learning and satisfaction within scaffolding structured environments, as they allow for active involvement in the learning process.

Although the coach attendees and myself actively participated in, and influenced the meaning making process, each person's impact varied due to the workings of power. Foucault (1979) explained that "power is exercised rather than possessed; it is not the 'privilege', acquired or preserved, of the dominant class, but the overall effect of its strategic positions" (p. 26), making power omnipresent, relational, constantly-change and context-specific (Denison & Scott-Thomas, 2011). Bringing this Foucauldian understanding to the coach-learning environment, the coach attendees were never without power nor did I as the learning facilitator 'hold' all of the power. Even so, since power is rarely equal, and seeing as I was in the

strategic position of researcher, workshop developer and learning facilitator, I had to act in a manner that minimized the dominating effects of my actions and also encouraged the participants to exercise power in an ethical way. Power can be described as the actions of one person helping to guide the conduct and/or actions of another, therefore the ethical use of power entails doing so in a positive and productive way that allows multiple truths to be voiced (Markula & Martin, 2007; Markula & Pringle, 2006).

Although I made a few modifications, to reflect Foucault's theories on power and knowledge, I designed my workshop to more or less resemble typical coaching courses, as a means to explore the potential of formal coach education settings for introducing Foucaudian-informed coaching information. For instance, while I kept the overall length of the workshop to five hours, which is similar to typical NCCP courses, instead of the workshop taking place all in one day or over a single weekend, my workshop was split into two, 2.5-hour sessions that were separated by one week. The 'break' between the workshop sessions provided the coaches with the opportunity to recognize and relate the concepts, introduced in the first workshop session, to their own coaching practices. During the week 'break' the coaches wrote about their experiences in their guided reflective journals. The journal entries subsequently informed the content and learning activities of the second workshop session, allowing the session to be relevant, meaningful and context-specific. Splitting the workshop into two sessions, also allowed the second session to provide follow-up support, which Guskey (2002) highlighted as an important aspect for high quality continued professional development workshops. All in all, these decisions concerning the workshop's design and delivery have been prompted by some of the common criticisms associated with typical coach education courses. Such criticisms include

the commonly unquestioned reliance on a set, pre-determined curriculum, the delivery of non-contextual, impractical content, and the use of isolated, one-off sessions which lack follow-up support (Cushion, 2011; Piggott, 2012).

Learning Activities

The learning activities utilized in my workshop were driven by my workshop's purpose, to enable coaches to problematize their daily training environments in order to facilitate athlete engagement. Markula and Pringle (2006) explained "problematisation relates to the ability to recognize how all knowledge has been discursively constructed in different contexts, over time, via power struggles and, most importantly, that one does not have to accept such knowledges as an unimpeachable truth" (p. 201). To initiate problematization, Foucault suggested evoking alternative views and raising awareness of knowledges that are often obscured (Markula & Pringle, 2006). Accordingly, the learning activities in my workshop have been designed to raise the coach attendees' consciousness and prompt exploration of alternative views to the uncritically accepted 'body as a machine' and 'coach as an expert' coaching logics.

Accordingly, I first introduced the 'body as a machine' coaching logic with a word cloud activity, where the participants' responses remained anonymous. The word cloud was chosen to create a safe environment, gradually encourage participation, increase comfort between participants, and establish a collaborative learning environment. To illustrate the unquestioned acceptance of body-machine comparisons, the next activity had the coaches race to recall body-machine metaphors, which allowed the participants to work independently at first, but

also provided them with the opportunity to share their results, if they were comfortable doing so. This activity was informed by Pringle (2009) who explained, critically exploring literary devices, such as metaphors, encourages us to de-familiarize our everyday language and "grapple with language in more strenuous, self-conscious ways" (p. 225).

Creating space for the coaches to question the 'trueness' of that which appears 'natural', I introduced coaches to the understanding that knowledge is subjective (not objective) by reading aloud a section of Mills and Denison's (2016) blog post. Introducing coaches to the Foucauldian understanding of knowledge is important as it can allow coaches to see the relevance and usefulness of drawing upon multiple knowledges, thus prompting the coaches to engage in problematization. Connecting this subjective view of knowledge to the 'body as a machine' coaching logic, the coaches read a modified story from Denison's (2010) article, which explored the journey of two Kenya runners who became framed as "engines on skis". This story had been purposefully selected to highlight the insufficiency of the 'body as a machine' mentality and it also illustrated some of the unintended effects that this mentality can have.

To emphasize the need for a Foucauldian understanding of knowledge, video clips were shown that exemplified and reinforced the view of the 'body as a machine'. After watching, the coaches worked in pairs to identify alternative knowledges that had been left out, forgotten, and/or marginalized. While problematization involves raising awareness of taken-for-granted practices and recognizing which knowledges have been marginalized, it also includes acknowledging the unintended effects associated with employing taken-for-granted coaching

logics. Therefore, a group-brainstorming session was used to explore potential, harmful and/or

unintended consequences that can be associated with coaching practices that promote or

reinforce a 'body as a machine' mentality.

 After a ten-minute break, I continued to emphasis the need to critically question (or

problematize) taken-for granted practices and coaching logics, by introducing the potentially

problematic effects associated with positioning the 'coach as an expert'. This coaching logic was

selected as it exemplifies the Foucaudian understanding of power. To further explore this topic,

video clips that depicted coaches exercising varying degrees of control and expertise were

shown. Jolly and Lyle (2016) have credited movies with providing "coaches an opportunity to

self-reflect" (p. 42) by prompting coaches to compare and contrast their own perceptions with

those illustrated through the video. Similarly, Hills and Kennedy (2013) suggested that the way

in which coaches are depicted in film "could form part of a coach training programme serving as

a catalyst for discussion or a basis for reflexivity" (p. 50). Thus, the video clips used in this

workshop were intended to initiate critical questioning through prompting self-reflection of the

often taken-for-granted position of the 'coach as an expert'. I felt it was important to have

these initial learning activities depict 'other' coaches, as a means to create a safer, less

threatening, and more supportive learning environment, than if the coaches were immediately

asked to be critical of their own practices, logics and behaviors.

 Similarly, in another learning activity, the coaches read a section of Barker-Ruchti and

Tinning's 2010 paper, which illustrated some the potential consequences that can result when a

coach uncritically accepts the position of an 'expert'. Additionally, this excerpt was selected as it

subtly introduced the idea that athlete docility can unconsciously be promoted through the uncritical employment of practices that reinforce a coach's position as the 'expert'. Accordingly, the aim of this article-stimulated discussion was to evoke awareness and debate concerning the need for athletes to be engaged physically and mentally in sport, challenging the view of athletes as passive, marginalized, docile beings. This learning activity also initiated problematization, as coaches were asked to identify the dominant knowledges portrayed in the story, consider possible effects of the guiding coaching logic, and explore alterative knowledges that could have informed the training environment.

Another learning activity, that was intended to support and facilitate the coaches in connecting the workshop's content to their own practices, included having the coaches complete a modified version of 'The Formation of Coaches' Practices'' worksheet. This worksheet, developed by Jones et al. (2016), guided the coaches in questioning their own taken-for-granted practices. Doing so increased the coaches' awareness of the unintended effects associated with their actions. Using the worksheet, the coaches worked individually to identify a coaching practice that they readily used. From there the coaches identified the positive, productive effects and the potential limitations, or unintended consequences that can arise when uncritically utilizing the identified practice. After working individually, the coaches had the opportunity to share their sport-specific practice with the group, where the coaches (who were from other sports) asked questions to gain a greater understanding of the practice and its associated effects.

Continuing to meaningfully connect the Foucaudian understanding of power and knowledge to the coaches' own practices, the coaches completed online, guided reflective journal entries after the first workshop session and during the break between the sessions (see appendix A for guiding questions and thought prompts). The participants' reflective journals subsequently guided the topics and learning activities of the second workshop session. For example, the experiences and interests shared in the journals informed my decision on which of the practical Foucauldian-informed coaching practices, described in Mills and Denison's (2016) blog post series and Denison and Mills' 2014 article, were presented in the second session. These examples were used to illustrate to the coaches how to problematize and utilize Foucault's concepts to develop innovative coaching practices. Having the participants' reflective journals guide my selection concerning which examples to include, allowed the examples to be more relevant and meaningful to the coaches.

In another learning activity the coaches were supported in creating Foucauldian-informed practices. To initiate this, participants were shown video clips, depicting other coaches, and then worked in small groups to identify potentially problematic, taken-for-granted coaching practices from the videos. Subsequently, the coaches were challenged to develop innovative Foucauldian-informed coaching practices that would overcome the consequences identified in the video clips. The coaches were asked to design their innovative practices with the aim of engaging their athletes as creative, independent decision-makers. Connecting the skill of problematization to coaches own training environment, we returned to the 'Formation of Coaches' Practices'' worksheet, where the coaches were prompted to develop potential innovative practices for the sport specific practice they had previously identified.

To further facilitate coaches in developing alternative coaching practices and to highlight the need to continually problematize, the coaches deconstructed one of the innovative practices they previously developed in the workshop. Deconstruction involves exploring how even well thought-out coaching practices can become constraining, as continually using the same practices allows it to become routinized and normalized, which can prompt the athletes and coaches to become disengaged. Therefore, although the coaching practice may have been well thought-out, when a practice becomes 'normalized' coaches can become 'blind' to its unintended and undermining consequences. Additionally, contextual factors are always changing, thus the effectiveness of a given drill, as well as the associated consequences, are fluid. As such, to raise coaches' consciousness of need to continually problematize, the coach attendees were encouraged to develop another Foucauldian-informed coaching practice aimed at minimizing the potentially constraining effect of the previously developed practice or drill. This learning activity, which encouraged continual problematization, was based on the idea that nothing is inherently 'bad', however, everything has 'other' effects.

Before the second workshop session finished, I led a discussion around some of the challenges associated with adopting Foucauldian-informed coaching practices. As a group we discussed potential strategies for overcoming these challenges. Looking beyond the course, the coaches were encouraged to apply their newly developed Foucauldian-informed coaching practices in their own training environment and to write about their experiences' in their reflective journals. Since the coaches all worked for the same sport club, they were encouraged to use each other for support, as they continued developing and applying innovative, Foucauldian-informed coaching practices. Additionally, I invited the coaches to contact me as

another means of support. The coaches were also provided with a list of articles, as resources to support them in continuing to develop their ability to 'think with Foucault'. Upon completion of the last workshop session, the coaches were asked to complete two more guided reflective journal entries.

Prior to finalizing these learning activities, I had received guidance and feedback from a number of valuable sources. Specifically, Foucauldian coach developer, Dr. Jim Denison, provided feedback on the workshop's content and the progression of the topics. After making the necessary changes, I held a pilot workshop with two graduate students, who were also actively coaching in youth sport contexts. These graduate students provided rich insights that encouraged me to ensure the content and learning activities would be meaningful and relevant to the coach participants. Next, Dr. Doug Gleddie, who instructs pre-service courses for elementary physical educators, provided feedback concerning the sequencing and pedagogy behind the activities, which ensured each of the learning activities were properly justified. Lastly, the sport club's athletic director provided insights into the length and overarching structure of the workshop, based on his experience arranging professional development for his coaching staff. He also provided a space, within the facilities of the sports club, in which the workshop was held. The assistance and feedback from these parties, coupled with the literature supporting the workshop's content and learning activities, helped to ensure that my workshop was well designed. In the next section I will explain the methods that were used to generate empirical material.

Methods

To better understand the experiences of the participants who took part in my Foucauldian-informed coaching workshop, I used a multi-method qualitative design. The two methods I selected included participant guided reflective journals and field notes. Utilizing these two field methods allowed me to collect multiple perspectives and honored the existence of subjective knowledges, truths, and realities.

Participant journals, as a qualitative method, have been credited with the potential to generate rich data, are recognized for their ability to illuminate various aspects of social life, and can enhance participants' understanding of their own learning (Tuckett & Stewart, 2004). To generate meaningful data within the journals, the learning activities utilized within my workshop had been purposefully chosen to stimulate these reflections. On top of this, guiding questions and thought prompts were also provided to the participants (see appendix A). To further facilitate the participants' reflections, time was set-aside during each workshop session for the coaches to write their journal entries, which were completed and submitted to me through a secure, online dashboard. Additionally, the coaches were asked to submit one entry within five days of the first workshop session and a final entry within seven days of the last workshop session.

Despite taking these facilitative measures, Michael dropped out after the first workshop session, not completing any of the reflective journal entries. Although Stephanie attended both workshop sessions, she did not complete the third or fourth journal entry, despite my frequent reminders urging her to do so. Nevertheless, reflective journals were fitting for my project as

they can "enable students to reflect on their own learning, dissect their own thoughts, [and even] argue with themselves" (Wallin, Adawi, & Gold, 2016, p. 2). Moreover, reflective journals are deemed to be appropriate for issues concerning sensitive or potentially threatening topics, such as challenging the knowledges and coaching logics one faithfully, but often uncritically, relies on. Importantly, these strengths align with the aims of my coaching workshop and with my poststructuralist paradigm.

Since I was working within a poststructuralist paradigm, I recognized that I influenced and participated in the workshop, thus I actively contributed to the empirical material collected as part of this research project. More specifically, I wrote field notes during the breaks in the workshop and immediately after each workshop session. My field notes focused on the verbal exchanges and emotional expressions that I observed within the workshop, my own thoughts, actions and feelings, as well as any initial connections I recognized between Foucault's theories and the happenings within the workshop. In the next section I will explain how I analyzed the empirical material I collected through the use of these field methods.

Analysis

Within qualitative research, it is recognized that the researcher plays an integral role within the research process and thus must be self-reflexive. Self-reflexivity has to do with "how much of the self to let in and leave out" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 76). As a poststructuralist, I acknowledge that I will influence the entire research process and reject the positivist notion that it is possible to be 'objective'. Recognizing that the research process is power-laden means I as the researcher, workshop developer and learning facilitator was exercising power as I

guided the focus, delivery and proceedings of the workshop, as well as when I analyze, interpret and represent the empirical material. On top of this, the research participants have shaped the happenings of the workshop. Therefore, through my analysis process I have attempted to represent the multiple, subjective 'truths' that have formed the reality of the workshop and also acknowledge the various sociocultural, contextual and political factors that have influenced meaning making.

Accordingly, to analyze my empirical material, I used a poststructuralist theory-based analysis, as it places a strong "emphasis on understanding individual meaning making within a social, political, historic and economic context" (Markula & Silk, 2011 p. 108). Since I have been using a Foucauldian theoretical perspective throughout this research project, I will continue to use this lens as I analyze and make sense of the empirical material that I have collected. Taylor (2014) explained that poststructuralist analysis involves going back and forth between the empirical material and theory, which enables the researcher to expose the complexities, conflicts and contradictions that form reality. Although my Foucauldian poststructuralist theory-based analysis was not a strictly linear process, I will describe the steps that were involved.

Correspondingly, I first reviewed Foucault's work concerning power and knowledge, which helped to ensure the analysis process had a strong and clearly articulated theoretical basis. Once I felt very comfortable with these theoretical concepts, in the second step I familiarized myself with the participants' journal responses and my own field notes, before individually fitting them to the Foucauldian concepts. The third step involved comparing each of

the participants' journal responses (intra and interpersonally) and cross-referencing them with

my field notes to identified intersections and discrepancies. Doing so allowed me to

acknowledge and honor the participants' individual differences, which influenced meaning

making, and also allowed me to acknowledge my own subjective interpretation and influence

on the research process. The fourth step involved identifying themes that aligned with, and

thus answered, my research question. Lastly, I connected these themes to previous coaching

literature and contextualized them within the current social and political coaching context.

To ensure the quality of my research, I have used theoretical rigor and a

poststructuralist perspective (Markula & Silk, 2011). Additionally, I have continually revisited

Foucault's work to ensure my research decisions and interpretations aligned with, and

accurately reflected Foucault's theories. These steps have helped to ensure my research project

is both meaningful and of high quality. All in all, this analysis process has enabled me to

represent the multiple, individual experiences' of the participants in my workshop, understand

and/or explain them in relation to Foucault's theories, and contextualize them within the

broader Canadian sport context. Correspondingly, I will share and elaborate on the findings of

my analysis in the next chapter.

Chapter 4: Analysis and Discussion

With my research purpose in mind, which was to understand how youth sport coaches experienced learning to problematize within a poststructuralist-informed coaching workshop, I adopted a Foucauldian lens to rigorously familiarize myself with the participants' journal responses and analyze my own field notes. Through this process the two main themes I identified were: 1) implementing a Foucauldian-informed coaching workshop, and 2) engaging in problematization. In this chapter I will breakdown these main themes into sub-themes and elaborate on them by sharing the perspectives of the workshop participants and reflecting on my field notes. Importantly, through this research project I made no attempt to evaluate the impact of the workshop on the coaches' effectiveness or on their athletes' performances. Rather, the purpose of this research was to understand the differing perspectives of the participants, which shaped the fragmented reality of this workshop. As such, I will discuss these perspectives in light of Foucault's theories on power and knowledge, connect them to existing coaching literature, and contextualize them within the current Canadian coaching context. Prior to elaborating on these themes, I will provide a brief overview of my workshop as a means to situate the subsequent analysis and discussion.

My Foucauldian-informed workshop, titled 'Designing Training Environments to Enhance Athlete Engagement', consisted of two, 2.5-hour sessions that were separated by a one-week break. Through a variety of learning activities, including videos, worksheets, articles and group discussions, the participants were challenged to think critically about the taken-for-granted coaching logics which view the athletic 'body as a machine' and position the 'coach as an expert'. These coaching logics were used to introduce the participants to the Foucauldian view

of knowledge being subjective and power being relational. After exposing the coaches to a Foucauldian view of power and knowledge, which challenges the dominant understanding of knowledge being 'objective' or singly 'right' and power being top-down or solely oppressive, the coaches were supported in problematizing their daily training environments. As a means to support learning and to generate empirical material, the coaches were asked to complete four guided reflective journal entries over the duration of the workshop. The participants were aware that I would be reading their journal entries and varied between writing directly to me as the reader and writing in a more descriptive format for an outside reader who was not present in the workshop. In what follows I will use pseudonyms, when I share and elaborate on the participants' journal entries, as I discuss the themes: 1) implementing a Foucauldian-informed coaching workshop, and 2) engaging in problematization.

Implementing a Foucauldian-Informed Coaching Workshop

My decision to design a Foucauldian-informed workshop was inspired by the criticisms associated with typical, modernist-driven coaching courses, including the accusation that these courses indoctrinate coaches by delivering non-contextualized content to passive attendees (Piggott, 2012). Prompted by these criticisms, I adopted a Foucauldian lens, which allowed me to recognize the potentially constraining effects associated with the dominant practices commonly employed in typical coaching courses. Opportunistically, using a Foucauldian theoretical lens also prompted me to critically consider how I was exercising power and enabled me to view knowledge as subjective and socially constructed. This Foucauldian-informed understanding of power and knowledge underscored the need for the coach participants to contribute to meaning-making and be active participants in their own learning.

Additionally, when developing my workshop I sought recommendations from coach education

scholars (e.g. Cushion, 2011; Jones, 2006; Potrac & Cassidy, 2006) and received guidance from

my supervisory committee, Dr. Jim Denison and Dr. Doug Gleddie.

After familiarizing myself with the criticisms associated with typical coaching courses,

seeking recommendations from coaching scholars and adopting a Foucauldian view of power

and knowledge, within my workshop I decided to: 1) take on the role of a learning facilitator, 2)

adopt a poststructuralist view of learning, 3) incorporating a one-week break between the

workshop sessions, and 4) acknowledge the unique background of each coach participant.

When analyzing the participants' journal responses and my own field notes I kept these

intended changes in mind. As such, these four aspects became the sub-themes in my analysis of

'implementing a Foucauldian-informed coaching workshop'. As I discuss these sub-themes I will

draw upon the multiple, fragmented, even divergent participant perspectives that formed the

reality of this workshop, and as a result informed my analysis of these sub-themes. Doing so will

illustrate how these intended changes actually played out, having both facilitating and

constraining effects, within the context of this workshop. Additionally, I will identify some of

the circulating discourses that directed the happenings within the workshop and explain how

these discourses influenced the sub-themes.

Taking on the Role of a Learning Facilitator

When designing my workshop I decided to take on the role of a learning facilitator

rather than a coach educator. Typical coach educators have been criticized for using their

experience and status to establish themselves as authorities, avoiding participants' questions as

a means to protect their position of power, and for allowing their own aims, and objectives to dominant the learning environment at the expense of coach learning (Cushion & Nelson, 2013). By adopting a Foucauldian lens I was able to recognize the potentially constraining effects that can be associated with this depiction of coach educators. As such, I felt taking on the role of a learning facilitator, who emphasizes coach learning and provides guidance instead of dictating content, would enable me to exercise power in a less dominating manner.

Foucault viewed power as a relationship between humans where one individual attempts to guide or direct the behaviors of another. These power relations are omnipresent and often unbalanced or asymmetrical. Pringle and Crocket (2013) explained that the imbalances, inherent within power relations, can be influenced by differences in age, maturity, experience and/or knowledge. Within the specific context of my workshop, I did not feel that there was an obvious difference in age or experience between the coach participants and myself. However, through the tactical discourse of hosting the workshop, receiving endorsement from the sport club's athletic director and having a more in-depth understanding of the Foucauldian-informed workshop content, my strategic position provided me with more opportunities to exercise power, compared to the workshop participants (Markula & Pringle, 2006).

Case in point, I exercised power when selecting the learning activities and the workshop content. Correspondingly, I had a more thorough understanding of the Foucauldian-informed content than the coach participants. Therefore, through the interplay of power and knowledge within this workshop, I was positioned as a 'content expert'. Foucault, however, cautioned us

about positioning individuals as 'experts', as this strategic position can enable an individual to exercise power in a manner that makes him/her an 'agent of normalization'. Barker-Ruchti and Tinning (2010) explained that normalization, reinforced through controlling actions and a hierarchical depiction of power, can erase differences and may induce docility among the 'subordinates'.

Recognized the potential for my position as a 'content expert' to have constraining effects on the coach learners, I designed my workshop to support the coaches in being active participants in the learning process and to facilitate them in critically questioning (or problematizing) the knowledge they receive. This differs from typical 'experts' who present content as universally applicable, 'objective' facts that 'should' be uncritically applied by all. Therefore, despite the knowledge imbalance (specific to the Foucauldian-informed content) between the participants and myself, I was not exercising power with the aim of normalizing the coaches into uncritically accepting what I was saying or to indoctrinate them to think and act in the same ways. Rather, my intent was to facilitate the coaches in critically questioning the practices and knowledges they rely on, to help them ensure their actions align with their intentions.

Another way I facilitated the coaches to think critically was by directing the discussions away from what I, the 'expert' would do. For example, upon the coaches arriving at the first workshop session, I casually conversed with them about their coaching experiences. When they reciprocally asked what sport I coach, I responded by saying, "I'm just going to school right now". With this response I aimed to encourage the coaches to critically explore their own

coaching habits, practices and environments, rather then relying on what I would, or have done, as if it were a 'best practice'. Nevertheless, I still provided a few examples from my coaching and teaching experience when they were relevant. In his reflective journal Dean (coach of male and female team sport) expressed, "I liked how the [workshop] session incorporated videos, discussions, a couple of written exercises, and **Crystal sharing her thoughts**" [bold added for emphasis]. With support from this quote, I feel my decision to not outwardly establish myself as an 'expert' and instead sparingly share examples from my coaching experience, was an effective strategy for minimizing the potentially dominating influence of my position as the learning facilitator within this specific workshop context.

Despite my attempt to lessen the asymmetry of power within the workshop, an imbalance remained. While it is common for power relations to be asymmetrical, it is important to remember that through a Foucauldian lens, power is not solely oppressive. Instead, Foucault was interested in understanding how power is exercised and what as a result can occur (Denison, 2010). From a Foucauldian point of view, it is not that one can never take control or make decisions that will effect others, rather by examining how power is exercised one can better recognize when it has the potential to become unethical or abusive. Looking at the specific context of this workshop, being in a position of power enabled me to exercise power productively. This included being able to introduce and explain the workshop content, while also ensuring the learning activities progressed in a timely fashion. However, when looking more closely at how I exercised power I recognized that although I was cognizant of exercising power in a less dominating and constraining manner there were times when I struggled with this.

For example, after acknowledging the time constraints of the workshop I felt as though I needed to control the duration of each learning activity. While this had the productive effect of ensuring all of the content was covered, it marginalized the individual learning pace of the coach attendees. Nevertheless, there were a few occasions when I did respond to the learning pace of the coaches. This was reflected in my field notes where I wrote, "the 'body-machine analogy' activity seemed to be a hit!". This remark was sparked by the participants' eagerness to share their analogies, where in response I extended the time allotted for this activity. Upon reflection, however, I realized that despite making these small time adjustments, my own objectives and agenda remained dominant. Although the participants had more time to share, I ended up decreasing the time spent exploring how these analogies can be constraining within the coaches' own training environments. Therefore, instead of allowing learning to guide the pace of the activities, my predetermined agenda prompted me to move to the next activity, before the coaches fully comprehended the content being discussed. Thus, at times my own objectives overshadowed the prioritizing of the coaches' learning.

It is quite ironic that I allowed time to direct my actions and dictate the progression of the workshop, as throughout this research project I was attempting to think and act in Foucauldian-informed ways. Foucault is well known for his work where he deconstructed time (control of activity disciplinary technique), revealing its potential to be both productive and constraining (Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010). Although I am aware of his work in this area, reflecting on the actual happenings within the workshop it appears that my deeply entrenched modernist-driven desires prompted me to control the learning activities in a manner that

ensured economic efficiency, certainty and timely progressions, and as a result had unintended

effects that undermined my intentions of acting in a Foucauldian-informed manner.

My analysis, concerning how my own objectives outshone the prioritizing of coach

learning, was prompted by the participants' reflective journal responses. Making reference to

the first workshop session, Phil (coach of male and female individual sport) commented; "I

would appreciate time to pick apart the concepts a bit more so that it means something to us".

He elaborated by stating, when "I was in the session, I had some thoughts. [However] I felt like

we were breezing through some of the concepts". These comments imply that I was exercising

power in a manner that allowed my own interests to dominant the learning environment,

regrettably at the expense of coach learning.

Further addressing the pace of the learning activities, but offering a slightly different

perspective, Dean stated,

> I felt I was probably not the easiest to deal with during the session as I am relatively
>
> vocal and wanted to share my opinion on a lot of things, but I thought Crystal did a good
>
> job of moderating the group and leading us through discussions.

Dean's comment indicates that the pace of the discussions and learning activities were not

undermining his learning. Rather, it appears the learning pace, imposed within this workshop,

had a facilitating effect for this particular participant. This comparison between Phil's and

Dean's comments illustrate and support the poststructuralist view that multiple, subjective

perspectives shape reality. As a poststructuralist I can recognize that multiple truths exist.

However, when considering how power is exercised it is essential that I acknowledge my own

political research objective, which has been to illustrate the value of coaches learning to 'think with Foucault', as this has likely invisibly directed how I perceived the happenings of the workshop. Furthermore, although I have attempted to represent the multiple perspectives that have shaped the reality of this workshop, both during the workshop and in this thesis write-up, I recognize that I have likely relied more heavily on the participants who made more apparent, outward contributions to the workshop discussions and reflective journals.

Circulating discourse. Another circulating force that invisibly directed the happenings of the workshop was revealed through the previous quote from Dean, where he shared his perception that his active participation was inappropriate. Regulatory influencers such as these are often referred to as discourse, which from a Foucauldian perspective can be defined as the "unwritten rules that guide social practices, help to produce and regulate the production of statements… [and] control what can be understood and perceived" (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 31). In typical coach education settings (such as certification courses, conferences and continuing education clinics) dominant discourses circulate to produce and regulate the roles of those in the learning environment. Often, the attendees are positioned as passive knowledge recipients and the 'coach educators' as content 'experts'. From Dean's comment it is apparent that this 'naturalized' understanding of individuals' roles within a learning environment, where attendees are depicted as passive beings, were directing his participation and experience in the workshop. Thus, this dominant discourse was operating in a constraining manner as it gave the coaches' the perception that it was inappropriate or unacceptable to be an active participant in the learning process.

In addition to the participants being guided by the 'naturalized' understandings of individuals' roles within a learning environment, this discourse was also directing my thoughts and actions. For instance, despite recognizing that knowledge is socially constructed and subjective, when the participants would ask me questions, I felt as though I needed to provide a universally applicable, singly 'right' answer. This was reflected in my field notes where I commented, "I felt I had to have a definite, fixed answer for participants' questions and that I needed to defend the content I was sharing when they [participants] questioned it". This quote illustrates my struggle to negotiate between the poststructuralist view of knowledge being subjective and the dominant discourse of 'coach educators' being all-knowing 'content experts'. To negate this I tried to continually remind myself, and the participants, that 'best practices' are infeasible in sport as contextual factors are dynamic and always changing. In this way, working as a Foucauldian-informed learning facilitator requires constant scrutiny of oneself as it is no simple task to move beyond dominant ways of thinking, acting and being.

Just as contextual factors are dynamic and always changing in sport, the workshop itself was also a dynamic environment. For example, the coaches had various opportunities to participate and ask questions, which allowed for a shift in the power dynamics within the workshop. On one particular occasion, when I hesitated to answer a participant's question (as I negotiated between aligning my behavior with the role-determining discourse of being a 'content-expert' and honoring knowledge as subjective), Michael (male team sport coach) stepped in offering an answer to the question posed by Phil, which was, "when, if ever, can we use fitness tests if they give the perception that athletes are machines that just need to be calibrated?"

Through his university classes Michael had received guidance in applying Foucault's concepts to his coaching practices. When he noticed me struggling to arrange an answer to Phil's question, he offered his own interpretation of the content and applied it to his coaching context. In his response, Michael reiterated that Foucault's work is not about eliminating practices all together, as nothing is inherently 'bad'. Continuing on, Michael emphasized the importance of critically questioning one's coaching practices, as this can allow a coach to be in a more informed position where s/he is aware of any unintended consequences associated with the employed coaching practice. He also explained that once a coach is aware of these unintended consequences s/he may still choose to use the practice, but also has the option to modify the practice or develop an entirely new practice. When contextualizing this explanation, Michael spoke about his use of wind sprints, where after problematizing the practice he recognized its potential to be constraining and in response he has decided not use this drill as much. Nevertheless, he explained that there are still times when he has his athletes' line-up for their wind sprints. The coach learners in the workshop seemed to respect and understand Michael's answer. During this moment I felt I was moving towards my goal of supporting learning, where taking on the role of a learning facilitator enabled me to exercise power in a less dominating manner. This event also marked a shift towards a more poststructuralist-informed learning environment.

A Poststructuralist View of Learning

When designing my workshop, one typically marginalized discourse that I wanted to draw upon was the poststructuralist view of learning being a complex, fluid, active process facilitated through the social-construction of knowledge. Jones et al. (2016, p. 165) explained,

"for Foucault, learning experiences do not occur in the isolated core of an individual's mind, rather they are governed by the spaces individuals occupy and the relationships they hold". This view of learning contrasts the conventional view, dominant within coach education, that learning is "an individual process, that it has a beginning and end, that it is separated from the rest of our activities, and that it is the result of teaching" (Wenger, 1998, p. 3). The conventional view of learning is grounded in the assumption that coach learners are passive recipients of knowledge. Yet, after interviewing coaches, Nelson, Cushion and Potrac (2013) found that "coaches disliked occasions 'where you [coaches] are lectured to without time being given to discuss ideas', but they enjoyed educational experiences 'that were more interactive'" (p. 210). This insight emphasizes the importance of questioning the conventional assumptions that surround coach learning, as leaving these assumptions unquestioned "restricts innovation and prevents alternative ways of thinking about learning from surfacing" (Jones et al., 2016, p. 165).

Accordingly, when designing and implementing my workshop I critically questioned the dominant view of learning, and instead drew upon the poststructuralist view of learning as a multifaceted, active, social process. Supporting the need to utilize a poststructuralist approach to learning, Nelson et al. (2013) found that coaches desire learning environments "that encourage learners to actively participate in the course" (p. 215). Based on the needs of coaches and on the understanding "that knowledge is always socially constructed and a result of complex relations of power" (Jones et al., 2016, p. 167), I aimed to create a learning environment where the participants were able, and felt comfortable, sharing and challenging their thoughts, ideas and experiences. I attempted to facilitate this by opening the workshop up

to coaches from different sports, utilizing a variety of interactive learning activities, and employing a scaffolding pedagogical approach to gradually increase participation.

When attempting to facilitate an environment that would support a poststructuralist view of learning, I recognized that a potential challenge associated with workshop learning environments included coaches viewing others in sport as opponents rather than collaborators (Mallett, 2010). This could partially be influenced by the competitive discourse that circulates within sport and creates the perception that coaches need to keep information (that is thought to give one a competitive edge over their opponents) secret. This competitive discourse can restrict coaches' willingness to learn through collaboration. Therefore, to promote collaboration I recruited coaches from different sports, but all of whom worked for the same sporting organization. This decision was supported by the interviewees in Nelson et al.'s (2013) study, who suggested the "sharing of knowledge, experiences, and practices should not be solely confined to individual sports, but should be between them" (p. 212). Overall, the decision to create a multi-sport learning environment allowed the coaches in my workshop to see each other as confidants who they could respect and trust. The coaches seemed to appreciate and benefit from the poststructuralist-informed, multi-sport learning environment, as was shown by their willingness to collaborate. In support of this, through his journal Dean expressed, "I really enjoyed the opportunity to more formally interact with the other coaches".

Another way I attempted to facilitate a poststructuralist-informed learning environment, was through the utilization of a variety of interactive learning activities. These interactive activities, which included word clouds, races, videos, pair-sharing and group

discussions, were chosen for their potential to promote participation and prompt discussions. The decision to include a diverse array of activities was supported by Armour and Yelling (2004) who explained that learning can be facilitated through reading, doing, reflecting, collaborating, observing and sharing. Moreover, I decided to sequence my learning activities in a manner that would gradually increase participation, which Lange et al. (2016) referred to as a structural scaffolding approach. Accordingly, my workshop began with low risk activities where the coaches' responses remained anonymous, then progressed through individual to pair-sharing activities, and gradually built-up to large group discussions. While the coaches' levels of participation seemed to vary in a nonlinear fashion throughout the sessions, in my field notes I wrote, "the discussions were more fruitful when the coaches reflected and/or connected the content to their own practices and experiences".

Acknowledging that multiple, fragmented perspectives shape reality, the following quotes illustrate the coaches' perceptions of my attempts to facilitate a poststructuralist-informed learning environment. When asked to reflect on the first workshop session Dean expressed, "I really liked how there was a variety of different interactive approaches to learning". Conversely, Phil expressed, "at one point you [Crystal] said something to the effect that we all understood the problem… but there was **not a lot of real discussion** around it". Additionally, Stephanie (female team sport coach) felt the "session was very school related" expressing, "I was disappointed because of the amount of school based information and **talking at us** that was happening" [bold added for emphasis]. These differing perspectives show that while one coach was being supported in his learning, the learning environment failed to bolster the other participants. These quotes also indicate that the learning environment did not allow

for genuine exploratory discussions and perhaps took a knowledge dissemination approach rather than supporting collaborative meaning-making.

Further illustrating this absence of collaborative meaning-making, in my field notes from the first workshop session I commented, "some of the lecture-style sections seemed long". Despite recognizing this, during the workshop I felt I was struggling to elicit participant contributions noting, "the participants didn't seem to be asking questions or contributing to the discussions". In these moments I took comfort in knowing that I had information to share. Although I found comfort in having planned content, upon reflecting on the participants' journal responses, especially Stephanie's comment of "talking at us", I questioned if I was exercising power ethically or not. I also wondered if I was attentive to the needs and interests of the participants or if my own objectives, to facilitate coaches in adopting a Foucauldian view of power and knowledge, dominated the learning environment. As such, despite my genuine intentions I struggled to share information in a manner that drastically challenged the conventional view of learning, which depicts learning as a passive process where knowledge is 'delivered'. Nevertheless, by problematizing the taken-for-granted understanding of learning and exploring potential ways to overcome the unintended effects associated with typical coaching courses, I was able to begin to move towards creating a learning environment that provided coaches with opportunities to understand learning differently and to reconsider what constitutes 'effective' coaching knowledges (Marklua & Pringle, 2006).

Evoking marginalized knowledge. When adopting a Foucauldian lens it is essential to move beyond simply labeling practices as 'good' or 'bad', and instead to reveal the strengths

and weaknesses associated with the workings of power (Markula & Pringle, 2006). Accordingly, within the context of my workshop, I was introducing information that was fairly new to the coach participants. As such, I believe that I needed to use some preliminary learning activities and mini lecture components to expose the participants to the marginalized knowledges, which my workshop was designed to bring forth. If I had not first increased the coaches' awareness of their taken-for-granted knowledges and encouraged them to consider an alternative lens, I do not feel the participants would have been prepared to have meaningful discussions that moved beyond their traditional ways of thinking.

Although I recognize that using a lecture-based approach could have had some constraining effects, and indeed might be considered by some to be poor pedagogy within todays dominant student-centered learning climate, after reflecting on this I still feel that I was exercising power in a productive way. One productive effect included prompting the coaches to reconsider their practices, which aligns with the Foucauldian understanding of learning being "a process that involves continually rethinking and questioning what one is doing (Jones et al., 2016, p. 167). The following comment from Dean also confirms that he felt his learning was being facilitated, as he expressed,

> I thought that Crystal did a good job in walking us through a novel or unique perspective that, if nothing else, helped us to personally reflect and unpack some of the things we do as coaches without necessarily acknowledging why.

This is not to say the approach I took was a 'best practice' or would yield the same effects in all contexts, as that would counter the poststructuralist rejection of 'universal truths' (Markula &

Pringle, 2006). Rather, this quote illustrates how power and discourse played out within the specific context of this workshop. Being able to recognize how knowledges and practices always 'play out' in different ways depending on the context, is something I feel learning facilitators could benefit from, as it could help them ensure that they do not treat learners as a homogenous group or view learning as a universal process.

Although the first workshop session could have been described as being more 'content-heavy' or 'lecture-based', it was in the second session that the participants' contributions were the main focus. The participants seemed to enjoy and benefit from having the opportunity to collaboratively contribute to the meaning-making process. Illustrating this, Phil commented, "the best part of the content came from the discussions that we had as a group. Coaches sharing ideas with each other can be an invaluable tool". While there is no question that collaborative learning is valuable, as it aligns with the idea that knowledge is socially constructed, I did frequently struggle with how I should exercise power during the coach-led, collaborative learning activities.

These points of struggle arose when the coach-led conversations evolved into 'rants', instead of focused critical discussions. For example, Stephanie had just finished a tournament weekend prior to the first workshop session. From her perspective, her athletes lacked the discipline and dedication that it took to be successful. On multiple occasions throughout the workshop, Stephanie shared her frustrations with her athletes' 'off the court' activities such as swimming in the hotel pool and shopping. Although aspects of these rants were worthy of deep consideration and problematization, at times I felt Stephanie was simply unloading her

frustrations rather than relating her experiences to the workshop's concepts, which would have required her to look at her assumptions with respect to 'blaming' her athletes for acting in ways that she deemed as inappropriate (Denison et al., 2015a).

Correspondingly, during these 'rants' I found myself contemplating how to act in a manner that would not discourage participation, downplay the coaches' interests, or put too much emphasis on my own objectives. Generally speaking, I would try to let the coach-led discussions evolve without 'intervention' however, there were a few times when I did step-in to refocus the conversations. My strategies for redirecting the conversations entailed reminding the participants of the task at hand, bringing small group conversations into large group discussions, or progressing to the next learning activity. Yet again, recalling the happenings within this workshop it is clear that as a Foucauldian the exercise of one's power is still possible. It is the manner in which this is done, however, that is critical. Accordingly, learning facilitators could benefit from considering how one exercises his/her power to recognize if it is done so in a dominating way or in a more constructive or understanding way? It is certainly the latter that I was attempting to do.

My decisions to exercise power in a constructive, understanding way by redirecting the 'off-topic' conversations, was further supported by Armour and Yelling (2007). These two scholars explained that conversations between professionals do not automatically result in high quality learning, warning these discussions can reinforce poor and/or ineffective practices. Armour and Yelling went on to suggest that conversations between practitioners could benefit from the support and guidance of a professional development provider. Likewise, Nelson,

Potrac, and Groom (2016) suggested that learning facilitators should be prepared to respond, question and potentially challenge the narratives a learner brings to the learning environment, as a means to aid coaches in deconstructing their existing understandings and dominant ways of thinking. Reflecting on this advice, it is possible that I could have more effectively facilitated learning if I would have questioned and challenged the participants' 'rants', rather than refocusing the conversations or just having them 'drop' the topic all together.

Nevertheless, one contextual factor that helped me negotiate my use of power in these situations was the existence of two, ten-minute breaks that were incorporated into each of the workshop sessions. During these breaks I made sure that I did not mediate the conversations. Accordingly, these breaks in the workshop session allowed for a shift in the power dynamics. Phil highlighted the value of these breaks expressing, "we seemed to have better discussions around the topics when we broke from structure and just had informal discussions". Providing opportunities for informal discussions is important within learning contexts as coaches can learn from interactions with one another, however, these social engagements have the potential to both facilitate and/or inhibit learning. Recognizing that informal conversations can inhibit learning, by reinforcing or perpetuating the uncritical use of problematic coaching practices, I found myself pondering what strategies could be used to promote (while still using power ethically) facilitative interactions between coaches?

Incorporating a One-Week Break

In addition to the ten-minute breaks within each workshop session, I also incorporated a one-week break between the workshop sessions. I intended this break to account for the

complexities of the workshop content, by providing more opportunities for the coaches to reflect and recognize how the content related to their own coaching. My decision to incorporate this one-week break was also informed by the critique of typical coaching courses being isolated, 'one-off' events (Cushion, 2011). Accordingly, the break between the sessions allowed the second session to act as a 'follow-up', which provided an opportunity for the coaches to be supported in overcoming any confusion and/or points of contention.

Incorporating this one-week break into the workshop format ran counter to the common structure of typical coaching courses, and as such required a greater level of commitment on the part of the coaches. While one coach did not return for the second session, those who did expressed that the break enhanced their learning experience. For example, Phil wrote, "a week after our first day and we had wrapped our heads around the concepts and were better at articulating our thoughts about the topics".

Although the participants valued this break, it is plausible that a shorter break (less than seven days) could have been more beneficial for this specific group of coaches. This insight was prompted by Stephanie's journal responses. In her first journal entry, which was completed at the end of the first workshop session, she indicated that the workshop's content was relevant stating,

> I think that the workshop so far generally relates to my coaching environment. For example the 'body as the machine' [coaching logic] I can relate to a bit in the relation of athletes having more aspects then just the physical aspect. I more so relate to the coach as an expert.

Yet, five days later when Stephanie wrote her second journal entry, her feelings seemed to have changed expressing, "**I can't really connect the 'body is a machine' theory** because in female sport I have never heard many examples of that. I can connect however the 'coach in the expert' theory" [Bold added for emphasis]. These quotes from Stephanie could indicate that the workshop content was discussed in a meaningful and relevant manner during the workshop session. However, when Stephanie was left to contemplate and apply the concepts on her own, it is possible that she struggled due to the lack of support and the complexity of the ideas, which could have contributed to her changed perception.

Offering another perspective, Denison et al. (2015a) explained that learning to 'think with Foucault' is a very challenging, sometimes threatening task. Therefore, coaches may initially reject the ideas presented, becoming anxious, nervous or even defensive. This creates the temptation for coaches to revert back to the practices, coaching logics, and frameworks that are familiar and comfortable, which could explain Stephanie's changed perception concerning the relevance of the workshop content. Accordingly, Denison et al.'s (2015a) insights in combination with the quotes from Stephanie highlight the need for coaches to have continual support when learning to 'think with Foucault'. Within the context of this workshop, I feel incorporating the one-week break offered a starting point for providing continued support that goes beyond the common 'one-off' structure of typical coaching courses. Nevertheless, more modifications (such as changing the length of this break or creating an online discussion board for the coaches) could have been made to better support and facilitate the coaches in learning to challenge their taken-for-granted practices.

Coaches' Backgrounds

Offering another possible explanation for Stephanie's changed perception concerning the workshop content, Lyle (2018) suggested that some coaches might not be receptive to new information. Mediating a coach's readiness to learn, reflect and contextualize information is the coach's previous experiences and background (Mallett, 2010). Thus, reconsidering Stephanie's 'changed' perception, concerning the relevance of the workshop content, it is feasible that she may not have been receptive, or ready to consider new information, due to the mediating influence of her background. Accordingly, it is importance to consider the impact that a coach's unique background has on a given learning experience (Oldridge, Nelson, Greenough, & Potrac, 2016). Acknowledging this, I will now explore some of the possible ways in which the coaches' backgrounds, including their sporting culture, previous learning experiences, prior exposure to social theory, as well as their interests, needs and experiences as coaches, could have influenced (facilitated and/or constrained) their perceptions of the workshop.

During the workshop the participants were curious about how certain sports or sporting cultures may be more receptive to the Foucauldian-informed workshop content. For example, in his journal Dean reflected, "I also found myself wondering how the sport one plays increases their likelihood to adopt certain perspectives". Through this comment it appears that Dean was contemplating how some sporting cultures may be more open to trying new things while others are deeply rooted in 'traditional' practices. Additionally, when discussing athlete docility within the workshop, Phil spoke about one of the sporting cultures (male team sport) he had previously worked in, which reinforced a rigid hierarchical view of power and likely induced docility, as the athletes were expected to do exactly what they were told, no questions asked.

Conversely, he explained that within the individual-sport culture he was currently working in the athletes had a much larger role in determining the intensity and focus of their training sessions. These participant reflections and workshop discussions illustrate that the sporting culture a coach works in may influence his/her perceptions on the relevance and feasibility of applying Foucault's concepts.

In addition to recognizing the influence of one's sporting culture, it is important to consider a coach's previous learning experiences, as "learning acquired in one situation will inevitably influence a coach's learning engagements in other situations" (Cushion & Nelson, 2013, p. 361). Contextualizing this, the coaches who attended this workshop were all enrolled in a university Kinesiology program. Dean was completing a doctoral program, Phil and Michael were in masters programs, and Stephanie was working towards obtaining a bachelors degree. Interestingly, Jones et al. (2016) explained that previous learning experiences can constrain and limit the growth and development of learning coaches, by making them docile. Docility can arise when learning experiences discipline coaches to think and behave in very specific ways, which can encourage them to "regulate and monitor their thoughts and behaviours to conform with dominant meanings of what it means to be a competent coach" and student (Jones et al., 2016, p. 167).

The coaches who attended my workshop seemed to have varying degrees of docility when it came to learning. This variety existed despite all of the coaches having a relatively high level of education and thus all likely disciplined to act and think in specific ways. From the compilation of journal entries it seemed as though the coaches who had completed more years

of university recognized and appreciated the novel content and the variety of interactive

learning activities more than those who had less university experience. Conversely, through the

participants' journal responses and my field notes it seemed that the coach who was in the

earliest stages of her university career, Stephanie, was disappointed with the workshop

structure and content.

Taking a deeper look at the coaches' perceptions of the workshop's content, it is likely

that through their previous learning experiences the coaches had been 'taught' to understand

traditional sport science knowledge (such as physiology, biomechanics and sport psychology) as

the 'gold standard' knowledge needed to be an 'effective' coach. Showing the prevalence of

spot science knowledge within coaching, Avner and colleagues (2017) critically assessed three

major Canadian coaching websites, after which they expressed, "it became clear to us how

dominant various scientific discourses are in shaping coaches' current understandings of

effective coaching" (p. 103). They went on to explain, "the recommended approach… was

always a periodized approach where training, competition, and recovery were **based on**

scientific principles" (Avner et al, 2017, p. 103) [bold added for emphasis].

One area within the workshop that exemplified the participants' disciplined, steadfast

reliance on dominant sport science knowledge was through the way they framed their

questions. In my field notes I expressed,

I felt the participants got hung up on some of the dominant coaching knowledges as

they wanted to know the exact age, level and gender of athletes who would benefit

from the workshop's information. For instance, the coaches were trying to determine

'objective' markers to establish when it would be 'appropriate' to encourage athletes to

be independent, creative decision-makers.

Although I recognize that the workshop content likely did not align with the participants'

disciplined understanding of the knowledge that is needed to be an 'effective' coach, based on

how they framed their questions, I was skeptical if the content prompted them to challenge this

dominant knowledge. From my observations within the workshop, I felt Stephanie choose to

continue to draw from her existing coaching knowledge rather than challenge it. While Jones et

al. (2016) suggested more education may lead an individual to become more disciplined to

think and behave in very specific ways, Lyle (2018) offered another rationale which could

explain why the coaches who had more university experience were more willing to challenging

their existing knowledge. As Lyle wrote, it is reasonable to "guess that coaches with higher

levels of certification and those in the high-performance domain are more likely to reflect on

and challenge their practice, and therefore, be open to new knowledge" (2018, p. 10), which

may explain why Phil and Dean appeared to appreciate the poststructuralist-informed

workshop and novel Foucauldian content more than Stephanie.

In addition to considering how one's previous learning experiences may influence

his/her appreciation of the Foucauldian-informed content, it is worthwhile to consider how a

coach's prior exposure to social theory may have also impact his/her ability, willingness and/or

readiness to engage with the content. Demonstrating this, Phil explained,

I am however somewhat aware of the concepts covered simply because of the

[university] classes I have been in… I would have to image if I wasn't already thinking

that way the workshop format would have gone at too quick of a pace to allow me to actually consider the concepts and change any major ways of thinking.

Dean, who also had some prior exposure to social theory expressed,

I had had the opportunity to explore some of these concepts before in informal conversations, but I enjoyed the opportunity to more formally interact with other coaches and also to take a deeper look at some of the literature related to coaching.

Both of these quotes demonstrate the influence that prior exposure to social theory had on the coaches' learning and perceptions of this coaching workshop.

Along with considering the impact of a coach's previous exposure to social theory, a coach's own interests, needs and experiences can influence his/her learning experience. Illustrating this Stephanie explained,

I more so relate to the 'coach as an expert' because in the past I have be[en] considered that crazy coach. Since then I have tried to update my coaching style and trying to embrace power as relational and keeping the info[rmation] open between athletes and coaches.

This quote from Stephanie illustrates how her past experiences as a coach has influenced, and is now guiding, her current learning objectives. From this quote it appears that she recognized that 'thinking with Foucault' holds great potential to help her overcome some of the coaching obstacles she has faced in the past. However, her explanation also indications that, at this point in the workshop, she did not fully comprehend what it means to adopt a relational view of

power. Nevertheless, it seems her interests and past experiences drew her to the concept of 'power as relational', which may have prompted her to explore the concept more thoroughly over the rest of the sessions or perhaps even after the completion of the workshop.

All in all, the quotes included in this section highlight that each coach came to the workshop with a unique array of past experiences. These past experiences included the coach's sporting culture, his/her previous learning experiences, prior exposure to social theory, as well as his/her own interests, needs and experiences as a coach. The compilation of these experiences influenced the coaches' expectations of the workshop as well as their experience in the workshop. Recognizing that each coach brings his/her own unique background illustrates some of the complexities associated with designing and facilitating coaching courses. As was the case in this specific workshop, despite all coaches attending the same workshop, each coach will likely have a different learning experience. Nevertheless, it is the collection of these perspectives that formed the fragmented reality of this workshop. Accordingly, I feel learning facilitators could benefit from adopting a poststructuralist perspective as it can allow them to recognizing that learning environments are comprised of multiple perspectives and emphasizes the need to move beyond a one-dimensional view of learning. Honoring that reality is comprised of multiple interpretations, when discussing the next theme I will continue to explore these unique perspectives while I elaborate on the participants' experiences engaging in problematization.

Engaging in Problematization

My decision to facilitate coaches in learning to problematize was informed by the calls

for coaches to 'think with Foucault' (Denison & Scott-Thomas, 2011; Mills & Denison, 2016).

Prior to selecting the topics that would be used to stimulate problematization, I familiarized

myself with the content-related criticisms associated with typical coaching courses. These

criticisms included delivering content that is too basic, decontextualized, and/or abstract (Lyle,

2018). In an attempt to overcome these criticisms, the Foucauldian-informed content, which

was selected for this workshop, offered a distinct, alternative lens to conventional sport science

curriculums. Additionally, the workshop's learning activities encouraged the coaches to connect

the content to their own contexts, as problematization involves coaches' reconsidering their

roles, critically assessing their practices and drawing from multiple knowledges.

Correspondingly, after analyzing the participants' reflective journal entries and cross

referencing them with my field notes, the sub-themes I identified included; 1) overcoming

content-related criticisms, 2) problematizing one's role as a coach, 3) critically assessing

practices, and 4) utilizing multiple sources of knowledge. In what follows, I will consider the

varied experiences of the coach participants' and explain how several discourses influenced the

coaches as they engaged in problematization.

Overcoming Content-Related Criticisms

The criticism that typical coaching courses deliver content that is too basic,

decontextualized, and/or abstract partially derives from confusion as to whether the purpose of

coaching courses should be for training (providing a job-orientated, technical 'tool-box') or

education (person-orientated, development of analytical and critical abilities) (Cushion &

Nelson, 2013). However, looking to the work of Foucauldian sport scholars (such as Denison, 2007; Denison & Avner, 2011), it seems that facilitating coaches to 'think with Foucault' has the potential to enhance coaches' effectiveness by stimulating the development of both innovative coaching techniques and critical thinking. More specifically, this enhanced effectiveness can result from coaches learning to problematize, which is "the ability to recognise how all knowledge has been discursively constructed in different contexts, over time, via power struggles and, more importantly, that one does not have to accept such knowledge as an unimpeachable truth" (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 201). Accordingly, developing the ability to problematize can facilitate critical thinking while also encouraging coaches to adapt their practices in applied, context-specific ways.

Therefore, to support the coaches in learning to problematize, I attempted to bring awareness to the existence of multiple truths. I initiated this by critically exploring the taken-for-granted coaching logics that view the athletic 'body as a machine' and position the 'coach as an expert'. While doing so, I was cognizant of my choice of words, as the coaching literature emphasizes the importance of utilizing lay language when sharing academic knowledge (Lyle, 2018). Using understandable language was especially important as my workshop introduced social theory, which typically receives little attention in coaching courses, manuals and websites, making my workshop content fairly novel for the coaches. In my field notes I wrote, "the participants seemed to understand the words/concepts of 'problematization', 'coaching logics' and 'docility'". In addition to being attentive to my use, explanation, and application of these words, I chose to avoid using the terms 'social theory', 'Foucault', 'discourse' and 'dominance'. Instead of using 'marginalized knowledges', I utilized the synonyms marginalized

'perspectives' and 'understandings'. Given the relatively short duration of the workshop, my decision to exclude some words and provide synonyms for others not only made the concepts tangible, meaningful and comprehensible, but also helped to ensure the content was not intimidating or confusing. From my observations and the discussion-based learning activities, these word choices appeared to facilitate the participants in understanding and contemplating the Foucauldian-informed content.

Another criticism I wanted to address included the critique that typical coaching courses present decontextualized content. Similarly, Nelson et al. (2013) found that coaches prefer content that is relevant and can easily be applied within the coaches' own contexts, where "usable content was referred to as being information that can be 'easily transferred to practical situations'" (p. 210). Accordingly, I attempted to select learning activities that encouraged the coaches to contextualize the concepts. Despite trying to facilitate this, in my field notes I wrote, "the body-machine analogies [learning activity] seemed to be engaging, relevant and interesting to the coaches, but it was harder for them to contextualize within their everyday training environments". This statement was made in comparison to the 'coach as an expert' coaching logic, which the coaches seemed to readily relate to and speak about in terms of their previous experiences as coaches and former athletes. While I recognize there was room for improvement in contextualizing the workshop's content, it seemed that the Foucauldian-informed concepts were not too abstract or irrelevant. Instead, I believe the concepts discussed in the workshop were comprehendible and applicable, as the coaches were able to contextualize the content within their own coaching situations. Acknowledging that multiple

perspectives shaped the fragmented realty of this workshop, in what follows I will draw upon the perspectives of the coach attendees.

Upon completion of the first workshop session Phil expressed, "I was on board with all of the concepts, but they were being given as facts, but with little explanation". He elaborated further, expressing some frustration; "we didn't talk tremendously about how to make change, or what that change should look like". Although the first workshop session focused on raising the coaches' consciousness of marginalized knowledges, the break between sessions and the second workshop session were intended to provide more opportunities for the coaches to apply the concepts. This was noted by Phil, who after the second session changed his perception expressing, "I would say it [workshop content] relates quite strongly" to my coaching practices and training environment as, "we developed practices that could be implemented to encourage a less docile athlete". Similarly, after the second session, Dean also recognized the practical application of the Foucauldian-informed concepts stating, "we discussed problematization and how it can be a useful tool when examining one's own coaching practice".

Although the coaches seemed to benefit from problematizing their own coaching contexts, which primarily occurred in the second workshop session, the excerpts from Phil's journals indicate that the way I organized the content between the two sessions may not have met the needs of the coaches. My original strategy was to evoke marginalized knowledges with learning activities that featured 'other' coaches (session one), before having the coaches look more critically at their own practices (session two). This decision to gradually build towards the

coaches problematizing their own practices, coaching logics, and training environments was informed by Denison et al. (2015b). In this paper, Denison and his colleagues, warned that when coaches are initially asked to problematize they may reject the ideas, become anxious, nervous and/or defensive, as problematizing has the potential to threaten a coach's sense of self and identity.

My decision to gradually build towards applying the workshop content was also made in recognition that workshops are potentially more threatening contexts for coach learners. This is in comparison to mentoring or other informal coach learning options, as a workshop is a more social, public setting. Although it is important to facilitate problematization in safe, supportive ways, Phil's perspective emphasizes the need to continue to explore this mix between contextualizing the concepts, while also managing the potential threat associated with learning to problematize. When exploring ways to facilitate coaches in problematizing, these divergent participant journal entries also reinforce that each coach will likely have a different perception of a given learning experience.

Problematizing One's Role as a Coach

One reason why problematization can be perceived as a threatening task is because it requires coaches to critically question their role. Problematization involves adopting a relational view of power and then critically assessing how one exercises power. A relational view of power contradicts the conventional, dualistic understanding where the coach is positioned at the top of the hierarchy and athletes are viewed as subordinates. When employing a conventional view of power, the role of the coach is clearly defined. However, adopting a relational view of power,

where athletes have both power and unique knowledge, can create some ambiguity as to the role of the coach. Thus, utilizing a relational view of power and questioning how one exercises power may require a coach to redefine his/her role, and perhaps identity as a coach.

Favorably, workshops provide a unique learning context in which coaches can be supported, while at the same time being challenged, to reconsider their conceptualization of power and their understanding of their role as a coach. Within the context of my workshop, the content and learning activities were selected to support the coaches in problematizing their role. However, when the participants were challenged to do so, they chose instead to reflect on their time as former athletes, where they began to critically question the role and actions of their past coaches. This became apparent through the workshop discussions and the participants reflective journal responses. For example, in my field notes I wrote, "the participants seemed to struggle to problematize their own role as a coach, in their current context. Instead they would refer to their experiences as athletes and how different coaching practices and training environments made them feel". Further supporting this point, in her reflective journal Stephanie wrote,

> I can connect however [to] the coach in the expert theory. I have been coached by many different coaching styles over my years of being an athlete. Some were definitely within the reign of the coach being the expert to the point of reigning through fear and athletes did not feel like their opinions mattered at all.

Similarly, Dean wrote, "as an athlete myself I always wanted to know 'why' I was doing something rather than being told to do it 'just because'".

While the coach participants' experiences as former athletes noticeably informed their actions as coaches, I feel this 'redirecting' strategy employed by the coach participants was potentially being used as a protective mechanism. Coaches likely perceived the task of critically questioning the actions of their past coaches to be a less threatening task that 'protected' them from having to be critical of their own actions. Recognizing the potential for problematizing to be an uncomfortable or even threatening task, rather than pushing the coaches to problematize their own role, I allowed space for the coaches to become more comfortable and secure in showing their vulnerability. Correspondingly, I believe it would have been unethical to pressure the coaches into problematizing their role, especially if they were uncomfortable with the task.

Supporting my decision to not intervene, or pressure the coaches, "Foucault asserted that it was generally inappropriate for academics to tell others what to do, but suggested it was important for 'specific intellectuals' to problematize the current workings of power and shake up assumptions that are taken for granted" (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 211). Accordingly, after problematizing the assumptions underlying typical coaching courses, I decided that I wanted to 'shake-up' these assumptions by moving away from rigidly adhering to a curriculum, especially if it came at the expense of coercing the coach learners to think and behave in certain ways. Instead through this workshop, I attempted to provide opportunities that prompted the coaches to disrupt their own taken-for-granted assumptions. As illustrated through the happenings of this workshop, it is possible that this can be accomplished by using learning activities which prompt coach learners to problematize the role of their former coaches.

Providing space for the coaches to become more comfortable showing their vulnerability seemed to support the coaches in learning to problematize, because as the workshop progressed some coaches accepted the challenge, to critically assess, their own actions and role as a coach. This was reflected through my field notes, where after the second workshop session I wrote, "the coaches seemed to be better able to problematize their own coaching experiences". Illustrating this, in his journal Dean started to question his role as he reflected on some of the athletes he had worked with in the past, writing,

> I have definitely worked with some docile athletes who never questioned my suggestions, seemingly follow the group, and who have difficulty speaking up. I think in particular this athlete likely viewed me 'as an expert' and is hesitant to confidently self-reflect if there is an alternate provided to them.

Through this quote, we can see Dean is utilizing a relational view of power to frame his reflection. Dean has depicted the athlete as having power and unique knowledge that can positively inform his or her training efforts, rather than simply framing the athlete as a subordinate 'recipient' of his technical coaching expertise (Jones, Armour, & Potrac, 2002).

In his journal entry, Dean further questioned his role as a coach noting, "we talked a lot about how athletes can become docile, but I wonder too how much **we [as coaches] are also 'cogs' or 'docile' in our adherence to structures and common practices**" [bold added for emphasis]. This reflection from Dean shows a deeper level of engagement with problematization, where he is starting to recognize that certain knowledges dominate (within the Canadian coaching context it is often sport science knowledge) and obscure other ways of

knowing. Furthermore, through this reflection it seems that Dean recognized that dominant knowledges do not only have the potential to constrain athletes, but can also be constraining for coaches.

From Dean's journal responses it appears that the workshop's content and learning activities supported him in beginning to problematize his role as a coach. Interestingly, not all of the coaches who attended the workshop engaged in problematizing their role to this extent, which became evident to me when reading through their journal responses. Offering a potential rationale for this, Jones et al. (2016, p. 171) explained, "because students and novice coaches lack coaching experience to reflect upon, a useful instructional practice could be to analyze and evaluate the thoughts and practices of other coaches". Hence, rather than the coaches feeling threatened when prompted to challenge the conventional view of power and critically assess their own role as a coach, it is possible that they simply did not have enough of their own coaching experiences to draw upon when asked to problematize their role.

All in all, from these field notes and the participants' reflective journal responses it is evident that each coach engaged with problematizing their role to differing degrees. These varied levels of engagement could indicate that the workshop may not have provided enough time and/or support for all of the coaches to fully engage in problematization. Alternatively, it is possible that the coaches did not have enough experience to draw upon when they were challenged to problematize their own role. In any case, it is essential to acknowledge that the coaches' experiences as former athletes strongly guided and shaped their decisions as coaches. Thus, problematizing the actions of their former coaches may be an effective strategy to begin

contextualizing and recognizing the unintended effects associated with dominant sporting and coaching practices. Nevertheless it could be beneficial for future workshops to provide examples of coaches' who have problematized their role, as a means to exemplify to the coach learners what problematization actually entails.

Critically Assessing Practices

In addition to problematizing their roles as coaches, the workshop's learning activities were intended to prompt the coaches to critically assess, or problematize, the practices they employ. The participants seemed to value this aspect of the workshop. Affirming this, Phil wrote, "the idea of problematization can keep me refining the coaching process as I, [the] athletes, and the environments change". Similarly, Dean explained,

> I found myself doubting or second-guessing some of the coaching practices that I employ (or have employed) in some cases, but also felt bolstered by the fact that I feel I do a number of things as a coach that I feel are constructive in light of our discussions.

This reflection from Dean was especially enlightening as Foucault's work is often criticized for promoting an overly pessimistic outlook, despite various scholars attempting to clarify that adopting a Foucauldian lens does not entail "looking for problems because you want to be annoying or pessimistic" (Mills & Denison, 2016, Thinking more broadly section, para. 7). Accordingly, the fact that Dean felt "bolstered" after engaging in problematization shows that although 'thinking with Foucault' entails recognizing unintended consequences, it does not mean that everything is 'bad' and/or needs to be radically changed. Thus, problematizing can

aid coaches in ensuring that their practices actually align with their intentions, especially

considering the numerous unintended consequences that can result from coaches' practices.

On a cautionary note, the previous quote from Dean could be interpreted as if he had

identified or developed a 'best practice', which has the potential to be problematic as 'best

practices' are often left unquestioned. When practices are uncritically accepted as 'true' and

'right', their associated unintended consequences may become invisible and as a result can

have constraining effects on coaches and athletes. Alternatively, coaches can benefit from

embracing sport as a dynamic context where 'best practices' are infeasible. Doing so can enable

coaches to continually reconsider the potential for unintended consequences to arise from the

coaching practices they employ, which emphasizes the need for coaches to continually

problematize. Dean acknowledged this need when he expressed,

> I think it is important to continue to challenge and problematize my own coaching
>
> practices as the trend in our sport is moving more towards pre-planned, structured,
>
> 'best-practice-orientated' types of training. Problematizing provides what seems like a
>
> 'counter' or quality control measure to help ensure I continue to keep the needs of [the]
>
> athletes I work with in mind.

Developing innovative practices. In addition to recognizing the unintended effects of

one's coaching practices, problematization creates opportunities for coaches to devise an

"endless number of creative, innovative and imaginative workouts and learning outcomes"

(Mills & Denison, 2016, Doing differently section, para 13). Accordingly, during the workshop

and through their reflective journals, the coaches were prompted to develop and apply

innovative strategies that would help them overcome any unintended consequences they identified in association with their typical practices.

In the following excerpts from Dean's reflective journal, he explains some of the innovative practices that he developed and implemented over the duration of the workshop.

I have tried to problematize some of my training environments to consider how there are some aspects of the training that might be conducive to docility with the athletes. I've tried to keep things a little less predicable, and leave room for decisions to be made by the athletes regarding what they work on, how we approach a lesson, and how we engage in the lesson.

One way he did this was by critically assessing the 'norm' in his sport, where, as he stated, "athletes in different roles have different degrees of contributions regarding decision making". In doing so, Dean was able to recognize the associated unintended consequences. Therefore, in an attempt to disrupt the hierarchy that these sport-specific roles created and to introduce some unpredictability into his practice environment, Dean explained,

I devised a format in which two teams competed against one another, with players switching positions and teams throughout the practice. In this manner, each player got to play a number of different positions and play with a number of different teammates.

Dean went on to explain another innovative practice that he applied during one of his film review training sessions. When problematizing his 'normal' practice of reviewing game film, he recognized that he was unintentionally positioning his athletes as passive recipients of his

corrective feedback. As a means to engage the athletes as creative, independent decision

makers, Dean's innovative practice allowed the athletes to determine when they wanted to

stop the game film. This prompted the athletes to actively assess their own performance and

ask questions specific to their individual needs and observations. Reflecting on his

implementation of this innovative practice Dean wrote,

> The session went well, though I thought at times that I took too much control and had
>
> too much to say rather than providing more opportunities for the athletes to share their
>
> thoughts… this was the first time I had done a session of this nature, so I actually felt as
>
> though there was a considerable amount of exploration that took part as the lesson
>
> unfolded. I have found that actually having less structured lesson plans at times has
>
> allowed me to 'think on the fly' and take lessons/sessions in directions in response to
>
> how the athletes are engaging and reacting. Trying to impose less structure in a planned
>
> manner has been something that I have felt is effective as it aligns more with the needs
>
> and interests of the athletes.

This explanation illustrates that problematization is a challenging, yet rewarding

practice. It requires one to continually assess his or her practices in order to recognize potential

unintended effects that can result from taken-for-granted norms, and then devise alternative,

innovative strategies for overcoming them. Even with all of this planning and thought, it is

common for coaches to still struggle when it comes to implementing their innovative practices.

This challenge is partially due to the unpredictable nature of sport, where the coach has a very

dynamic role and is constantly intertwined in various relations of power. These conditions often

make conformity to the 'norm' an easier path to take than innovation. For example acting in a manner that counters the 'norms' of a given sport can put the coach in a position where they risk losing the respect of their athletes or even their jobs from appearing 'unorthodox' or perhaps 'incompetent'. Denison (2010) explained that coaches fear labels such as these due to their associated risk, which creates a coaching culture that is risk adverse. Accordingly, coaches often avoid uncertain situations and acting in ways that are considered to be 'against the norm', despite the fact that 'going with the norm' can restrict a coach's field of possible actions and as a result limits the outcomes s/he gets from her/his coaching efforts. Nevertheless, although problematization is a 'labor-intensive' task and requires some risk taking on the part of a coach, Dean's quotes illustrate how problematization can result in innovative practices that can improve coaches' effectiveness and benefit their athletes' performances.

While these excerpts from Dean's reflective journals exemplify his experience engaging with problematization, the other participants' journal responses (or lack of journal responses) did not reflect the same level of engagement. Various plausible factors could have contributed to some of the coaches' decisions not to engage, apply and/or write about their experiences problematizing and implementing alternative, innovative practices. Potential factors, as I have previously discussed, could include the unique background of each coach (i.e. education and coaching experience), competing personal and professional commitments, the workshop's learning environment, and the unwavering, dominant reliance on sport science knowledge within coaching. Thus, when facilitating coaches to problematize, it is important to remain aware of the larger social, cultural and historical influences that act on individual coaches and their learning environments.

Utilizing Multiple Sources of Knowledge

In addition to problematizing one's role and critically assessing coaching practices, 'thinking with Foucault' involves drawing from multiple knowledges. To draw from multiple knowledges one must adopt the Foucauldian view of knowledge as subjective, thus rejecting the notion that knowledge is 'fixed', 'true' or 'absolute'. Adopting this Foucauldian view creates opportunities to consider a wider range of perspectives and knowledges. For example, instead of relying solely on the dominant, mechanistic understanding of the body when trying to make sense of an athlete's underperformance, 'thinking with Foucault' allows a coach to consider 'other' factors that can influence performance (Denison, 2010). As Mills and Denison (2016) explained, "while there is no question that science is helpful for humans trying to perform in optimal ways… science will never be enough on its own" (Concluding thoughts section, para. 2). This quote emphasizes the need to expand our explanatory frameworks beyond periodized, 'objective' performance outcomes to consider other influencers such as athlete health, happiness and identity.

Although problematization creates opportunities for coaches to draw from multiple knowledges, within the context of this workshop, the dominant depiction of coaches as 'technicians' who unproblematically apply sport science-based information, still directed the experiences and perceptions of the participants (Jones et al., 2002). This was revealed through Stephanie's journal response where she expressed disappointment writing, "I was hoping that it [the first workshop session] would be more about introducing theories on how to improve the moral, drive, and energy levels of athletes during practices and games". Since coaching courses are typically comprised of technocratic content that is delivered as the 'gold standard' in

coaching, it is likely that Stephanie had been expecting a workshop that was congruent with this dominant discourse (Cushion & Nelson, 2013). Thus, when the workshop did not match her expectations, Stephanie was disappointed and/or frustrated. Although Stephanie returned for the second workshop session, she did not complete the last two journal responses, despite my frequent reminders asking her to do so. Therefore, it is unclear if her perspective changed throughout the workshop.

The discourse surrounding sport science further guided the happenings of this workshop, as was seen through the coaches' use of assimilation. In both the workshop discussions and their reflective journals, the coaches assimilated the novel Foucauldian-informed content to their existing knowledge by drawing parallels between sport science constructs and the Foucauldian-informed concepts. In my field notes I wrote, "Dean kept comparing the ideas presented to his existing knowledge in sport psychology, while Phil related the concepts to student-centered teaching which is a prominent concept in education (his undergraduate degree)". Supporting this Phil wrote, "the [Foucauldian-informed] concepts are things I need to keep in mind. The conflict between **agency and motivation** still plague me. I think that this reinforces the idea of creating critically thinking athletes that are free of the dependency effect" [bold added for emphasis]. Interestingly, in the workshop we never formally spoke about the constructs of motivation or agency, yet it appears Phil drew upon his previous knowledge to understand the Foucauldian concept of docility. This technique of assimilating new ideas to the knowledge one already has could have been used to help the participants understand and comprehend the Foucauldian-informed content. Alternatively, it

could indicate that the workshop was ineffective in emphasizing the distinct nuances and complexities associated with adopting a Foucauldian lens.

Despite this uncertainty as to whether the participants understood the nuances of the Foucauldian-informed content, from the coaches' journal responses it is apparent that the workshop prompted them to move beyond simply accepting the information they receive. Illustrating how the participants were prompted to move beyond blindly accepting the concepts presented, Dean critically questioned the use of problematization expressing,

> I felt at times as though things could be overly-problematized and I found myself questioning how it could be overused and become problematic itself. I like the idea of incorporating problematizing into my repertoire as both a coach and mental trainer as part of an eclectic approach, but would not want to completely lean on this technique when planning or implementing practices.

I also captured this in my field notes where I wrote, "unprompted, the participants started to problematize problematization and discuss the 'risks' (or potential constraining effects) associated with relying solely on one knowledge". Seeing as the coaches began to critically question problematization demonstrates that they were not being indoctrinated into uncritically accepting the workshop's content. However, from this field note and Dean's journal entry, it seems that the coaches were under the impression that problematizing involves thinking with 'one' knowledge, rather than drawing from multiple knowledges. Thus, despite the workshop introducing the skill of problematization and prompting critical thought, once

again it seems the workshop was not effective at emphasizing the subtle nuances of Foucault's

work

Nevertheless, I feel the participants' reflective journals and my field notes support the

need for coaches to be exposed to social theory, including a Foucauldian understanding of

power and knowledge. As demonstrated through this analysis and discussion, learning to

problematize is a valuable skill for enabling coaches to develop innovative practices and for

improving their critical thinking. Furthermore, problematization can prompt coaches to be

critical of the knowledge they receive. Avner et al. (2017) supported this position when they

explained,

> [problematization] is not about being negative or pessimistic. Rather, it is about
>
> understanding that all coaching knowledges and practices have their uses, but also their
>
> dangers and problematic effects and that a commitment to mitigating these dangers
>
> should be a priority for all of us involved in coach education and development. (p. 108)

Summary

Importantly, through this research project I made no attempt to evaluate the impact of

the workshop on the coaches' effectiveness or on their athletes' performances. Rather, I was

interested in understanding the differing perspectives of the workshop participants and how

these perspectives shaped the fragmented reality of this workshop. Accordingly, this analysis

and discussion provided rich insights concerning how these coaches perceived the

poststructuralist-informed learning environment and how they experienced the opportunity to

explore, develop and implement Foucauldian-informed coaching practices. On that note, each

coach seemed to engage with problematization to differing degrees, which could have been influenced by the workshop's learning environment, the coaches' own unique educational backgrounds, their currents needs and interests, as well as their past experiences as coaches and former athletes.

Furthermore, throughout the workshop it was apparent that the dominant discourses surrounding coach development (including the depiction of learners as passive and the prevalence of sport science knowledge) continued to circulate and impact the happenings within the workshop. Nevertheless, by the end of the second session it appeared that the coaches were being supported in developing their critical thinking and in creating innovative coaching practices. All in all, I believe this analysis and discussion can be a springboard to prompt further exploration of coach learning through a poststructuralist lens and encourage the development of innovative outlets that support coaches in learning to 'think with Foucault'. In the next chapter I will summarize these findings and provide suggestions for future studies to expand on this research.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

My thesis research project is unique in that it has focused on mobilizing social theory within coaching courses, which typically prioritize conventional sport science curriculums (Avner et al., 2017; Denison, 2010; Pringle, 2007). Accordingly, I designed and implemented a coaching workshop that was intended to introduce coaches to the skill of problematization. Doing so enabled me to gain a greater understanding of how four youth sport coaches' experienced the workshop's Foucauldian-informed content and poststructuralist learning environment. Through implementing and analyzing the happenings of this workshop, it became clear that multiple, fragmented perspectives shaped the reality of this workshop. Thus, despite all of the participants attending the same sessions at the same time, each coach experienced the workshop differently. This reinforced that it is infeasible to have 'best', 'universal' pedagogical approaches and reiterates that the insights gained from this research cannot be generalized to all coaches, learning facilitators, and/or learning environments (Markula & Pringle, 2006; Nelson et al., 2016). Therefore, rather than conveying that I could, or would, develop a new 'gold standard' for coaching courses, my intent has been to elicit social change by prompting thoughtful consideration concerning the value for coaches to 'think with Foucault', and to encourage further exploration of coach development outlets that have the potential to enable this.

Correspondingly, challenging and changing some of the taken-for-granted assumptions underlying typical coaching courses, revealed new possibilities and opportunities for facilitating learning (Jones et al., 2016). Additionally, using a poststructuralist philosophical framework and a Foucauldian theoretical perspective have provided a unique lens that has allowed me to gain

a better understanding of how the changes I made had both facilitative (enabling) and constraining (limiting) effects. These effects were revealed through my Foucauldian poststructuralist theory-based analysis of the participants' guided reflective journals and my own field notes, where I identified two main themes. The two themes included: 1) implementing a Foucauldian-informed coaching workshop, which elaborates on the workshop's learning environment, and 2) engaging in problematization, which explores the understandability and applicability of the workshop's content. Accordingly, to conclude this thesis I will first summarize my research findings as they relate to each of these themes. I will then suggest some potential directions for future coach development efforts and make recommendations for further research within the area of coach learning. Lastly, I will close with my final thoughts.

Findings

Prior to implementing my coaching workshop I thoroughly reviewed the coach education literature, where it became clear that conventional coach learning environments, which often view the coach learners as inactive 'recipients' of knowledge, disseminate standardized, 'objective' curriculums, and lack follow-up support, were not meeting the needs of the coach learners (Cushion, 2011). Furthermore, by assessing the interplay of power and knowledge I recognized the potential for these underlying assumptions to have constraining effects on coach learners and coach educators, which may explain why these courses have been receiving so much criticism within the existing coach education literature. Accordingly, after challenging some of the dominant assumptions underlying typical coaching courses and in an effort to overcome their potentially constraining effects, I decided to create a Foucauldian-

informed learning environment, as Foucault's work has been credited with the potential to expand the boundaries of education (Markula & Pringle, 2006). In what follows, I will elaborate on the how the workshop played out by summarizing my findings.

Through analyzing the first theme, implementing a Foucauldian-informed coaching workshop, I found that taking on the role of a learning facilitator, adopting a poststructuralist view of learning, incorporating a one-week break, and acknowledging the unique backgrounds of the coaches, all meaningfully influenced the happenings within the workshop, in both facilitative and constraining ways. More specifically, taking on the role of a learning facilitator enabled me to introduce new concepts to the coaches and ensured the learning activities progressed in a timely fashion, which had facilitative effects. However, I noticed that there were times when my own objectives outshone the prioritizing of coach learning, which had constraining effects on learning (I will revisit this later on in this section). Nevertheless, adopting a poststructuralist view of learning prompted me to utilize a variety of interactive learning activities, which facilitated the coaches to be active participants in their own learning. Additionally, having coaches from different sporting disciplines created a multi-sport learning environment that promoted collaboration and prompted the coaches to critically question their sport-specific practices.

While adopting a poststructuralist view of learning allowed the coaches to actively participate, I noticed that the coach-led, collaborative learning activities had the potential to be both facilitative and constraining. Thus at times I was left wondering how to promote facilitative interactions between coaches, while still exercising power ethically. This question

still needs to be explored further as the happenings within the workshop reaffirmed that coaches having discussions with one another can have facilitative effects, such as when they prompt critical thought. However, these exchanges also have the potential to reinforce ineffective practices, which can limit learning (Armour & Yelling, 2007; Nelson et al., 2016). Regardless, my decision to incorporate a one-week break between the workshop sessions seemed to have facilitating effects, where the break helped to account for the complexities of the workshop's content and provided more opportunities for the participants to reflect on, and contextualize the content. The break also allowed the second session to act as a follow-up support outlet, where the coaches could be supported in overcoming any confusion or points of contention. From the participants' reflective journals, however, it appeared that a shorter break and/or additional follow-up support would have had further facilitative effects on their learning.

In addition to these intentional changes, the workshop was also influenced by the dominant discourses, which invisibly directed the coaches' thoughts, actions and perceptions of the workshop. This guiding influence became evident through the coaches' perceptions that their active participation was inappropriate and from their desire to receive 'universal', 'ready-made', 'quick fixes' for their coaching problems, which had constraining effects on learning. In addition to these dominant discourses influencing the coach participants, this same role determining, modernist-driven discourse was directing my thoughts and actions as the learning facilitator, in a constraining manner. This became apparent through my perceived need to have 'objective', singly 'right' answers for the participants' questions, my reliance on time to dictate the progression of the learning activities (rather than the individual learning pace of the

coaches), and through my discomfort with the coach-led discussions that went 'off-topic'. After analyzing the empirical material and revisiting the coaching literature, I feel that I could have more effectively facilitated learning if I would have acted on Nelson et al.'s (2016) recommendation to respond, question and, at times, challenge the experience-related stories that the coaches brought to the learning environment. This would have been appropriate to do, as being a Foucauldian does not mean that 'anything goes', rather this theoretical lens emphasizes the importance of being sensitive to the needs and differences of the learners, challenging norms, and continually assessing the effects of power.

Bringing greater considerations to the needs and differences of the learners, during the workshop it became apparent the each coach's unique background influenced his/her experience in, and perceptions of, the workshop, which had facilitating and constraining effects. A coach's background can include one's sporting culture, his/her previous learning experiences, prior exposure to social theory, as well as his/her own interests, needs and experiences as a coach. It seemed this particular workshop was more facilitative for those participants who had more education, previous exposure to social theory and more coaching experience, compared to those with fewer of these experiences. However, this finding would not hold true in all contexts. Acknowledging these unique backgrounds highlights how designing and implementing coaching workshops can be a complex task. As such, I believe learning facilitators could benefit from having a Foucauldian sensibility, which could enable them to live comfortably within the fragmented reality of each learning environment. Additionally, a Foucauldian outlook could allow learning facilitators to honor knowledge as

subjective and socially constructed, which can help them to truly support learning, in ways that move beyond simply disseminating knowledge.

The second theme, engaging in problematization, primarily focused on the participants' perceptions of the Foucauldian-informed content. Accordingly, this research project provided support showing that social theory can be introduced to coaches in relevant, understandable, applicable ways. This counters the common perception that social theory concepts are too abstract to be applicable. Furthermore, this research illustrated that social theory, or more specifically aiding coaches in learning to problematize, holds great promise for overcoming the 'education' verses 'training' debate (concerning the purpose of coaching courses) that exists within the current coaching literature (Cushion & Nelson, 2013). Although each coach participant engaged in problematizing to varying extents, it seemed that they all felt it was a thought-provoking task. Furthermore, learning to problematize can enable coaches to develop practical strategies that can be readily implemented within their own coaching contexts. Supporting this, in their reflective journals the coaches explained that problematizing their 'normal' practices prompted them to develop, and in some cases employ, innovative practices that allowed them to be 'in-the-moment' and attentive to the needs of their athletes. Additionally, Dean's reflective journal indicated that despite Foucault's work prompting a critical eye, problematizing can support and provide justification for informed coaching practices, especially if they are not congruent with the 'norms' of the sport. Thus, using Foucauldian-informed content exemplified how coaching courses can encourage critical, creative and practical coach development, which moves away from the critique that coaching courses simply indoctrinate coach learners to think and act in the same ways (Piggott, 2012).

However, during the workshop I did struggle to emphasis the distinct nuances of the Foucauldian informed concepts. This was shown through the participants' tendency to draw parallels between Foucault's concepts and their existing sport psychology knowledge. While these comparisons may have facilitated the coaches in initially understanding the concepts, the coaches were not facilitated to recognize and appreciate how the content was different from their existing knowledge, which would have required them to develop an entirely different framework specific to this social theory.

Nevertheless, an innovative learning activity was developed through the unplanned happenings of this workshop, which was revealed when the coaches began to critically question the actions and behaviors of their former coaches. This occurrence suggests that having coaches problematize the practices of their former coaches could facilitate learning and may be extremely useful for aiding coaches in contextualizing content, especially for those who have less experience to draw from. However, the fact that the coaches were initially reluctant to problematize their own role as a coach reaffirmed Denison's (2010) work, where he explained that problematizing can be a uncomfortable, potentially threatening task. Accordingly, when attempting to facilitate coaches in learning to problematize, it is important to allow space for coaches to become comfortable with their vulnerability. Lastly, the two-session workshop did not successfully emphasize the utility of drawing from multiple knowledges, as was seen by the coaches' perceptions that problematizing was meant to 'replace' their existing planning practices. Therefore, I feel coaches could benefit from having repeated content exposure and from receiving continual support, especially when learning about complex concepts such as problematization.

Overall, when developing coach learning opportunities it is important to acknowledge that obstacles will arise. This holds true even for individuals, like myself, who strive to exercise power in less dominating ways and are passionate about evoking marginalized knowledges. Nevertheless, challenging these conventional practices and taking on the associated obstacles has the potential to enhance coaches' learning experiences, which could boost coaches' effectiveness and in turn improve their athletes' performances. Therefore, even though challenging the assumptions underlying conventional coach learning contexts is an immense task that can be ridden with obstacles, researchers, sport organizations, learning facilitators and coaches all need to continually challenge the dominant discourses that drive these environments. Although this workshop was not implemented 'perfectly', it did illustrate that even subtle changes to the dominant assumptions underlying coach learning can allow for innovative opportunities that will likely influence coaches' and learning facilitators' behaviors, perceptions and experiences in future coach learning contexts.

Future Directions

Throughout this research project I tried to challenge some of the assumptions surrounding conventional coach learning contexts, however, obstacles arouse due to the inherent, dynamic, power-laden complexities of learning environments. Therefore, I believe learning facilitators could benefit from adopting a poststructuralist lens, which could enhance their awareness of the discrete, subtle workings of power and knowledge. As such, I recommend that outlets be developed to support learning facilitators in finding comfort with ambiguity, adopting a relational view of power and embracing a subjective understanding of knowledge. Doing so could enable learning facilitators to answer participants' questions

without a definitive, universally applicable answer. Similarly, I believe learning facilitators

should receive guidance that helps them become attentive to the needs and learning pace of

the attendees. This could help to ensure that learning facilitators do not view learners as a

homogenous group or conceptualize learning as a universal process. Instead, learning

facilitators would be prepared to acknowledge the unique knowledge and experiences of the

coach participants. Building off of Nelson et al.'s (2016) recommendation, this training could

also prepare learning facilitators to respond, question and even challenge the narratives a

coach brings to a given learning environment, in an effort to facilitate the coaches in

deconstructing their habitual practices and assumptions.

When it comes to designing future coach learning opportunities, I recommend that

workshop developers explore ways to provide the coach attendees with continued support.

Similar to my workshop, this could include incorporating one, or more, breaks between the

workshop sessions. Alternatively, developing and incorporating an online discussion board

could provide continued support. Offering another suggestion, Armour and Yelling (2007)

recommended that courses explore potential ways to incorporate professional communities

that foster facilitative informal learning.

Potential Research Directions

This research project was unique in that it involved designing and implementing a

coaching workshop. Supporting this project's structure, Lyle (2018) explained that research,

where "interventions are 'tested' in situ and in the context of real-life goals and constrains" (p.

2), can be extremely valuable as the findings can readily be implemented. In addition to

advocating for 'application-based research' (such as this project), Lyle went on to suggest that case studies, action research and co-produced research should be conducted, as these methodologies also produce transferable and usable findings. I would like to echo Lyle's suggestion and advocate for this recommendation to be acted upon. For example, utilizing a case study methodology could allow research to be done in natural settings, where the case itself is of interest (intrinsic) or where studying the case can generate insights into the general context surrounding it (instrumental) (Markula & Silk, 2011). Similarly, participatory action research (PAR), which relies on the critical paradigm's assumptions, combines both of Lyle's recommendations for action research and co-constructed research. Advantageously, case studies and PAR can provide rich insights into the social world as they involve recognizing social, political and other context-specific factors. Accordingly, the outputs of these methodologies have practical relevance, which could inform policy and practice. Although both of these methodologies aim to transform theory and practice, future researchers working from the poststructuralist paradigm (as this research project did) will be well-placed to assess the interplay of power and knowledge, and recognize the effects (intentional and not) associated with their 'intervention'.

Being able to assess the interplay of power and knowledge within my workshop intervention reaffirmed that a coach's unique background may influence his/her ability, willingness and/or readiness to utilize and contextualize the Foucauldian-informed workshop content. Accordingly, I feel further research is needed that explores how coaches' backgrounds shape their learning experiences. Offering some direction for this prospective research, Oldridge et al. (2016) recommended, "asking coach learners to consider the critical incidents,

people, and phases of time that have informed their learning, as well as assisting them to deconstruct the wider discourses, language, and other cultural means that have influenced their thinking" (p. 265), as one potential strategy to better understand this impact.

While there is no denying that facilitating coaches in learning to 'think with Foucault', by introducing the skill of problematization, has been a worthwhile, insightful pursuit, I feel Foucault's work has much more to offer coaches. For instance, Denison and Mills (2017) explained that, "coaching with Foucault would mean coaching with an awareness and sensitivity of how one is using his or her power" (p. 113). Acting on this, a potential follow-up study could involve creating a learning environment that is designed to introduce coaches to Foucault's concepts concerning disciplinary power, including the associated techniques and instruments. In doing so, it would be important that these concepts are introduced in a manner that engages the coach learners as active participants in the learning process and provides opportunities for them to contextualize the concepts. Facilitating the coaches in first adopting the view of power as relational and knowledge as subjective (as this workshop did), may be a valuable and sensible prerequisite to facilitating coaches in learning about Foucault's disciplinary techniques. However, embracing a poststructuralist lens allows for exploration beyond the view of learning as a linear, sequential process.

Along these lines, more research is needed that continues to challenge the dominant, one dimensional understanding of learning within coach education and development. Challenging this conventional view of learning can allow for a more nuanced, comprehensive understanding of the factors that can influence learning. Importantly, simply replacing or

substituting one set of dominant practices with another is not enough to destabilize

problematic relations of power (Denison & Avner, 2011; Mills & Denison, 2013). Therefore, to

truly challenge the dominant assumptions surrounding coach learning, I recommend expanding

the theoretical lenses that are utilized to research and develop coach-learning opportunities.

Exploring alternative theoretical lenses could effectively broaden our understandings of

teaching, learning and knowledge. For instance, Deleuze's work offers a number of exciting

opportunities that I believe have the potential to enrich coach-learning outlets (Pringle & Landi,

2017). Supporting this suggestion, through her ethnographic study as a Pilate's instructor,

Markula (2011) has illustrated that movement instructors can benefit from adopting a

Deleuzian theoretical lens.

Furthermore, acknowledging that my research project has only problematized and

challenged the underlying assumptions surrounding formal learning settings (such as

workshops and/or courses), it would be a worthwhile pursuit for researchers to problematize

and reconceptualize coach learning in a diverse array of environments. These might include

mentoring, online modules, or communities of practice. Broadening the scope of coach learning

contexts, supports the poststructuralist view that learning is a composition of fluid, socio-

culturally embedded practices, where learning episodes do not occur in isolation of each other

(Jones et al., 2016).

Final Thoughts

In closing, disrupting the taken-for-granted assumptions surrounding coach learning can

create new possibilities and ways to understand, participate and design coach learning outlets. I

believe questioning dominant coach development practices and exploring alternative ways to

facilitate coaches to act innovatively, could initiate this. Correspondingly, challenging and

changing these assumptions can create space for coaches to embrace the dynamic nature of

sport and a subjective view of knowledge, which can allow for a broader (less constraining)

understanding of how to coach 'effectively'. Conversely, without an enhanced awareness of the

workings of power and knowledge, coaches are left to be just a "slightly larger cog in the

machine" (Shogan, 1999, p. 40), who are constrained to uncritically employing ineffective

practices, which likely have problematic effects.

Opportunistically, adopting a Foucauldian lens can aid us in moving away from

positioning coaches as subject matter 'experts' who unproblematically coach in systematic,

knowable and controllable ways. To date, this undisrupted depiction of coaches has strongly

influenced how typical coach learning environments are designed, and thus has informed how

coaches coach. However, 'thinking with Foucault' emphasises the need for coaches to be in an

informed position where they are able to recognize the unintended consequences of their

actions, are encouraged to experiment, and are able to adapt their practices innovatively and

creatively. Furthermore, when these innovative practices support athletes in being creative,

independent, decisions makers, athletes are given the opportunity to truly perform in exquisite

ways (Shogan, 1999). To facilitate this, researchers, coach education developers, sport

organizations and coaches need to work together to challenge the taken-for-granted

assumptions surrounding coach learning and explore innovative alternatives. Correspondingly, I

believe this research project has provided a springboard to prompt further exploration of

innovative coach learning opportunities that account for the social, cultural and historical

factors of a specific learning context. Acknowledging and accounting for these wider social

factors can provide fresh, new insights that have the potential to enrich coach learning.

References

American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreations, and Dance. (2013). Position

statement: Maximizing the benefits of youth sport. *Journal of Physical Education,*

Recreation, and Dance, 84(7), 8-13.

Armour, K. M., & Yelling, M. R. (2004). Continuing professional development for experienced

physical education teachers: Towards effective provision. *Sport, Education and Society*,

9(1), 95-114. doi: 10.1080/1357332042000175836

Armour, K. M., & Yelling, M. R. (2007). Effective professional development for physical

education teachers: The role of informal, collaborative learning. *Journal of Teaching in*

Physical Education, 26, 177-200.

Avner, Z., Markula, P., & Denison, J. (2017). Understanding effective coaching: A Foucauldian

reading of current coach education frameworks. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, *4*,

101-109.

Balyi, I., Way, R., & Higgs, C. (2013). Long-term athlete development model. In Balyi, I., Way,

R., & Higgs, C, *Long-term athlete development* (pp. 5-17) Windsor, ON: Human

Kinetics.

Barker-Ruchti, N., & Tinning, R. (2010). Foucault in leotards: Corporeal discipline in women's

artistic gymnastics. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, *27*, 229–250.

Cassidy, T. G., Jones, R. L., & Potrac, P. (2004). *Understanding sports coaching: The social,*

cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice. New York: Routledge.

Coaching Association of Canada. (2018). The National Coaching Certification Program. Retrieved

from https://www.coach.ca/coach-training-in-canada-s15408

Cushion, C. (2011). Coach and athlete learning. In R. L. Jones, P. Potrac, C. Cushion, & L. T.

Ronglan, (Eds.), *The sociology of sports coaching* (pp. 166-178). London: Routledge.

Cushion, C., 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., & Nelson, L. (2013). Coach education and learning. In P. Potrac, W. Gilbert, & J.

Denison (Eds.), The *Routledge handbook of sports coaching* (pp. 359–374). New York:

Routledge.

Denison, J. (2007). Social theory for coaches: A Foucauldian reading of one athlete's poor

performance. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, *2*, 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*, 209–227.

Denison, J., & Mills, J. P. (2014). Planning for distance running: Coaching with Foucault. *Sports

Coaching Review, 3*(1), 1–16. doi: 10.1080/21640629.2014.953005

Denison, J. & Mills, J. P. (2017). (High-) performance sports. In D. Andrews, M. Silk and H.

Thorpe (Eds.), *The Routledge handbook of physical cultural studies*. (pp. 111-118).

London: Routledge

Denison, J., Mills, J. P., & Jones, L. (2013). Effective coaching as a modernist formation: A Foucauldian critique. In P. Potrac, W. Gilbert & J. Denison (Eds.), The *Routledge handbook of sports coaching* (pp. 388-399). New York: Routledge.

Denison, J., Mills J. P., & Konoval, T. (2015a). Sports' disciplinary legacy and the challenge of 'coaching differently'. *Sport, Education and Society*, *22*(6) 1-12. doi:10.1080/13573322.2015.1061986

Denison, J., Pringle, R., Cassidy, T., & Hessian, P. (2015b). Informing coaches' practices: Toward 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. In R. L. Jones, P. Potrac, C. Cushion, & L. T. Ronglan (Eds.), *The sociology of sports coaching* (pp. 27-39). London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (1988) 'The Concern for Truth', in L.D. Kritzman (ed.) *Michel Foucault Politics, Philosophy, Culture: Interviews and Other Writing 1977–1984*, London: Routledge. SEP

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York, NY: Vintage.

Guskey, T. R. (2002). Professional development and teacher change. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, *8*(3), 381–391.

Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. In S. Hall (Eds.), *Representation: Cultural*

   representations and signifying practices (pp. 1-63). London: Sage.

Harwood, C., & Johnston, J. (2013). Positive youth development and talent development. In N.

   Holt (Eds.), *Positive youth development through sport (2nd ed.).* (pp. 113-125). New

   York: Routledge.

Heroux, D. (2017, December 7). Rachel Homan's secret weapon is a curling coach who doesn't

   really coach curling. *Canadian Broadcasting Corporation*. Retrieved from

   http://www.cbc.ca/sports/olympics/winter/curling/rachel-homan-coach-adam-

   kingsbury-1.4437630

Hills, L., & Kennedy, E. (2013). Ready, set action: Representations of coaching through film. In P.

   Potrac, W. Gilbert, & J. Denison (Eds.), The *Routledge handbook of sports coaching* (pp.

   40-51). New York: Routledge.

Jacobs, F., Claringbould, I., & Knoppers, A. (2016). Becoming a 'good coach'. *Sport, Education*

   and Society, 21(3), 411-430. doi:10.1080/13573322.2014.927756

Jolly, S., & Lyle, J. (2016). The traditional, the ideal and the unexplored: Sport coaches' social

   identity constructs in film. *Sports Coaching Review*, *5*(1), 41-53.

Jones, R. L., (2006). The sports coach as educator: Reconceptualising sports coaching*.

   International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 1*(4), 405-412.

Jones, R. L., & Armour, K. M. (2000). The practical heart within: The value of a sociology of

    sport. In Jones, R. L., & Armour, K. M. (Eds.), *Sociology of sport: Theory and practice*

    (pp. 1-12). Essex, England: Longman Pub Group.

Jones, R. L., Armour , K. M., & Potrac, P. (2002). Understanding the coaching process: A

    framework for social analysis. *Quest*, *54*, 34-48.

Jones, R. L., Denison, J., & Gearity, B. (2016). Robin Usher: A post-structuralist reading of

    learning in coaching. In L. Nelson, R. Groom, & P. Potrac. (Eds.), *Learning in sports*

    coaching: Theory and application (pp. 161-175). London: Routledge.

Lange, C., Costley, J., & Han, S., H. (2016). Informal cooperative learning in small groups: The

    effects of scaffolding on participation. *Issues in Educational Research, 26*(2), 260-279.

Lyle, L. (2018). The transferability of sport coaching research: A critical commentary. *Quest*, in

    press, 1-19. doi: 10.1080/00336297.2018.1453846

Mallett, C. J. (2010). Becoming a high-performance coach: Pathways and communities. In J.

    Lyle & C. Cushion (Eds.), *Sports coaching: Professionalisation and practice* (pp. 119-

    134). Toronto: Elsevier Ltd.

Markula, P. (2011). 'Folding' a feminist intervention in mindful fitness. In E. Kennedy & P.

    Markula (Eds.), *Women and exercise* (pp. 60-79). New York: Routledge.

Markula, P., & Martin, M. (2007). Ethical coaching: Gaining respect in the field. In J. Denison

    (Eds.), *Coaching knowledges: Understanding the dynamics of sport performance* (pp.

    51–82). Oxford: AC Black.

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

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

McMahon, J., Penney, D., & Dinan-Thompson, M. (2012). 'Body practices—exposure and effect of a sporting culture?' Stories from three Australian swimmers. *Sport, Education and Society*, *17*, 181 – 206. doi: 10.1080/13573322.2011.607949

Miles, A. (2011). Sport and positive youth development. In I. Stafford (Ed.), *Coaching Children in Sport* (pp. 109–120). London: Routledge.

Mills, J. P., & Denison, J. (2013). Coach Foucault: Problematizing endurance running coaches' practices. *Sports Coaching Review*, *2*, 136–150. doi: 10.1080/21640629.2014.913871

Mills, J. P., & Denison, J. (2016, June 27). Beginning to coach with power: Power, philosophy, programming, pedagogy & practice. Retrieved from http://www.mcmillanspeed.com/2016/06/beginning-to-coach-with- power-in-mind.html

Nelson, L., Cushion, C., & Potrac, P. (2013). Enhancing the provision of coach education: The recommendations of UK coaching practitioners. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *18*(2), 204-218. doi: 10.1080/17408989.2011.649725

Nelson, L., Potrac, P., & Groom, R. (2016). Conclusion: Recognizing the dimensions and tensions of learning in coaching. In L. Nelson, R. Groom, & P. Potrac. (Eds.), *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application* (pp. 227-237). London: Routledge.

Oldridge, L., Nelson, L., Greenough, K., & Potrac, P. (2016). The interplay between learning, knowledge, biography and practice: The tale of an experienced track & field athletics coach. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, *3*, 257-268. doi: 10.1123/iscj.2016-0020

Piggott, D. (2012). Coaches' experiences of formal coach education: A critical sociological investigation. *Sport, Education and Society, 17*(4), 535-554. doi: 10.1080/13573322.2011.608949

Potrac, P., & Cassidy, T. (2006). The coach as a 'more capable other'. In R. L. Jones (Eds.), *The sports coach as educator: Re-conceptualising sports coaching* (pp. 39-50). New York; Routledge

Pringle, R. (2007). Social Theory for coaches: A Foucauldian reading of one athlete's poor performance a commentary. *International Journal of Sport Science and Coaching, 2*(4), 365- 393.

Pringle, R. (2009). Defamiliarizing heavy-contact sports: Critical examination of rugby, discipline, and pleasure. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, *26*, 211-234.

Pringle, R., & Crocket, H. (2013). Coaching with Foucault. In P. Potrac, W. Gilbert & J. Denison (Eds.), The *Routledge handbook of sports coaching* (pp. 16-26). New York: Routledge.

Pringle, R. & Landi, D. (2017). Re-reading Deleuze and Guattari's a thousand plataus. *Annals of Leisure Research, 20*(1), 117-122. doi: 10.108/11745398.2016.1204138

Ritchie, I. (2015). Sociological theories of sport. In J. Crossman & J. Scherer (Eds.), *Social dimensions of Canadian sport and physical activity* (pp. 19-41). Toronto: Pearson.

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

Taylor, W. (2014). Analysis of qualitative data. In L. Nelson, R. Groom, & P. Potrac (Eds.), *Research methods in sports coaching (*pp. 181-191). New York: Routledge.

Tuckett, A,, & Stewart, D. (2004). Collecting qualitative data: Part I journal as a method: Experience, rationale and limitations. *Contemporary Nurse, 16*(1-2), 103-113.

Turnnidge, J., Evans, B., Vierimaa, M., Allan, V., & Côté, J. (2016). Coaching for positive youth development. In N. Holt (Eds.), *Positive youth development through sport (2nd ed.).* (pp. 137-150). New York: Routledge.

Wallin, P., Adawi, T., & Gold, J. (2016, June). *Reflective diaries- a tool for promoting and probing student learning*. Paper presented at the 12th International CDIO Conference, Turku, Finland.

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

Appendix A

Journaling Guidelines

- Journaling is not about producing the 'right' answer, rather the purpose is to engage with your own thoughts, questions and emotions
- Your responses will inform this research project however, you will remain anonymous in all research deliverables
- I am genuinely interested in your unique perspectives, experiences and ideas concerning the workshop, its content and your application of the content
- All input is valuable
- You do not have to answer every question, the questions are provided to prompt your thoughts if you are struggling to get started
- Your thoughts may come in the form of questions, not answers, which is also valuable
- Thoughts do not have to be linear, allow your thoughts to wonder and flow freely

Journal Entry #1

Take 10-20mins to reflect on today's workshop session:

1. Describe what happened in today's workshop session

2. Provide your perception of the session- include any thoughts and reactions you had during the workshop as well as the reflections that you have now

   - Were the tasks easy or difficult? Was the content interesting? New? Entertaining? Irrelevant? What did you liked or not like? What would you change, keep, or get rid of? Did your feelings change throughout the session?

3. Consider how the workshop content relates to your own coaching or training environment

   - Djonoes the content/ideas discussed in the workshop relate to your coaching? In what ways does the conent not relate? Has the content presented in the workshop changed your feelings, perceptions, and/or how you think about coaching and performance? Do you have reservations about any of the content or about your own coaching?

Journal Entry #2

Take 10-20mins to reflect on the first workshop session and your coaching experiences:

1. Describe a recent training session

2. Reflect on the content discussed in the first workshop session and connect it to your own coaching

   - What coaching habits or logics do you rely on? When and how do you use them? How is this reflected through your language/word choice and actions? Are there certain

qualities that you value more in your athletes over others? What potential unintended effects could result from the coaching practices you use? Can you describe a time you have coached a passive, disengaged, docile athletes? How would your athletes perceive your coaching?

Journal Entry #3

Take 10-20mins to reflect on today's workshop session:

1. Describe what happened in today's workshop session

2. Provide your perception of the session- include any thoughts and reactions you had during the workshop as well as the reflections that you have now

   • Were the tasks easy or difficult? Was the content interesting? Informative? Entertaining? Irrelevant? What did you liked or not like? What would you change, keep, or get rid of? Did your feelings change throughout the session?

3. Consider how the workshop content relates to your own coaching or training environment

   • Does the content/ideas discussed in the workshop session relate to your coaching? In what ways does the content not relate? Has the content presented in the workshop changed your feelings, perceptions, and/or how you think about coaching and performance? Do you have reservations about any of the content or about your own coaching?

Journal Entry #4

Take 10-20mins to reflect on the workshop sessions and your coaching experiences:

1. Describe your week of coaching (planning, practices, performance, interactions)

   • What occurred? How do you feel about the coaching week? What language/word choice/analogies did you use? Did your actions match your perceptions of your coaching? How were they incongruent? What knowledges informed your practices/behaviors?

2. Explain your perceptions on how the workshop content relates to your own coaching

   • Are there any patterns or habits that you noticed with your coaching? Have you problematized your training environments? What have you discovered? If you haven't problematized your practice discuss that.

   • Have you tried applying any innovative practices within your coaching environment? What were you trying to achieve? What went well, could be improved, and/or did not work? What were the positive/negative consequences? What were the reactions of the

athletes? Parents? Other coaches? What challenges did you face? Did you find ways to overcome these challenges?

3. Provide your overall perceptions of this learning experience, express any and all thoughts you may have

- What are your perceptions of the course, instructor, learning activities, learning environment and content? Do you feel participating in this course has changed your ways of knowing or revealed anything new?

- Any other thoughts?