What can Foucault tell us about Fun in Sport?

A Foucauldian Critical Examination of the Discursive Production and Deployment of Fun within

Varsity Coaching Contexts

by

Zoë Avner

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

Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation

University of Alberta

Abstract

Fun is a concept of growing importance in sport and in sport coaching research (e.g., Bigelow et al. 2001; Mastrich, 2002; Small, 2002; Smoll et al., 1988; Thompson, 1997; 2003). Fun, and especially fun in sport, is generally understood not only as being unproblematic but also as being inherently desirable. This doctoral research project challenges this dominant positive understanding of fun through a critical examination of the role of fun within varsity sporting contexts. Unlike most of the sport psychology and positive coaching researchers on this topic (e.g., Allen, 2003; Bigelow et al., 2001; McCarthy & Jones, 2007), I did not seek to gain a better understanding of what fun *is*, or the 'essence' of fun: a concept generally defined as a positive state associated with emotions such as enjoyment. Rather, I sought to understand what fun *does*: to problematize its strategic deployment and effects as a political technology within the power relations of varsity sport.

I drew on the work of French poststructuralist philosopher Michel Foucault and his concept of power/knowledge (1978) to address my dissertation's aim and focus on how coaches understand fun and articulate their training practices related to fun within varsity coaching contexts. I first conducted a Foucauldian discourse analysis of two key coaching websites and their endorsed programs: the NCCP (National Coaching Certification Program) found on the Coaching Association of Canada (CAC) website, and the LTAD (Long Term Athlete Development model) found on the Canadian Sport for Life (CS4L) website. In addition, I conducted 10 semi-structured individual interviews with varsity coaches at a Canadian university.

My results showed that the humanistic concept of fun is currently strategically deployed to naturalize the unproblematic reproduction of dominant scientific, competitive, and

individualizing discourses. The current uses of fun support the reproduction of unbalanced power relations within varsity sporting contexts by enabling coaches' authority over athletes' training and competing. As a result, current dominant 'effective' coaching practices (e.g., periodization) and their problematic disciplinary and normalizing effects (e.g., athlete docility) are reified. Furthermore, other ways of knowing and practicing sport coaching and training (e.g., flow) are marginalized. Foucault (1983) claimed that all social practices are dangerous and need to be problematized. My dissertation's results show that fun needs to be continuously interrogated for its problematic disciplinary and normalizing effects and re-contextualized within the present power/knowledge nexus of varsity sport. Furthermore, critical coaching frameworks, which re-politicize all coaching knowledge and practices, need to be developed and integrated within formal coach education programs in order for fun to support the development of more innovative, ethical, and effective coaching and sporting practices within varsity sporting contexts.

Preface

This dissertation is an original work by Zoë Avner. The research project, of which this dissertation is a part, received ethics approval from the University of Alberta Research Ethics Board, "Fun and coaching in varsity sport", Pro00028273, 30/04/2013.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this dissertation to my family, my parents Jane and Philip Avner, my

brother Paolo, and my sister Elise. I love you.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisory committee, Dr James Denison, Dr Pirkko Markula, and Dr Chloë Taylor for all their care and support during my PhD program. I am immensely grateful for all the opportunities they provided me and for their thorough and passionate engagement with my work.

I would also like to thank my colleagues in the socio-cultural department in the faculty of Physical Education and Recreation for their support and generosity throughout my doctoral journey.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

Fun is deeply ingrained in our communal understanding and in the language we have to talk about sport. Dating back to Huizinga (1950) and his classical book *Homo Ludens*, scholars have taken an interest in theorizing fun/enjoyment in sport, play, and physical activity settings. The overarching belief that guides this scholarly interest is that the essence of sport and play is enjoyment or more importantly perhaps that it *should* be about fun/enjoyment (e.g., Bigelow et al. 2001; Mastrich, 2002; Small, 2002; Smoll et al., 1988). Over the last few decades, a body of expert knowledge has constituted itself around the articulated concern to 'bring the fun back in sport' by challenging a win at all cost mentality thought to be prevalent in professional sport and to have permeated and denatured youth sport (e.g., Sabock & Sabock, 2008; Smoll & Smith, 1987; Thompson, 1997, 2003). The concept of fun seems a priori to stand in stark opposition to the concept of sporting discipline, and as such, governmentally endorsed sporting and coaching frameworks (e.g., LTAD, 2012) to reactivate fun in sport have widely been read as moral and logical reactions to the well-documented excesses of high-performance sporting disciplines and of professional sport (e.g., Cahill & Pearl, 1993; Clifford & Feezell, 2010; Hyman, 2009). Fun and especially fun in sport is, thus, generally understood not only as being unproblematic but also as being inherently desirable. While most people generally think of fun as innocuous and desirable; as sport scholar Jackson (2000) argued, fun is also a 'slippery fuzzy term', which lacks conceptual clarity. As a result, scholars invested in the fields of sport, physical activity, and physical education have worked to define and conceptualize what fun is and what it means to different people in various sporting contexts in order to enhance their positive experiences. Notably, fun has been taken up as a central concept in the sport psychology literature on motivation (e.g., Allen, 2003; Griffin et al, 1993; Jackson, 2000; Mandigo & Couture, 1996;

McCarthy & Jones, 2007; Newton & Duda, 1993; Scanlan & Lethwaite, 1986; Wankel & Sefton, 1989) and in the sport psychology based literature on coaching effectiveness and leadership (e.g., Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Smith & Smoll, 1997; Smoll, Cumming, & Smith, 2011; Smoll & Smith, 2006; Turman, 2003; Vella et al., 2010).

My academic interest in the topic of fun in sport is, in contrast, spurred on by my personal experience as a former high-performance soccer player whose experiences of fun in high-performance sport did not always match up to these commonly held views of fun as innocuous and unproblematic. For example, as a high-performance athlete I was repeatedly made to feel that if I did not have fun in the context of becoming a highly disciplined and productive sporting body, then it meant that I did not have the 'right' mental makeup to play at the highest level of the game. Fun was, thus, used within my high-performance sporting context as a tool to naturalize various sporting and coaching practices and also as a tool to limit critical reflection and potential dissent. Rather than being straightforward and unproblematic, fun had silencing and oppressive effects, which only accentuated the unequal distribution of power within my specific sporting context. It was only through being exposed to the work of French philosopher Michel Foucault that I was able to start critically reflecting on my ambiguous personal experiences as a former high-performance athlete. It was against this critical background that I became interested in understanding how fun is experienced and used within various sporting contexts and how developing such knowledge could lead to the development of more ethical and effective coaching and sporting practices.

While the concept of fun in sport has mostly been theorized within the disciplinary boundaries of the positive sport psychology and coaching literature, the related concept of 'pleasure movement' (Booth, 2009; Hawkins; 2008; Rintala, 2009) has received wider scholarly

attention. Sport scholars have brought different disciplinary and theoretical sensibilities to theorize pleasure movement as an alternative framework for physical education [PE] to challenge its dominant instrumental tenets and goals (e.g., Booth, 2009; Gard & Meyenn, 2000; Gard & Wright, 1996; Hawkins, 2008; McKay et al. 1990; Rintala, 2009; Pringle, 2010). In contrast to most of the literature on pleasure movement which has engaged with the concept of pleasure in sport in a rather uncritical way, Pringle (2010) both recognized the need to promote pleasure movement as a valuable goal of PE, but also urged critical scholars to engage in more critical reflexivity by re-contextualizing play, games and sport as social constructions "that are constituted by, and constitutive of, broader social practices and the workings of power" (p. 129). He further promoted the value of a postmodern perspective, which moves away from the modernist project to define physical education's core identity. Last, he pointed to the need for more research to understand "the moving body as lived and emotional" (p. 131) on the one hand and how pleasures and displeasures are subjectively constructed and effectively managed on the other.

This dissertation heeds to Pringle's (2010) calls by recontextualizing fun within the present power/knowledge nexus of varsity sport. It inserts itself within a large body of literature of Foucauldian studies of high-performance sporting contexts which have problematized the role that high-performance sporting disciplines play in the production of docile bodies through the control of time, space and movement (e.g., Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010; Denison, 2007, 2010; Heikkala, 1996; Markula & Pringle, 2006; Shogan, 1999, 2007). However, few studies (Pringle, 2009) have used a Foucauldian framework to critically examine the strategic role that fun/pleasure plays in the discursive production of high-performance sporting identities. This dissertation sought to address this gap by building on Pringle's (2009) critical examination of

rugby, discipline and pleasure where interviews with competitive rugby players revealed the complex intertwined workings of technologies of power and technologies of the self in the constitution of rugby pleasures. However, this research project did not focus on the role of pleasure in the construction of high-performance sporting subjectivities. Rather it focused on coaches and how they understand and articulate how they promote fun in their coaching practices and within the discursive boundaries of performance coaching and sporting discourses. Furthermore, I focused on fun and not pleasure. Although these concepts might seem closely related, I argue that these should not be collapsed together for a couple of reasons. First, one can arguably experience pleasure during or after achieving certain athletic goals without there being any fun involved either in the process or in one's sense of satisfaction. Second, while both concepts are tied to processes of knowledge production and to the (re)-production of power relations in sporting contexts, the psychological construct of fun is arguably much more central to the production of coaching knowledge and to the power/knowledge nexus of performance sport and thus to my PhD research project and question. This warrants further examination: What are the set of knowledges and ways of understanding and practicing coaching in performance sport that fun specifically supports and enables? What are the power effects of fun within the specific power relations of performance sport?

To answer these critical questions, I drew on a Foucauldian theoretical framework to specifically examine the discursive production of fun in varsity sport and how coaches understand and promote fun within varsity coaching contexts. Unlike previous studies in the sport psychology and positive coaching literature, this project sought to engage with the topic of fun, not to gain a better understanding of what fun is, of the 'essence' of fun, but rather to understand what fun *does,* its strategic deployment and effects within the discursive formation of

varsity sport. Therefore, for the purposes of this specific research project and in line with Lauss and Szigetvari (2010), I conceptualised fun as a *political technology* and focused specifically on how fun is strategically produced and deployed within the power/knowledge nexus of performance sport. My aims were twofold: first, to develop a further understanding of the ways in which different coaching/sporting discourses intersect, conflict, and combine to produce specific understandings of fun in relation to effective coaching in performance sporting contexts; and second, to develop a further understanding of how varsity coaches understand and articulate how they promote fun within the boundaries of coaching and sporting discourses.

In the second chapter of my dissertation, I examined various sport related bodies of literature, which have theorized fun in relation to coaching and teaching effectiveness. In this chapter, I also examined some of the sport related literature on pleasure movement and articulated the need to move beyond humanistic psychology to theorize fun in coaching. In the third chapter, I articulated how a Foucauldian theoretical framework informs my research project. I specifically elaborated on Deleuze's (1988) articulation of Foucault's concept of discursive formation and on Foucault's concept of power relations as unique critical tools to critically examine fun in coaching. I also discussed some feminist and poststructuralist studies of emotions and pleasures and situated my research project in relation to these studies. In the fourth chapter, I discussed my methodology, methods, and research ethics in connection to my Foucauldian research project on fun and coaching. In the fifth and sixth chapters, I respectively presented the results of my Foucauldian discourse analysis of the key coaching texts I selected (the NCCP level one, two, three and the LTAD, 2012) and of my interviews with 10 varsity coaches at a specific Canadian University. In my concluding chapter, I connected my research results to my literature review, and theoretical framework and made recommendations based on

these findings for the development of more effective and ethical uses of fun within varsity

sporting contexts.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this chapter I review the literature on fun as well as some of the related literature on flow and pleasure movement within coaching and sporting contexts. I begin with a detailed examination of theorizations of fun, coaching effectiveness and flow within the positive sport psychology literature. I follow this with an examination of play theory and some of the pedagogical literature on pleasure movement. Finally, I end with an examination of critical studies of sport and sociological studies of sporting pleasures and situate my work with respect to these sociological studies. Here, I also articulate in what ways my Foucauldian study on fun and coaching will contribute to the existing literature on fun within coaching and sporting contexts.

1) Fun and the Positive Sport Psychology Coaching Pedagogical Model

I begin with a review of the sport psychology literature on motivation as one of the most substantial body of literature related to fun.

1.1 The Sport Psychology Literature on Motivation

The concept of fun in sport and physical activity settings has mostly been theorized in the sport psychology and coaching/teaching literature on motivation (e.g., Allen, 2003; Griffin et al, 1993; Jackson, 2000; Mandigo & Couture, 1996; Newton & Duda, 1993; Scanlan & Lethwaite, 1986; Wankel & Sefton, 1989). Research on motivation in sport and physical activity is a contested field, which can be articulated along two main strands: the achievement goal orientation motivational model, which draws predominantly on social psychology and adopts a positivistic perspective (e.g., Duda & Nicholls, 1992; Harter, 1978; Nicholls, 1984; Ommundsen & Vaglum, 1991) and the social motivational model, which draws predominantly on humanistic psychology (e.g., Allen, 2003; Anderman & Anderman, 1999; Wylleman, 2000). Combined,

these two interrelated strands of research cover the length of the sporting continuum from youth recreational sport to high-performance sport.

While motivational research in psychology might be a contested field, it does nonetheless inform most of the positive coaching and teaching literature. Positive coaching and teaching models of intervention have thus drawn on developmental and motivational psychological research to establish models of teaching and learning conducive to youth developing pro-social behaviours through their sporting participation (e.g., Holt, 2008; Ommundsen & Vaglum, 1991; Sabock & Sabock, 2008; Smoll & Smith, 1987; Thompson, 1997, 2003; Wells et al., 2008), and to youth developing a lifelong engagement in physical activity (Duda, 1992; Hohepa et al., 2006; Wold & Kannas, 1993).

Positive coaching pedagogical models were initially developed in reaction to the recognized limitations of applying a strictly instrumental professional sporting model to youth sport (e.g., Bigelow et al., 2001; Mastrich, 2002; Vernacchia et al., 1992). One of the main limitations of the professional sporting model, which positive coaching models sought to address, was a narrow instrumental focus on achievement in sport to the detriment of the 'intrinsic' pleasures of sporting participation. Positive coaching and teaching models thus critiqued the de-pleasuring effects of the professional instrumental sporting model on the one hand and sought to theorize and promote fun in sporting participation on the other. In what follows, I contrast the earlier performance motivational model and the later social motivational model and examine the various ways in which these two models have been and are currently applied in various sporting contexts. Applications of motivational research within performance sporting contexts (e.g., Jackson, 1996; 2000; Scanlan & Lethwaite, 1986; Wankel & Sefton, 1989) focused specifically on factors of enjoyment in performance sport to the end of theorizing

how fun could be harnessed to positively enhance individual and team performance and productivity. Fun was defined in various ways in these studies. Wankel and Sefton (1989) for example defined fun as a positive affective response and the principle motive of sporting participation. Earlier applications of motivational research (e.g., Scanlan & Lethwaite, 1986; Wankel & Sefton, 1989) drew primarily on social psychology and a positivistic perspective to understand the psychological processes, which underpin motivation in sport. They built on theories of competence, achievement and goal orientation (e.g., Duda & Nicholls, 1992; Nicholls, 1984). In contrast, later applications of motivation research in high-performance sport (e.g., Jackson, 1996; 2000) drew predominantly on the seminal work of Csikszenmihalyi (1998) and his theoretical construct of flow. Despite these differences, both the earlier and later applications of motivational research to performance sporting contexts focused on establishing causal relationships and predictors of enjoyment in order to develop a generalizable model of coaching effectiveness.

On the other side of the sporting spectrum, the social model of motivational research built on a humanistic perspective and sought to demarcate itself from achievement goal research. Social motivational research in sport and educational psychology was a critique and reaction to the limitations of the achievement motivational model and its narrow reductionist framework. In contrast, the social motivational perspective attempted to draw attention to the complexities of human motivation and to the multiple factors, which play a part in it. Within a context where health and exercise issues are increasingly foregrounded due to the so-called 'obesity crisis' and the development of other 'lifestyle diseases', social motivational researchers articulated the need to develop a more holistic understanding of the social and cultural processes that underpin motivation in sport and of the psychological processes that lead to differences in the quality of

sport participants' motivation (e.g., Allen, 2003; Anderman & Anderman, 1993; Wylleman, 2000). Allen's (2003) study for example aimed to understand what motivates female adolescents' sporting participations and pointed to the limits of achievement goal research in terms of understanding the gendered complexities of youth sport motivation. More recently, McCarthy and Jones (2007) sought to address a gap in the motivation literature by examining both enjoyment and non-enjoyment factors among younger and older children in the sampling years of sport participation. Their research drew on a developmental perspective to theorize what constitutes optimal conditions for learning in order to provide athletes, coaches, and parents with guidelines and strategies on how to develop enjoyment to "maximize learning and participation at various stages of an individual's involvement in sport" (p. 402).

Social motivation theorists built on the core thesis that "social bonds are necessary for optimal psychological functioning" and that "as a consequence of the need to belong, individuals should show tendencies to seek out interpersonal contacts and cultivate relationships" (Allen, 2003, p. 552). They thus attempted to both expand and refine our understanding of motivation in sport by establishing differential quality of motivation to theorize which kinds of motivation are most conducive to 'optimal psychological functioning' in various sporting contexts. In what follows I examine how fun has been theorized within two other bodies of literature: the sport psychology literature on coaching effectiveness and the sport psychology literature on leadership while recognizing that the three constructs of motivation, coaching effectiveness, and leadership significantly overlap.

1.2 The Sport Psychology Literature on Coaching Effectiveness and Leadership

In line with the sport psychology based literature on motivation, the sport psychology based literature on coaching effectiveness, expertise, and leadership has also moved from earlier

reductionist models (e.g., Martens, 1987, 1990, 2004; Smoll & Smith, 1987) towards more holistic and complex theoretical models, which sought to better account for the complex social dimensions of the coaching process (e.g., Côté & Gilbert, 2009; Kavussanu et al., 2008; Vella et al., 2010). Côté and Gilbert (2009) for example set out to present an integrative definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise "conceptually grounded in the coaching, teaching, positive psychology and athletes' development literature" (p. 307). Their research sought to address a perceived lack of precision both in terminology and in practice, which they believed came from the lack of a clear conceptual framework to understand what constitutes coaching effectiveness and expertise. Based on their comprehensive review of various bodies of literature, the definition they proposed outlined three major components and constituents of coaching effectiveness: first, coaches' knowledge (comprised of *professional knowledge* defined as sport specific knowledge, pedagogy and the sciences of coaching, *interpersonal knowledge* defined as the ability of a coach to communicate effectively with his/her athletes and *intrapersonal knowledge* defined as a coach's self-understanding and ability for introspection and reflection); second, athletes' outcomes (based on Côté 's '4C's model' of competence, confidence, connection and character); and third, coaching contexts (based on the Development Model of Sport Participation (DSMP) and Côté et al.'s typology of coaching contexts, which draws the distinction between the sampling, recreational, specializing and investment years of sporting participation). Based on these three major constituents, the definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise they proposed is "the consistent application of integrated professional, interpersonal and intrapersonal knowledge to improve athletes' competence, confidence, connection and character in specific contexts" (Côté & Gilbert, 2009, p. 316).

In congruence with Côté and Gilbert (2009), Vella et al. (2010) similarly lamented the lack of "a sound conceptual basis and definitive set of principles to understand the coaching process" (p. 426). The purpose of their article was to critically discuss the application of coach leadership models to coaching practice framed in current conceptions of sports coaching and expected athlete outcomes. They critiqued purely behavioural definitions of leadership based on the idea that "coaching is a dynamic, complex and messy practice" (p. 429) and encouraged practitioners to adopt an understanding of coach leadership based on Côté and Gilbert's research on coach effectiveness specifically emphasizing the importance of interpersonal and intrapersonal knowledge. While Vella et al. did support Côté and Gilbert's (2009) definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise, they nonetheless pointed to its limitations in terms of athletes' outcomes since Côté's four constructs of competence, confidence, connection, and character do not account for a large part of coach leadership, which they defined as including "the facilitation of positive emotions such as fun, happiness, joy, motivation and satisfaction" (p. 430). As they further pointed out, "recent research has suggested that coaches also desire such positive emotions as a result of their coaching, in addition to the facilitation of team related outcomes such as team cohesion, etc." (pp. 430-431).

While the above studies show an effort to adopt a more 'holistic' approach to theorizing coach effectiveness and leadership grounded in the recognition that the coaching process is an inherently complex social endeavour, other studies continued to privilege a behavioural check list approach to theorize coach effectiveness and effective leadership (e.g., Feldman & Cakebread, 2004; Smith & Smoll, 1997; Smith, Smoll, & Cumming, 2007; Smoll, Cumming, & Smith, 2011; Turman, 2003; Yukelson, 2011). These sport psychology based studies and models of intervention emphasized the importance of fun as a key component of effective sport coaching

and pointed to some of the positive outcomes of a coach's ability to promote fun such as

developing group cohesion, increasing individual hard work and team performance (e.g.,

Turman, 2003; Yukelson, 2011), enhancing coach-parent relationships (e.g., Smoll, Cumming, &

Smith, 2011), and reducing performance anxiety stress (e.g., Smith, Smoll, & Cumming, 2007).

Based on these desired positive outcomes, these researchers developed various models of

intervention designed to promote a positive psychological climate in youth sport. Amongst such

models, is the Coaching Behavior Assessment System (CBAS) (Smith & Smoll, 1997), which is

an intervention program designed to train coaches on how to create an athletic environment that

"fosters positive coach-athlete and peer interactions, increases the pleasure of participating and

enhances self-esteem" (p. 17). This model of coaching effectiveness outlines five core principles

of behavioural coaching guidelines and requires the coach to: first adopt a developmental model

of sport focused on fun, effort and improvement; second use positive reinforcement,

encouragement and technical instruction; third establish norms that emphasize athletes' mutual

obligations to increase social support, cohesion and commitment; fourth include athletes in

decision making regarding team rules; and finally engage in self-monitoring to increase

awareness and compliance with effective coaching guidelines. In addition, the CBAS model

incorporates a coaching effective training manual (CET), which is a 24-page document offering

"concrete suggestions for communicating effectively with young athletes, for gaining their

respect and for relating effectively to athletes' parents" (Smith & Smoll, 1997, p. 19). The CET

guidelines have also been used in some later research on the positive effects of a mastery

approach to sports coaching (Smith, Smoll, & Cumming, 2007). A mastery approach to sports

coaching (MAC) is defined as a "cognitive behavioural intervention designed to promote a

mastery involving motivational climate designed to reduce performance anxiety in young

athletes" (p. 39). Within a mastery approach to sports coaching, success is defined in terms of self-improvement, task-mastery, and effort and persistence and the emphasis is placed on having fun.

While the bulk of these positive sport psychology models of intervention are oriented towards youth sport, they are by no means exclusive to it. Yukelson (2011) for example drew on this body of research to discuss effective team building interventions in varsity sport. He outlined a series of core components to successful team building, which include a shared vision, collaborative teamwork, individual and mutual accountability, a strong team identity, a strong team culture, an open and honest communication, peer helping, and trust at all levels. Based on these core components, Yukelson made a series of recommendations for varsity coaches to develop a positive psychological climate, which will be most conducive to team performance and success. These include establishing a clear team mission statement, developing team goals and team commitments, clarifying roles on the team, setting up a reward system, having regular team meetings, establishing a player counsel, providing opportunities for informal activities outside of the sport setting, taking an interest in players' lives outside of the sport setting. This particularly resonates with my personal experience as a former varsity soccer player in the US where a large amount of the pre and postseason was dedicated to various team-building activities organized by an expert sport psychologist and designed to promote fun and team cohesiveness and success.

In the following sections, I move away from the sport psychology based literature on fun to examine the sport psychology literature on flow and its application to various sporting contexts. Flow is an important concept as it is related to fun and positive sporting emotions and experiences.

1.3 The Sport Psychology Literature on Flow

Csikszentmihalyi's (1998) psychological construct of flow and theorization of 'flow consciousness' warrants in depth discussion as it directly or indirectly informs both the bulk of the sport psychology literature on fun and the bulk of the sport and physical education pedagogy literature on pleasure movement which I will examine in the next part of this chapter. The construct of flow most commonly describes an optimal psychological state of consciousness experienced by an individual immersed in an activity where his/her skills match the difficulty of the task. Although this construct was not originally used to examine sport, a wide range of sport scholars with interests in sport psychology and high-performance sport, sport exercise and health, and physical education and youth sport have drawn on this construct to examine high-performance sporting contexts (e.g., Jackson, 1996, 2000; Jackson & Csikszentmihalyi, 1999), adult recreational physical activity contexts (e.g., Lloyd & Smith, 2006) and physical education and youth sport (e.g., Bengoecha et al., 2004; Strean, 2009). Examples of theoretical application of the psychological construct of flow in high-performance sport are found in the work of Jackson (1996, 2000) and Jackson and Csikszentmihalyi (1999). Jackson (1996) drew on Csikszentmihalyi's seven dimensional framework of flow consciousness to theorize what constitutes an optimal sporting experience and what factors contribute to an optimal state of consciousness. While her study showed a strong correspondence between Csikszentmihalyi's framework of flow and the optimal experiences of high-performance athletes, it also helped refine his framework by highlighting the prominence of some dimensions over others (e.g., the challenge-skill balance, the action-awareness merging, the concentration on the task at hand, and finally the autotelic /enjoyable experience, which emerged as the single most prominent and transferable dimension to high-performance sport). Jackson's initial exploratory study thus paved

the way for the design of psychological and pedagogical models of intervention to enhance coaching and athletic effectiveness based on the construct of flow consciousness as an optimal and intrinsically fun/pleasurable state of being.

While a body of literature focused on theorizing flow experiences in high-performance sport, other sport researchers took up the construct of flow and sought to apply it within the wider contexts of youth and adult recreational sport (e.g., Bengoecha et al., 2004; Lloyd & Smith, 2006; Strean, 2009). Bengoechea, Strean, and Williams (2004) for example used the concept of flow to examine coaches' perspectives and strategies to promote fun within youth sport settings. They drew on Csikszentmihalyi's (1998) work on flow consciousness in support of their argument against a dominant narrow definition of fun/enjoyment in sport "based primarily on non-achievement, non-performance factors, as well as on a hedonistic conception of fun in terms of pleasure attainment and pain avoidance" (p. 209). They articulated some problematic and limiting effects of this dominant conceptual framework of fun/enjoyment for both coaches, athletes, and for the task of promoting fun in youth sport. Instead of this perceived problematic dominant understanding of fun, Bengoechea et al. offered a definition of fun/enjoyment based on Csikszenmihalyi (1998) concepts of 'optimal challenge' and 'flow', which avoided setting up fun as the dichotomous opposite of skill development and hard work. They also argued for the need to develop a line of research based on a eudaimonic perspective on enjoyment, which focuses on meaning and self-realization instead of pleasure attainment and pain avoidance. A eudaimonic perspective on fun/enjoyment would according to these authors allow young athletes to maintain a high degree of motivation and enjoyment during the specializing and investment years and "to find meaning and a sense of self-realization (eudaimonia) in the demanding process of attaining higher levels of performance" (p. 207).

16

While I support Bengoechea et al's. argument that there is need to move beyond a narrow conceptual definition of fun/enjoyment, which fails to distinguish 'fun' from 'hedonistic pleasure' in sport, I would argue similarly to Pringle (2010), that more importantly there is a need to contextualize and critically examine both how 'fun' and 'pleasure' are strategically produced and put in play within dynamic power relations in sporting/coaching contexts.

Strean's (2009) study built on his (2004) study of coaches in youth sport but focused more specifically on how coaches and teachers could contribute to making sport and physical education more fun for children. Based on interviews with adults and their recollections of their past experiences in physical education and youth sport, Strean outlined a series of aspects which are likely to contribute to positive sporting experiences for children. These include the personal characteristics of the teachers/coaches (e.g., caring, individualised, fair), their ability to foster a sense of flow through their instruction based on an adequate matching of skills and challenges, their ability to create a positive social context which enables children to experience a sense of competence and autonomy as well as develop interpersonal relatedness. In addition to the personal characteristics of the teachers/instructors, Strean briefly outlined that an optimal learning environment would provide students with a variety and novelty of games and with adequate rules and strategies. Importantly, while these are framed as characteristics of the learning environment, it remains up to teachers/instructors to ensure that these characteristics are met. Finally, just like Bengoechea, Strean, and Williams (2004), Strean (2009) reaffirmed the value of a physical activity and education model which moves beyond immediate gratification and pleasures towards a model which seeks to develop and provide greater lifelong meaning to children in sport and physical education contexts.

Similarly to Strean (2009), Lloyd and Smith (2006) sought to extend Csikszentmihalyi's individualized theorization of flow as an individual peak experience to theorize how instructors and teachers could produce a different kind of collective, interactive flow through their pedagogical practices. More specifically, their phenomenological study explored how flow experiences are shared and influenced by teachers. It aimed to challenge Csikszentmihalyi's mechanistic and dualistic view of the body and flow and to promote a transcendental and primordial connection to pleasure achieved through interactive flow. Lloyd and Smith's study outlined various ways in which fitness instructors could develop this higher and deeper sense of interactive flow which accounts for the fact that "each body has his or her story, nuances in alignment, emotions, thoughts, and depth" (p. 229). Amongst the various recommendations they made, they promoted pedagogical practices, which work to de-emphasize the position of authority of the instructor and to diminish the importance placed on skills being executed the right or wrong way. The onus was placed less on mimicry and more on how much the instructor was able to help his/her students to deepen their level of bodily consciousness and awareness. Their hope was that this phenomenological investigation would serve to broaden the repertoire and range of bodily motions and gestures in exercise pedagogy thereby allowing the physical education curriculum to "become a living, breathing, interactive encounter" (p. 238).

Up to this point, the sport psychology literature I have examined has discussed fun in sport in various ways and used it interchangeably with enjoyment to describe either a positive affective response (e.g., Wankel and Sefton, 1989), or an autotelic enjoyable experience based on an individual optimal state of consciousness (e.g., Jackson, 1996, 2000), or a primordial and transcendental experience of pleasure achieved in and through connecting with other moving bodies (e.g., Lloyd & Smith, 2006). As the literature showed, the meaning of fun is anything but

a uniform and universal construct and has most notably evolved over the last decades in connection with the paradigmatic shift in sport psychology from positivism to humanism/interpretivism.

While the concept of fun and the related sport psychology concept of 'flow' has been dominantly theorized within the framework of developmental humanistic psychology to inform the development of positive sport psychology models for effective coaching and teaching, the related concept of pleasure has received broader and wider attention in the fields of psychology, sociology, and philosophy (e.g., Caillois, Deleuze, Foucault, Freud and Huizinga). In what follows, I review how the concept of pleasure has been taken up and theorized within sporting and physical education contexts.

2) Play Theory and the Pleasure Movement Pedagogical Model

The concept of pleasure has a long history in the philosophy of play literature (e.g., Caillois, 1961; Huizinga, 1950). Pleasure and play have been interpreted and defined in various ways by different scholars at different points in time. Huizinga's (1950) seminal treaty on play for example adopted an essentialist view of play defining it as a core constituting element of Man [*sic*]. He distinguished between different types of play but emphasised fun as their foundational-shared aspect. Caillois (1961) built on Huizinga's work but also disputed his characterization of play. He arguably refined Huizinga's taxonomy by establishing a continuum of play forms from ludus (structured activities with set rules) to paidia (unstructured and spontaneous activities). However, both scholars overlap in their critique of modern societal trends which tend towards the increasing institutionalization and regulation of play arguably to the detriment of freer, more spontaneous and joyful forms of play.

This foundational body of work on play underpins the work of many contemporary theorists across a wide range of disciplines (e.g., Booth, 2009; Hugues, 1999; Pellegrini et al., 2007) and continues to influence the design of pedagogical models for teaching within physical education and physical activity contexts (e.g., Hawkins, 2008; Rintala, 2009; Siedentop, 1994). Notably, play theory informs the bulk of the recent literature on 'pleasure movement' which some scholars in physical education pedagogy offered as an alternative model to understand and practice physical education (e.g., Booth, 2009; Hawkins, 2008; Oslin, 2002; Rintala, 2009). Similar to the sport psychology based positive coaching literature, the literature on pleasure movement mainly evolved out of a critique of the current physical education pedagogical model and its narrow emphasis on health, fitness and motor skill development to the exclusion of almost anything else. It also sought to address and rectify the modern trend of de-pleasuring in physical education and physical education's absence of disciplinary coherence which many scholars continue to highlight as problematic (e.g., Booth, 2009; Hawkins, 2008; Rintala, 2009; Siedentop, 2002). Booth's (2009) paper in particular was a direct critique of "the modern prejudice against pleasure in the academy and in state policy" (p. 133), which drew on the work of Caillois (1961) to promote pleasure movement as a potential "pillar of disciplinary coherence" (p. 133). It sought to problematize the modern project of de-pleasuring and its negative ramifications within the field of physical education. Similarly, Hawkins (2008) and Rintala (2009) both problematized the current physical education model, which they framed as partially responsible for what they viewed as the modern crisis of physical education. They critiqued the current utilitarian model which they associated with a loss of professional meaning and urged scholars and physical education practitioners to consider a re-orientation of the discipline of

physical education towards play (as an end in itself) and as a more genuine and meaningful core disciplinary foundation for physical education.

This line of research, thus, tended to adopt a romantic essentialist view of play defined as intrinsically fun, transcendental, and as emanating from basic human needs. Similarly to some of the sport psychology based literature on fun, the bulk of the literature on pleasure movement drew on the concept of flow (Jackson & Csikszentmihalyi, 1999) to support their argument in favour of play and of the joy of moving for its own sake. They based their argument on the notion that flow holds much potential as a pillar of disciplinary coherence in terms of allowing individuals to experience peak experiences which transcend the physical. Helping individuals to achieve flow experiences (whereby individuals are totally emerged in the activity itself rather than in subsidiary skills) as well as helping individuals experience the autotelic, joyful and sensuous experiences of movement should be the primary aims of physical education teachers. Physical education and sport redefined in those terms would thus regain its "genuine humanizing purpose" (Hawkins, 2008, p. 354).

Kirk's (2006) paper aligned itself with the argument developed by Hawkins (2008) and Rintala (2009) that play should form the core justification of Physical Education. However, in contrast to Hawkins and Rintala, Kirk's paper also advanced the notion that sport (as a more structured form of play) should be retained within a critical pedagogy in physical education. A critical pedagogy is a philosophy of education which seeks to promote social justice through PE. He based his view on the argument that play, games and sport are at their essence intrinsically good. It is only a modern trend, which emphasizes the extrinsic pleasures and rewards of sport (e.g., money, fame), which is problematic. While his paper can also be critiqued for its romantic essentialization and idealization of play and sport and for uncritically celebrating their potential

within a critical pedagogy of emancipation, empowerment and critique, it did nonetheless provide a useful launching point for a discussion of the ways in which play and sport can be integrated within a critical pedagogy in physical education contexts.

While Kirk (2006) advanced the merits of a critical pedagogy and the promotion of pleasure as a foundation for PE, Pope (2005) provided an interesting review and critique of the Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU) model for physical education and focused on theorizing and promoting affect as a key component of learning and instruction in sport. His understanding of affect encompassed "emotion, preference, choice and feeling but also beliefs, aspirations, attitudes and appreciations, which can occur both at an individual and collective level" (p. 273). In his study, he reviewed some of the early literature on fun, which I have already discussed (e.g., Wankel & Sefton, 1989) but also some of the critical literature which has problematized normative views of fun and how they do not reflect the realities and difficulties of teaching (e.g., O'Reilly, Tomkins, & Gallant, 2001). The central thesis of Pope's (2005) study was that the TGfU model, just like any other model, should be treated with caution and used more as a heuristic device rather than as a rigid prescription. As such it aligned itself with the work of critical scholars (Pringle, 2010; Tinning, 2002a, 2002b). Framed as a heuristic device, he believed that the TGfU model holds much promise in terms of allowing scholars and instructors to rethink the connections between cognition, action and affect and how affect in particular can be usefully drawn upon to promote better learning and instruction. Replacing affect at the centre of learning would, according to Pope, enable the TGfU model to grow into a living, animated model, which would "confirm the humanness of physical education and sport" (p. 284).

To summarize, much like the bulk of the positive sport psychology literature on fun, the pedagogical literature on pleasure movement in physical education has, with some exceptions,

22

(e.g., Pope, 2005) adopted predominantly a humanistic perspective to theorize pleasure in sport and physical education contexts. It has also grounded itself on the idea of reclaiming the intrinsic and essential pleasures of play, which "transcend social and cultural conceptualizations" (Booth, 2009, p. 133). In what follows I examine some critical studies, which in contrast have adopted an anti-humanistic perspective to critique both the dominant instrumental pedagogical model of physical education and alternatives such as the pleasure movement model.

3) Critical Studies

While some studies have critiqued the dominant instrumental pedagogical model but focused more on theorizing pleasure movement as a foundational alternative in a rather *uncritical* way, other studies have focused more heavily on drawing attention to the ways in which the current dominant pedagogical model for physical education and youth sport reproduces problematic dominant power relations (e.g., Gard & Meyenn, 2000; Gard & Wright, 2001, McKay et al., 1990). Gard and Wright (2001), for example, problematized how the current dominant pedagogical model for physical education reproduces damaging discourses which construct a certain view of children's bodies as being 'at risk' thereby naturalizing the current war waged against the obesity epidemic. Bonita's (2010) critical study also problematized how various discourses of risk and healthism intersect to construct a view of children's bodies as being at risk concomitantly naturalizing the need for an ever increasing disciplining of their bodies through play, physical education and youth sport. Although these studies touched upon pleasure movement as a potential alternative, they did not take it as their focal point. Rather, they focused on showing how the current dominant model for PE closes spaces for critical thinking, critical awareness and the promotion of social responsibility.

Similarly, Tinning (2002a, 2002b) sought to draw our attention to the dangers of romanticizing the proposed alternatives advanced by certain scholars in response to the alleged crisis of PE. The target of his critique was the sport education model advanced by Siedentop (2002) and the critical pedagogy model in PE, which scholars and teachers invested in education towards social justice and social rights have embraced over the past thirty years. While he positioned himself under the wide umbrella of critical pedagogy, Tinning (2002b) remained critical of this social rights pedagogical model. His critique was designed to promote a move towards a more 'modest pedagogy' which recognizes the need to problematize knowledge and schooling but also the difficulties of it. Tinning also cautioned against the pitfalls of Enlightenment thinking and the neglect of student subjectivity, which characterizes much of the critical pedagogy literature. Furthermore, his argument was designed to draw our attention to the ways in which social justice discourses and critical pedagogy are currently mainstreamed and diverted by a modern neoliberal and capitalistic logic. As such, it was to be read as an attempt to counter some of the more utopian emancipatory claims advanced by certain advocates of critical pedagogy, which he judged to be not only erroneous but also dangerous. Central to Tinning's thesis was the Foucauldian argument that knowledge is constructed, legitimated and disseminated within a complex web of power relations. As such, a critical pedagogy needs to both engage "with its own ideology, power and culture" (p. 224), but also understand how the discourse of critical pedagogy functions within this complex web of power relations and how it is strategically used to reproduce dominant power relations in physical education contexts. This critical conceptualisation of the power/knowledge nexus allowed him to gain insight into how critical pedagogy is currently shaped by the modernist imperative of 'getting things right' and thus to problematize an evidence-based quest for perfection and success understood as the

wholehearted conversion and alignment of students with the articulated goals of critical

pedagogy. Importantly, this critical conceptualization of the power/knowledge nexus also

allowed Tinning to problematize the effects of this modernist quest for getting things right which

grounds itself in a humanistic understanding of truth. Notably it helped him to problematize the

ways in which these modernist discourses of truth work in very disciplinary, oppressive and

counterproductive ways by stifling individual students and teachers and hindering change and

innovation within the discipline of physical education. Instead of this dominant standard and

benchmark for success, he advanced more modest pedagogical goals which are more in touch

with the needs of contemporary youth and which also recognize that students bring different

subjectivities to programs and are shaped by different discursive histories. Rather than assuming

that all students will find the same meaning in critical pedagogy and embrace all of its various

tenets, Tinning proposed that one goal of critical pedagogy could be to help students develop the

fundamental capacity to unlearn and adapt to uncertainty. Such a goal could be achieved by

working to develop an emotional commitment to change which recognizes students' and

teachers' embodied subjectivities and reactivates different knowledges to support them.

     In line with Tinning's (2002a, 2002b) critical examinations of the Siedentopian sport

education model and of the critical pedagogy model, Pringle (2010) set out to critique the

pleasure movement literature and its uncritical embrace of pleasure movement as an alternative

foundational pedagogical model. His critical examination of the educative value of positive

movement affects provides a useful framework for this research project and aligns itself closely

with my research aims to draw attention to the politics of fun within performance sporting

contexts. While Pringle valued and recognized the need to promote the value of pleasure

movement as a legitimate goal of PE, he, nonetheless, raised various concerns to encourage more

critical reflection on the place of pleasure in PE and more critical reflexivity from critical

scholars which promote pleasure movement as an alternative pedagogical model. He thus

cautioned against romantic and essentialist views of play, games, and sport (e.g., Booth, 2009;

Hawkins, 2008; Rintala, 2009), which "ignore that participation in these activities does not

automatically result in experiences of pleasure" (p. 129) but are actually just as likely to produce

intense experiences of displeasure. Pringle's main argument was that play, games and sport need

to be re-contextualized as social constructions "that are constituted by, and constitutive of,

broader social practices and the workings of power" (p. 129) and that the promotion of

movement pleasure is anything but straightforward, unproblematic and easy to achieve. Rather it

warrants careful planning, critical reflection, and an awareness of the dynamic and complex

ways in which power relations operate within physical education and sporting contexts. In

accordance with his anti-humanistic perspective on play, games and sport, Pringle urged physical

education scholars to move away from attempts to define PE's core identity suggesting instead

that it might be timely to consider the value of a "postmodern perspective which accepts that an

objective and universal justification of PE will not be found or agreed upon" (p. 131). Rather

than attempting to settle a core foundation for PE, he advocated for more research to understand

"the moving body as lived and emotional" (p. 131) and how pleasures and displeasures come to

be subjectively constructed and effectively managed in physical education and sporting contexts.

In the following section, I review some of the sport and leisure literature which has critically

discussed and contextualized sporting pleasures within a wider social and political context.

4) Sociological Studies of Sporting Pleasures

As researchers (Pringle & Rinehart, in press) have pointed out, sporting pleasures and

emotions have with some exceptions (e.g., Andrews; 2006; Rojek, 1985; Smith Maguire, 2008)

remained conspicuously marginal within the field of sport sociology and critical studies of sport and leisure. In what follows I provide a brief overview of how emotions have been theorized in critical studies of leisure (e.g., Rojek, 1985; Smith Maguire, 2008) and in critical studies of sport (e.g., Andrews, 2006).

In his book *Capitalism and leisure theory,* Rojek (1985) brought together the viewpoints of various social theorists (e.g., Barthes, 1977; Elias, 1978, 1982; Elias & Dunning, 1969; Foucault, 1981) to discuss the place and role of pleasure and leisure in relation to modern capitalistic society. Rojek's (1985) overall thesis aligned itself most closely with that of Elias (1978, 1982) and of Elias and Dunning (1969) who sought to theorize how specific historical developments, which they named the civilizing process resulted in long term changes in the social organization of deep emotions and strongly shaped human beings' relations to pleasure and leisure in ways which support specific social interests and modern capitalism. According to them, the civilizing process and the rise of modern capitalistic society profoundly altered pleasure and leisure practice, which have become increasingly privatized, individualized, commercialized, and pacified. Furthermore, Elias (1982) discussed how emotions have become increasingly "psychologized and richer in nuances but less spontaneous" (p. 167) within modern society. While Elias's (1978, 1982) discussion of the civilizing process provided an interesting historical viewpoint, Rojek's (1985) brief chapter which drew on Foucault's (1978) *History of Sexuality (Vol.1)* offered a more complex and helpful viewpoint for this research project. In this chapter, Rojek drew on Foucault's theorizing of the body and of modern power relations and sought to apply aspects of it to leisure theory. Notably, he asked the question as to whether Foucault's analysis of sexuality as the "set of effects produced in bodies, behaviours, social relations by a certain deployment deriving from a complex political technology" (cited in Rojek,

1985, p.156) could be fruitfully applied to leisure theory. He certainly claimed that Foucault's theorizing of power relations as productive was helpful to problematize a formalist view of leisure as freedom, as standing outside of power relations, and as being dissociated from other areas of social life. Although, as Rojek pointed out, Foucault's analysis of sexuality and of sexual pleasure/desire within a biopolitical society cannot and shouldn't be uncritically transposed to other areas such as leisure, it does nonetheless help formulate interesting questions to critically interrogate modern forms of leisure. For example: "What images of healthy and unhealthy leisure exist in society? How does the discourse on leisure relate to the practice of leisure? How does leisure conceal and reveal the operation of power in society?" (p. 156). In a similar way, although Foucault's analysis of sexuality and of sexual pleasure/desire shouldn't be uncritically applied to other forms of pleasure such as sporting pleasures, it nonetheless provides an interesting framework to problematize dominant understandings of sporting pleasures as intrinsic and universal and to critically interrogate the specific governmental stakes involved in the production of fun and pleasure in various sporting contexts.

More recently, Smith Maguire (2008) set out to examine modern leisure practices/experiences through an analysis of the field of fitness. Her Foucauldian inspired examination and critique of the commercial field of fitness revealed the complex interplay of dominant discourses of rational instrumentalism, individualism and consumerism. Furthermore, her analysis drew attention to the ways in which these dominant discourses tie in with the production of the neoliberal subject and shape our modern understanding of leisure and work. She argued that dominant power relations operate by naturalizing the links between physical exercise and leisure, and leisure and self-work. Moreover, they naturalize a very specific and narrow instrumental notion of pleasure achievable through self-disciplining and self-monitoring

practices. While her paper can be critiqued for romantically perpetuating a view of a pre-modern form of leisure as tied to "fun, freedom and self-expression" (p. 69) akin to Huizinga's (1970) uncritical treaty on play, her analysis of the imperative of self work involved in the production of modern practices/experiences of leisure and of the related instrumentalization and moralization of pleasure are also helpful in refining my specific research questions.

Similar to Rojek's (1985) book which brought together diverse theoretical perspectives to illuminate the role of pleasure and emotions in the construction of leisure within capitalist society, Andrews' (2006) book was a collection of critical essays written by sport sociologists which sought to theorize the various sources of pleasure, excitement and identification that sport participation and fandom produce. Although this collection of essays provided interesting insights for this research project, it was however most heavily focused on the pleasures of fandom rather than on the pleasures of sporting participation. This theoretically informed collection of essays illuminated the paradoxical, complex and multilayered pleasures of fandom and how these connect with processes of social inclusion, self-formation and self-actualization (e.g., Bass, 2006; Juffer, 2006; Ritzer, 2006; Surin, 2006). Moreover, these essays also pointed to the pleasures derived from the connection between sport and consumer culture (e.g., Moor, 2006) and finally to the pleasures derived from sport as a particular social space which opens up possibilities for affective and liminal experiences through which the self is transformed (e.g., Ganguly, 2006; Nealon, 2006; Surin, 2006).

Summary

As I have shown, the bulk of the scholarship in play, physical education and sport has mostly drawn upon a positivistic and/or humanistic/interpretivist framework. The problem with these frameworks is that they are grounded in a modernist understanding of power, knowledge

and truth, which mechanizes and depoliticizes coaching and sporting practices, and also individualizes the various effects of these practices and experiences. As a result of these dominant frameworks, most approaches to theorizing fun/pleasure in sport have failed to attend to how 'fun' and 'sporting pleasures' are shaped and constituted within a larger field of power relations and they have also failed to critically contextualize 'fun' and 'sporting pleasures' within the social production of coaching and teaching knowledges/truths. This has very problematic implications for coaches and athletes both in terms of coaching effectiveness and in terms of coaching ethics. As researchers Pringle (2000) and Markula and Martin (2007) showed, coaching situations and ethical dilemmas do not come in standard form. Nor can they be resolved by drawing on a pre-given set of standardized normative coaching principles. Many coaches are well aware that standardized 'check-list' approaches prominent in some of the positive coaching literature (e.g., Feldman & Cakebread, 2004; Smith & Smoll, 1997; Smith, Smoll, & Cumming, 2007; Smoll, Cumming, & Smith, 2011; Turman, 2003; Yukelson, 2011) do not reflect the 'reality' of coaching. However, these reductionist approaches and efforts to 'bring the fun back' into sport continue to hold a powerful currency and as I argue, negatively affect the development of truly innovative and ethical coaching practices.

Although recent coaching and sporting research have critiqued reductionist approaches and sought to develop complex holistic theoretical models, which account for the social dimensions and the inherent complexities of the coaching process (e.g., Côté & Gilbert, 2009), these remain embedded within a modernist humanistic tradition. This is problematic because it implies that these models of coaching effectiveness and ethics, albeit more sophisticated, continue to perpetuate unhelpful understandings of power as hierarchical and of knowledge/truth as essential and 'out there to be discovered'. Thus despite being more helpful, these more

complex theoretical models also fail to adequately engage with the politics of production and dissemination of coaching knowledges and 'truths'. As such, they indirectly continue to work to individualize and depoliticize coaching and sporting practices and the effects of these practices and experiences. This happens in two ways: first, these frameworks strongly hinder coaches and athletes from problematizing a dominant linear model of expertise and knowledge transmission (from the research expert to the coach as transmitter of this expertise to the athletes as points of application) and how it relates to the reproduction of unbalanced power relations in sporting contexts. Second, these frameworks render it difficult for coaches and athletes to problematize the ways in which the production and dissemination of 'scientific' knowledge facilitates the uncritical reproduction of unethical coaching and sporting practices.

In conclusion, not only does the dominant modernist model of power/knowledge/truth, which underpins most of the current coaching research, fail to adequately account for dynamic power relations within social/sporting contexts, but most problematically it strongly hampers ongoing critical coaching reflexivity. Thus, the dominant modernist model needs to be challenged because it indirectly contributes to the production of docile coaches and docile athletes and to the uncritical reproduction of unethical and ineffective coaching and sporting practices. Therefore, I argue that this research project on fun and coaching, which draws on a Foucauldian theoretical lens, has the potential to make a substantial contribution to a body of literature on fun and coaching/teaching in performance sport. My two-fold research aims to further the knowledge of how varsity coaches understand and articulate how they promote fun within their coaching practices can specifically allow us to grasp how 'fun' is tied up with the social production of coaching and sporting 'truths' and further how it is strategically played out within the specific power/knowledge nexus of performance sport. This is critical because a (re)-

politicization of fun and sporting pleasures is but the first step in the development of more effective and ethical coaching and sporting practices related to fun. Last, while the social production of sporting pleasures has been examined from a player's perspective (e.g., Pringle, 2009), no studies have focused specifically on how coaches understand and articulate how they seek to promote fun within the discursive boundaries of coaching and sporting discourses. This is important to know because coaches are arguably in a more 'strategic' position than players to effect positive changes within the discursive formation of performance and high-performance sport. For this research project, I specifically chose to focus on varsity sport because of my familiarity with this specific sporting context but also for practical reasons and ease of access to a sample of practicing coaches. While the findings of my research are most relevant to varsity coaching/sporting contexts, these can also be drawn upon to shed light on other performance coaching/sporting contexts. In what follows, I elaborate on how Foucault's theoretical framework and concepts informed this research project.

Chapter 3: Theoretical Framework

"Theory does not express, translate, or serve to apply practice: it is practice" (Deleuze, 1988, p. vii).

As my literature review exemplified, fun/pleasure and emotion in sport have been mainly theorized within the field of sport psychology. Fun/pleasure remains with some notable exceptions (e.g., Andrews, 2006; Lauss, 2010; Pringle, 2009; Rojek, 1985) largely marginal within the field of sport sociology. On the other hand, pleasures and emotions have been the objects of a growing theoretical interest within sociology (e.g., Hopkins et al. 2009; Kemper, 1990; Turner & Stets, 2005). This growing interest in theorizing emotions and pleasures, known as the 'affective turn', is marked by a renewed interest in the body as a legitimate field of sociological investigation.

Interestingly, despite the influential work of poststructuralist theorists like Foucault, Deleuze, and Derrida, poststructuralist uptakes of pleasures and emotions occupy a relatively marginal space within this growing body of literature. Hopkins et al. (2009) raised a similar concern in their critique of a dominant cognitive approach that relegates the study of emotions and pleasures to the spheres of the biological and the psychological. Not only did they critique this model of interiority, but they also critiqued the work of various scholars (e.g., Turner & Stets, 2005) who attempted to conciliate the biological neuroscience perspective with the social perspective. In line with a large body of feminist work (e.g., Ahmed, 2004; Cruikshank, 1993; Fraser & Greco, 2005; Ramazanoglu, 1993), their Foucauldian critique grounded itself on the fact that such efforts ignore deep-rooted ontological and epistemological conflicts and how power relations operate within the formation and dissemination of knowledge.

Although fun is not an emotion, it is nonetheless usually defined as a pleasurable experience and/or at the very least as a state of being *associated* with positive emotions such as enjoyment and happiness. Given the limited number of poststructuralist/Foucauldian studies of fun in sport, I expand on how pleasures and emotions have been theorized from a poststructuralist/Foucauldian/feminist perspective within sociology and extrapolate from this body of work in order to consider the related phenomenon of fun from a similar theoretical framework. In what follows, I first review previous feminist and queer sociological studies of fun/pleasure and emotion focusing specifically on the various Foucauldian concepts that these studies drew upon. I then examine in depth two Foucauldian studies of fun (Lauss & Szigetvari, 2010) and pleasures (Pringle, 2009) in sport, which inform this research project. Finally, based on my theoretical review of the existing Foucauldian literature on fun/pleasure, I introduce and expand on the two main concepts (discursive formation and power relations) that help conceptualize fun as a part of a Foucauldian theoretical schema for this specific research project.

1) **A Foucauldian Theoretical Framework**

Foucault did not directly discuss or theorize the concept of fun in his work. Nonetheless, he provided us with a rich 'toolbox' of theoretical concepts to help us problematize a wide range of social phenomena within contemporary modern society. In light of this, the purpose of this chapter is to work through some of these conceptual tools to start answering the question: how might we theorize fun through a Foucauldian lens? Furthermore I ask: how might we theorize how coaches understand and articulate how they use fun within the specific performance context of varsity sport? Before I outline the specific Foucauldian concepts that helped me analyze how fun is known in sport training and how coaches understand fun and articulate how they

incorporate fun within their practices, it is useful to briefly discuss the main tenets of poststructuralism and situate the work of Foucault within this overarching paradigm.

1.1 Poststructuralism

Poststructuralism was born out of a critique of universal metanarratives (e.g., positivism), dualistic understandings of power relations (e.g., critical theory) and of the humanist self (e.g., humanism/interpretivism) (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 46). The poststructuralist movement originated in contemporary French philosophy in reaction to structuralism and gained influence through the work of French theorists like Foucault, Derrida, and Deleuze. Although the poststructuralist paradigm encompasses multiple different theoretical strands, they nonetheless overlap on the basis of their shared critique of structuralism "and its universal theorizing of how meanings are created through language structures" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 46). In contrast to this universalistic view of meaning as fixed, poststructuralist theorists emphasize the fluidity of meaning embedded within dynamic power relations, which shape our understanding of the social world.

Poststructuralist philosopher Foucault arguably provided us with the most substantial theorization of power since Marx and Engels' *Communist Manifesto* (1848). His theory of power fundamentally challenged a more commonly accepted dualistic understanding of power as hierarchical and exercised by a dominant ruling class over a powerless working class. In contrast, Foucault understood power as relational and as operating through discourses defined as "ways of knowing, which are perpetuated through our everyday practices" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 48). Here, I only briefly introduce these concepts since I return to these at the end of this chapter to show how they apply to my research project.

In order to problematize power relations in modern society, Foucault developed (1978) a sort of mapping exercise called 'genealogy'. This involved historically retracing how dominant discourses, institutions and practices are formed and how they become influential through the interplay of historical contingencies and power relations. The aim of his genealogical method was to show the historical contingency of knowledge and its deep connection to power relations in order to liberate thought from the double bind of individualizing knowledges and individualizing power relations within modern society. A staunch anti-humanist, Foucault understood this critique of culture as "an attempt to escape identity, to get away from oneself – an injunction to "*se dependre de soi*" (Bernauer & Rassmussen, 1991, p. 28). He was profoundly critical of the ways individual subjectivities are presently shaped narrowly within the boundaries of modern scientific and humanistic discourses. He was particularly critical of psychoanalysis and of the ways in which 'psy discourses' work to individualize and bind people to their own identities through self-knowledge. According to Bernauer and Rassmussen (1991), the objective of his work was to disrupt these individualizing knowledges and their effects by "developing a thinking adequate to events and, thus, permit the introduction into the very roots of thought, of notions of chance, discontinuity and materiality" (p. 46).

In contrast to a dominant humanistic and essentialist understanding of the self, Foucault understood the self to be continuously formed through discursive and non-discursive practices. The self is, thus, important to this research project as it is formed through coaching and sporting processes. The self is not fixed and is continuously formed through a process of "negotiation, circulation and alteration of discourses" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 51). Foucault theorized ways in which individuals can free themselves from the double bind of individualizing knowledges and individualizing power relations by engaging in what he called a care of the self or a work of

36

ethical self-formation. This requires individuals to problematize the knowledges and power

relations through which they have been constituted as subjects. Providing they engage in this

continuous ethical work of the self on the self, individuals can work to transform themselves and

create social change. Having briefly outlined the main tenets of poststructuralism and situated

Foucault's work within the poststructuralist paradigm, I next critically examine how previous

Foucauldian studies have theorized fun/pleasure and emotion. I start with a large body of

feminist literature on the body, pleasures, and emotions and elaborate on how my Foucauldian

project on fun builds and expands on their critical work.

2) Feminist and Queer Theorizations of Pleasures and Emotions

Feminist scholars (e.g., Ahmed, 2004; Cruikshank, 1993; Fraser & Greco, 2005; Hopkins

et al., 2009; Ramazanoglu, 1993) did not directly examine the constitution of pleasures and

emotions in sporting contexts. Their work nonetheless provides interesting theoretical insights

for this research project since they drew on various Foucauldian concepts to theorize the role that

pleasures and emotions have historically played in the reproduction of dominant power relations

and social and gendered inequalities. Cruikshank (1993), for example, drew on Foucault's

concept of 'governmentality' to problematize the relationship between power and subjectivity in

democratic states and how various technologies of subjectivity have come to "link personal goals

and desires to social order and stability" (p. 327). Her study set out to expose how celebrated

social programs designed to enhance the subjectivity of marginalized populations also act as

techniques for the subjection of these same marginalized populations. More specifically, her

study illuminated the complex ways in which the modern rhetoric of self-esteem is bound with a

neoliberal moral discourse of individual responsibility and self-governance, whereby "achieving

individual freedom becomes a matter not of slogans nor of political revolution, but of a slow,

painstaking, and detailed work on our own subjective and personal realities, guided by an expert knowledge of the psyche" (p. 331). Cruikshank provided interesting insights for this research project on coaching and fun. Although she did not specifically discuss fun, Cruikshank targeted another psychological construct: self-esteem. Her study exposed the various governmental stakes in the psychological construct of self-esteem. It also exposed the ways in which self-esteem acts as a powerful individualizing and normalizing political technology. Moreover, her work successfully problematized how the psychological construct of self-esteem works to draw our attention away from the power relations at work within social contexts and from various social and gendered inequalities. Based on Cruikshank's critical Foucauldian analysis, it could be argued that the growing importance of psychological constructs such as self-esteem and fun within contemporary social/sporting contexts is not incidental, but rather is related to the increasing dominance of psychology as an individualizing knowledge which supports the diffusion of power at the individual level.

Similarly, Hopkins et al. (2009) also built on a Foucauldian perspective to draw attention to the neoliberal and governmental stakes of a historical shift in the discourse on emotions from "irrational impulses to be controlled to highly valuable resources to be developed for both the individual and society" (p. 196). Their book provided useful theoretical insights for this research project as they attempted to debunk the traditional emotionality/rationality binary. They also problematized a dominant understanding of the 'affective turn' as the champion of a reactionary project seeking to overthrow modernity. Instead they showed how emotions are currently caught up and fully integrated within modern scientific and professional discourses. Finally Hopkins et al. (2009) disrupted a view of the Romantic Movement and its call for more emotional expressivity as a reactionary counter-enlightenment project. Instead they argued it should be re-

conceptualized "as a critical self-reflection and radicalisation of enlightenment ideas" (p. 212).

They claimed that a more accurate understanding of the history of modernization would

highlight this dynamic interplay between the rationalist and the romantic expressive aspects of

modernization. As such, they advocated for more sociological studies, which purport to show

how emotions are caught up within a modern neoliberal discourse of individual optimization and

how emotional expressivity and instrumental rationality blend together in support of dominant

scientific discourses. Hopkins et al's (2009) work provided an important starting point to

problematize both the positive sport psychology model of fun and the pleasure movement

pedagogical model. Indeed, their argument, based on Foucault's theorization of the

power/knowledge nexus, pushes sport researchers to engage more critically with how discourses

of emotional expressivity (e.g., pleasure movement literature) that emphasize fun and pleasure,

are strategically deployed in support of a dominant scientific and instrumental logic in varsity

sport. Based on this critical reading, I also consider *to what extent and how* the strategic

deployment of fun also supports a dominant scientific and instrumental logic in varsity sport.

More specifically, I consider to what extent and how the strategic deployment of fun relates to

the (re)-production of dominant coaching and sporting practices in varsity sporting contexts.

      Feminist and queer theorist Ahmed (2004) provided another helpful example of how a

poststructuralist theoretical framework could be applied to theorize pleasures and emotions.

Notably, her book aimed to shed light on the historical production and circulation of emotions:

i.e., on "what emotions do, how they circulate between bodies, how they shape the very surfaces

of our bodies, and how they delineate the boundaries between the social and the individual" (p.

8). Her book was a critique of both the psychological model of interiority and of the strict social

model of exteriority. It was framed as an analysis of "affective economies, where feelings do not

reside in subjects or objects but rather are produced as effects of circulation" (p. 8). According to

Ahmed, critical attention to the historical production and circulation of emotions and pleasures

has much to offer insofar as it allows researchers to understand how individual subjects become

invested in particular structures and how they often become attached to the very conditions of

their subordination. Ahmed began by situating emotions within gendered power relations. She

explained the historical construction of emotions as the negative binary of rationality and as tied

to nature, femininity, emotionality and passivity. This allowed her to retrace how the idea of

modern civilized man has come to be historically formed in connection with the ability to control

emotions, but also with the ability to cultivate the 'good emotions': i.e., those that sustain the

formation of a normative, competent self. Gendered power relations, thus, help to partially

explain why emotions have until relatively recently received little attention from social theorists.

They can also help to shed light on why, as Pringle and Rinehart (in press) similarly argued,

sporting pleasures and emotions have remained an understudied area within sport sociology.

Contextualizing the production and circulation of fun within gendered power relations in varsity

sport was also an interesting and important aspect of my analysis. I considered how fun is

deployed within different gendered varsity sporting contexts and whether more emphasis is

placed or not within women's varsity sport. I was, thus, particularly sensitive in my data

collection and analysis as to the ways in which the strategic deployment of 'fun' supports and

enables the (re)-production of gendered power relations and inequalities in performance sporting

contexts.

The structure of Ahmed's (2004) book further unfolded through an exploration of various

emotions such as pain, hate, fear, disgust, shame, and love. It specifically explored how a

theorization of these emotions could shed light on various political and socio-historical contexts

(e.g., the reconciliation process in Australia, responses to international terrorism after 9/11, asylum and immigration within the UK). Her final two chapters elaborated on how emotions could work within feminist and queer politics as "a reorientation of our relation to social ideals, and the norms they elevate into social aspirations" (p. 16). These last two chapters could provide a good starting point and framework for a theorization of how individual coaches can critically engage with the politics of fun/pleasure in performance sport to the end of developing of more ethical coaching and sporting practices. Similar to Pringle's (2010) critique of an uncritical celebration of pleasure movement as a pedagogical alternative, Ahmed (2004) argued that a queer politics based strictly on an anti-normative orientation and celebration of queer pleasures could be very problematic. She made this argument based on the idea that not everyone can afford the luxury of living their lives in opposition to socially sanctioned norms. Moreover, she argued that queer desires and pleasures have, just like any other forms of pleasure, become increasingly co-opted and commodified within modern capitalistic society. Similar to Pringle (2010) who urged critical scholars to move away from attempts to settle PE's core identity, she urged queer theorists to move away from attempts to theorize what being queer is, as a social identity, towards the idea of *'doing queerness'.* In such a political project creating discomfort as a pedagogical and political practice could be just as useful as is creating and displaying queer pleasures. In that sense the focus of the debate becomes less about whether practices of queering are practices of assimilation or resistance, and more about whether they help individuals to "inhabit norms differently" (p. 155). With that said, she recognized that the exploration of "queer pleasures" including sexual pleasures has the potential both to reshape bodies through the enjoyment of "what or who has been barred" (p. 165) previously, but also that it could "impress

differently upon the surfaces of social space" creating the possibilities for new social forms (p. 165).

For Ahmed (2004), the 'truths' of this world are intimately bound with emotions: with how they move subjects and 'stick them together'. Normative pleasures are, thus, firmly embedded within discourses and regimes of truth and can be very limiting and coercive. Pleasures are generally framed as a reward for good conduct, which involves being productive in a socially sanctioned way. However, they are also normative in the sense that it is very much about having the right kind of pleasure, in which "rightness is determined as an orientation towards specific objects" (p. 163). Interestingly, Ahmed seemed to collapse emotion and pleasure together which she defined as a specific orientation of a human being towards a specific object within a specific affective economy. Ahmed (2004) articulated that the first key component of a critical affective feminist pedagogy is to challenge the view that justice is about 'good' character, or having the 'right' kind of feelings. Not only does this model "work to conceal the power relations at work in defining what is good in itself but it also works to individualize, personalize, and privatize the social relation of (in) justice" (p. 165). This last argument is in alignment with sport theorists' (Pringle, 2000, 2009, 2010; Tinning, 1997) critique of the reductionist positive sport psychology models and of the pleasure movement pedagogical model which also work to conceal the power relations involved in defining what is good or pleasurable in sporting contexts. The second key component of a feminist struggle against injustice is then to understand how we are moved and oriented by feelings in specific ways in relation to established social norms and "how we can be moved into a different relation to the norms that we wish to contest" (p. 201).

These critical readings pushed me to question the strategic role that fun plays within the discursive formation of performance sport and the ways in which fun might similarly work to 'conceal' the power relations involved in defining what is good or pleasurable. Re-contextualizing fun within the dynamic power relations of performance sport could then allow for fun to be (re)-politicized and positively (re)-articulated within an ethical project. Both Ahmed's (2004) and Hopkins et al.'s (2009) work provided in that sense important insights. Indeed, as they compellingly argued, the construction of a new ethics has little to do with rejecting a problematic model to adopt a different model of truth. Rather it has to do with the ongoing critical task of a problematization of thought itself. As such, constructing and promoting a new ethics is deeply imbricated with the political act of "fictionalizing", which Foucault coined. Fictionalizing means "to make fictions work within truth, to introduce truth-effects within a fictional discourse, and to make discourse arouse, 'fabricate', something which does not yet exist, starting from a historical truth" (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983, p. 204). Following Ahmed (2004) and Hopkins et al's (2009) argument, the way to 'fictionalize' and practice a more ethical sport space cannot simply be about substituting one sporting model deemed problematic (e.g., the performance/professional sporting model) with another (e.g., the positive psychology coaching model). As Pringle (2010) also suggested, this complex ethical task cannot be reduced to promoting for example body movement pleasures in lieu of the scientific performance based model. To reduce this complex ethical task to a superimposition of one sporting/coaching model for another would be to disregard that all human interactions happen within a field of complex strategic power relations. Despite all our good intentions, we are often unaware of the ways in which our practices and interventions are shaped, constrained and inevitably recuperated by dominant discourses in sporting and social contexts. In this light, emotions such as joy and

happiness are not *essentially* superior to sorrow, sadness or discomfort, nor should they be pursued as political and moral ends in themselves (e.g., politics of happiness, positive sport psychology models, etc.). Rather, their worth lies in how they impact us in a self-constituting process of becoming and in how they help or hinder our capacity to affect and be affected. A Foucauldian politics and ethics would thus base itself on a critical investigation of how 'fun' is tied up with relations of production in order to "radically democratize the experience, expression and possibility for a political engagement" (Ruddick, 2010, p. 40).

While this review of feminist and queer theorizations of emotions and pleasures was not sport related, it did nonetheless provide useful and rich examples of how a poststructuralist/Foucauldian theoretical framework has been applied to critically examine the production of emotions and pleasures within wider social contexts. These feminist and queer theorists have successfully drawn on Foucault's theorization of the power/knowledge nexus to discuss the various governmental stakes involved in the production of various emotions and pleasures within social contexts. They have also successfully drawn attention to the role that emotions, pleasures and psychologically 'desirable' states of being continue to play in the reproduction of social and gendered inequalities. My research builds on this body of literature and elaborates on how dominant coaching and sporting discourses affect how coaches understand and articulate their coaching practices related to fun. In what follows, I focus on two Foucauldian studies of fun/pleasure in sport (Lauss, 2010; Pringle, 2009) and elaborate on how this research project also draws on their critical work.

3) Foucauldian studies of fun/pleasure in sport

There are very few Foucauldian studies of fun/pleasure in sporting contexts (e.g., Bonita, 2010) or in performance sporting contexts (e.g., Pringle, 2009). I start by examining Lauss's and Szigetvari's (2010) study, which drew on a Foucauldian framework to examine the discursive production of fun within the context of a major sporting event before examining Pringle's (2009) article on how high-performance rugby players negotiate experiences of pleasure within a context of pain, bodily risk and sporting discipline.

Lauss and Szigetvari (2010) drew on Foucault's concept of 'governmentality' to critically examine the discursive production of fun in fan zones. It specifically focused on the strategic uses of fun both as a congregational element by bringing individuals together and a regulatory element to organize and govern individual conduct to uphold "a symbolic political vision of a peaceful, competitive and unified Europe" (p. 737). While Lauss's and Szigetvari's work is not directly connected to this research project, it nonetheless provided useful insights into how emotions are discursively produced to meet certain specific political/strategic aims within social/sporting contexts. For example, they outlined a number of strategic devices animated to manufacture a form of individual conformity tied to consumerism and congruent with a neoliberal discourse of moral responsibility within fan zones (e.g., consuming and designing one's own product, the Adidas shoe; becoming a sport star through online spectator competitions or street football games; and providing one's own entertainment through filming and interviewing individual spectators). The discussion of these various strategies was ensconced within a discussion of Foucault's articulation of individual desires as the central problem within a neoliberal political framework and of "fun" as "the core question to answer for those who govern within such a political framework" (p. 738). Lauss and Szigetvari further provided a

useful conceptualization of fun as a political technology, which enables a "process in which desires, understood as the pursuit of individual interest, become translated into particular (social) action" (p. 738). They showed how fun facilitates the blurring of a sharp categorical differentiation between different elements such as the football event, brand and city marketing, and security interests. They also showed how fun helps to produce a 'reality' in which questions of security and entertainment are narrowly and 'naturally' intertwined concomitantly legitimizing a number of negative impacts and disturbances that the EURO 2008 event had for the locals in Vienna. Their Foucauldian analysis successfully problematized the instrumental and governmental logic behind the production of fun in fan zones. It further problematized the mechanisms by which fun operates to manufacture individual conformity under the guise of public entertainment and amusement. It demonstrated how the production of fun in fan zones helps to produce and normalize a specific individual subject: one that actively and uncritically supports "the vision of a compacted, peaceful, European, consumer community" (p. 738). Their critical reading pushes one to consider the role that fun plays in producing individual subjectivities and whether fun also plays a role as a normalizing and regulatory political technology in performance sport.

Pringle's (2009) Foucauldian analysis of the production of rugby pleasures within the context of high-performance rugby in New Zealand is undoubtedly most closely aligned with this specific doctoral research project on coaching and fun in varsity sporting contexts. Pringle examined the central role that rugby plays in the construction of masculine identities in New Zealand. By drawing on interviews with seven competitive rugby players, Pringle sought to develop a further understanding of the seemingly paradoxical mix of joy and pain in the constitution of rugby pleasures. More specifically, he drew on two Foucauldian concepts

(technologies of dominance and technologies of the self) to highlight the intersection of both in the production of rugby pleasures. Pringle's intent was not to romanticize rugby pleasures. Rather, he aimed to critically discuss how their discursive production enhances the social significance of rugby in the construction of masculine identities in New Zealand and also normalizes various problematic and unintended discursive effects such as a culture of violence, pain, injury and bodily risk. Whereas he recognized the ambivalence of the term 'pleasure', he defined it as a "feeling or source of happiness, delight or satisfaction" and underscored its contemporary social significance as a "prime existential project, an organizing principle of social life, and a productive force in the constitution of desiring sport subjects" (p. 213). Furthermore, Pringle sought to identify the discourses that encourage or demand participation in rugby and the "technologies of dominance that effectively control bodies, aptitudes and desires during training sessions and games" (p. 217). Notably, he discussed and problematized how rugby pleasures intersect with the pleasures of securing a sense of self, of fitting within the norm, of gaining social status and recognition, and with the thrill of overcoming fear of injuries, and of dominating one's opponent. Finally, Pringle drew on a strategy of 'defamiliarization', which aimed to "disturb people's mental habits by making the familiar strange" (p. 225). He, thus, drew a parallel between rugby and sadomasochism [S&M] as a framework to understand rugby pleasures and stimulate critical reflection not because of a personal interest in S&M, but because both S&M and competitive rugby share the fact that they provide opportunities for "creative participation in games of power" (p. 226).

Similar to Pringle, this doctoral research project also rejects the idea that fun is "the product of biological, psychological, or personal appetites" (p. 214) and also seeks to (re)-contextualize experiences of fun within the discursive boundaries of coaching discourses and

within the dynamic power relations of performance sport. However, this research project distinguishes itself from Pringle's work on multiple fronts: first, it sought to understand the prevalence of 'fun' and not 'pleasure' within coaching discourses. As I have previously argued, this is an important distinction to make since fun is arguably more prevalent than pleasure within coaching discourses and, thus, fun and pleasure likely do not play the same role within the specific power relations of performance sport and within the production of coaching knowledge. Second, this project focused less on understanding individual processes of subjectivation and more on understanding how coaches know about fun and articulate how they promote fun within the boundaries of available coaching and sporting discourses. Deleuze's (1988) articulation of Foucault's concept of 'discursive formation' and Foucault's concept of 'power relations' were, therefore, foregrounded. Third, this project sought to further understand the role that fun plays in the (re)-production of power relations and notably how fun is strategically deployed within the gendered power relations of performance sport. Pringle's (2009) study was a problematization of the construction of masculinities through rugby in New Zealand. However, he also claimed that differences in gender should not necessarily be foregrounded in the analysis of high-performance sporting pleasures: "Discourses of gender, although important, should not be overemphasized in the examination of sporting pleasures after athletes have become committed participants" (p. 223). This particular claim warrants further examination. As such, one aim of this study was to examine how gendered relations impact how coaches know about fun and seek to promote fun within varsity coaching settings. In what follows, I elaborate on how I used the concepts of 'discursive formation' and 'power relations' to inform my analysis of fun and coaching.

4) The Discursive Formation

Deleuze's (1988) work on Foucault defined a discursive formation as the ensemble of rules and conditions, which allow for certain knowledges to be produced and be intelligible. A discursive formation consists of both 'visible forms' (e.g., the various practices and disciplinary techniques of performance sport which operate through the control of time, space and movement) and of 'articulable forms' (e.g., the set of scientific and technical knowledges which inform coaching and sporting practices in performance sport). He further argued that an examination of both the visible and the articulable forms is necessary in order to understand a specific discursive formation. Part of what Deleuze aimed to show was the intricate interrelation between the visible and articulable forms of a discursive formation and their connection to power relations. He wrote:

> If knowledge consists of linking the visible and the articulable, power is its presupposed cause; but conversely power implies knowledge as the bifurcation or differentiation without which power would not become an act: 'There is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations. (Deleuze, 1988, p. 33)

For this project I chose to draw on Deleuze's (1988) articulation of Foucault's concept of discursive formation because it presents clear advantages: firstly, it breaks Foucault's concept into two distinct yet clearly interrelated parts (the visible and the articulable), which allows for the reader to make connections between the two more easily. Furthermore, in contrast to Foucault's concept of discourse which often ends up being boiled down to 'text', Deleuze's articulation of discursive formation offers sport scholars a powerful tool to precisely avoid this pitfall. As such, it has the potential to complement and enrich some of the feminist and queer

49

literature on the body, pleasures, and emotions. This doctoral research project entails developing a further understanding of how fun relates to the articulable forms of the discursive formation of performance sport: the present rules and conditions under which we can both speak intelligibly about fun in performance sport and practice fun in performance sport. A focus on understanding the connection between fun and the various articulable forms of the discursive formation of performance sport is arguably more central to my analysis since 'fun' is more of a psychological construct, although it is also inevitably related to sporting/training practices. In order to address my main aim to understand how the articulable forms of the discursive formation of performance sport inform coaches' understanding of fun and how they articulate how they use fun in performance sport, I relied on a Foucauldian textual analysis of two major coaching programs and websites. Doing this helped me to understand how fun is strategically articulated in relation to dominant understandings of coaching effectiveness and expertise. Once I examined how fun relates to the articulable forms of the discursive formation of performance sport, I examined how coaches understand fun and how they articulate how they promote fun within their practices as a result. I gained insights into how the strategic deployment of fun in the articulable forms of performance sport affects how varsity coaches understand fun and articulate how they promote fun within their coaching practices. These interviews also helped me to see how fun is tied to certain specific understandings and practices of coaching and of the body and movement. In what follows, I elaborate on Foucault's understanding of power relations and on the power/knowledge nexus since Foucault (1978) did not believe that one could be considered independently of the other.

5) Power Relations

Foucault understood modern society to be subjected to two main forms of power which he theorized in different bodies of work: the anatomo-political or disciplinary power (e.g., *Discipline & Punish,* 1979) which concerns itself with the control of individual bodies and bio-power (e.g., *History of Sexuality,* 1978; *Society Must Be Defended,* 2003b) which concerns itself with the overall control and effective management of populations. Importantly, he did not understand these two forms of power as separate, but rather as closely interrelated and mutually reinforcing and as combining into what he called modern technologies of dominance: "the two sets of mechanisms one disciplinary and the other regulatory do not exist at the same level. Which means of course that they are not mutually exclusive and can be articulated with each other" (Foucault, 2003b, p. 250).

Foucault (1979) articulated two main technologies of dominance in modern society: the technologies of discipline which operate on individual bodies through the control of time, space, and movement, and the confessional which acts on individual bodies through ritualised exactions of 'truths'. These shape how individuals come to know and govern themselves. Most sporting contexts lend themselves very well to the analysis of disciplinary power as they target individual bodies with the aim of moulding them into highly productive and efficient sporting bodies. As such, various scholars have drawn on Foucault's technologies of dominance to problematize high-performance operates to produce docile bodies (e.g., Barker-Ruchti & Tinning, 2010; Denison, 2007; Shogan, 1999, 2007). Denison (2007, 2010) in particular problematized the effects of docility by drawing on his own experiences as a former high-performance middle distance runner and coach. He claimed that although hard to discern, the effects of docility could best be characterized by a general and pervasive feeling of discomfort, which gradually

permeates life and can even result in early retirement and the onset of depression. Although this project does seek to understand how coaches understand and articulate how they use fun within the context of performance sport (i.e., within sporting/coaching contexts whose articulated aim is to train bodies to meet the productive goals of performance sport and of winning), an in depth discussion of the various disciplinary techniques is arguably not so central. Nonetheless, it was interesting to examine how varsity coaches understand and articulate how they use fun *in relation* to disciplinary practices of performance sport. It was equally interesting to examine how they rationalized fun within performance coaching/sporting contexts, which aim to produce highly disciplined/docile sporting bodies.

Foucault (1979) was very critical of the disciplinary effects of modern power relations. But part of what makes his analysis of modern power relations so interesting especially for the analysis of sport, lies in his rejection of a negative deductive understanding of power. Instead he emphasized:

> We must cease once and for all to describe the effects of power in negative terms: it 'excludes', it 'represses', it 'censors', it 'abstracts', it 'masks', it 'conceals'. In fact, power produces; it produces reality; it produces domains of objects and rituals of truth. (p. 194)

Foucault's productive understanding of power is linked to his theorization of power and knowledge as inseparable and co-constitutive. Furthermore, power relations are inextricably linked to the (re)production of discourses (as ways of knowing). Reciprocally, dominant discourses help sustain dominant power relations in various social contexts. It is particularly fruitful to draw on his theorization of power relations and discourses to problematize the pleasure movement pedagogical model and the positive sport psychology and coaching

project to 'bring the fun back' into PE and youth sporting contexts. More specifically, these could help sport scholars critique a view of these models as born out of a reaction to the de-pleasuring effects of modern scientific rationalism. These Foucauldian theoretical tools could also help sport scholars problematize the production of the pleasure movement and positive sport psychology pedagogical models as essentially positive and desirable and as the binary opposite of the scientific performance sporting model. Not only does a Foucauldian theoretical framework allow sport scholars to critique such a dualistic understanding, but it also allows them to problematize a romantic discourse which builds on the notion that fun/pleasures have been repressed and that it suffices to 'liberate' fun in order to create more positive and ethical sporting contexts. Indeed, Foucault would argue that such a perspective remains locked within a tradition, which understands power: "only as a constraint, negativity and coercion, as a systematic refusal to accept reality, as a repressive instrument, as a ban on truth, the forces of power prevent or at least distort the formation of knowledge" (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983, p. 129). What Foucault's understanding of power as productive, relational and tied to the formation of knowledge allows sport scholars to do, is to ask different questions: questions which neither attempt to settle the essential meaning of fun/pleasure in sport, nor attempt to differentiate good and bad coaching practices to the end of drawing up a generalizable prescriptive moral code. Instead, it pushes sport scholars to constantly critically engage with all knowledge production in order to understand how knowledge is strategically produced and used within the dynamic power relations of performance sport.

As Foucault (1978) put it:

> We must not imagine a world of discourses divided between accepted discourses and excluded discourses, or between the dominant discourse and the dominated one; but as

a multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies.

(Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 215)

In light of the above, we might ask: How do these two seemingly antithetical discourses (the romantic humanistic discourse on pleasure and the modern discourse of scientific rationality) intersect, overlap, and collude to produce specific understandings of fun, sport performance, and coaching effectiveness and expertise? What strategic role does the psychological construct of fun play within the specific power relations and 'games of truth' of performance sport?

A large part of Foucault's critical work (e.g., *Abnormal,* 2003a; *History of Sexuality,* 1978; *Psychiatric Power,* 2006a) targeted the dangers of the spread of 'psy-discourses' through knowledges like psychology, and psychoanalysis (what he called 'the sciences of the soul'). More specifically, it sought to expose how these individualizing knowledges insidiously work to govern the conduct of individuals by tying them to their identities through self-knowledge. Against this critical background, we might also question the psychological construct of fun that has entered the coaching literature and come to assume such a central position: How has fun become such a 'natural' imperative in sport? Furthermore, what strategic role does fun play in the formation and dissemination of coaching knowledges and in the (re)-production of power relations in performance sporting contexts? What Foucault aimed to show is that power relations are inextricably tied to the formation and reproduction of knowledge and to the establishment of 'regimes of truth'. As such, what we know in performance sport is intimately bound with what can be said, who gets to speak and with what conviction. While regimes of truth are neither fixed nor stable, they nonetheless operate in subtle and strategic ways to shape the views and practices of individuals in support of dominant power relations. Specific socio-historical regimes of truth, thus, provide a grid of intelligibility for what can and cannot be thought at different historical

times. Much of Foucault's work was dedicated to destabilizing our present modern regime of truth that he deemed problematic. Through his critical historical examination of different institutions like prisons, mental hospitals, Foucault (1979, 1978) aimed to challenge the Enlightenment idea that our modern truths are a reflection of human progress or of the gradual betterment of Man and society through a process of scientization. Rather, he showed that 'truths' are produced in the complex interplay of dominant power relations and historical contingencies. As such, he claimed rational and scientific truths should always be received with a certain amount of critical scepticism. Foucault based this claim on the fact that "what reason experiences as its necessity or rather what different forms of rationality present as their necessary condition one can perfectly do the history of and recover the networks of contingencies from which it has emerged" (Davidson, 2001, p. 189).

Deleuze's (1988) work on Foucault and his concept of discursive formation and Foucault's concept of power relations hold much potential as critical tools: both to interrogate present coaching and sporting practices, but also to promote more ethical coaching and sporting practices which will benefit all involved in sport. I argue that it is only through developing a critical understanding of the power relations at work in the production and dissemination of knowledge that coaches will be able to move beyond quick fix solutions towards creating fundamental positive changes within performance and high-performance sporting contexts. Deleuze's (1988) work on Foucault and articulation of discursive formation and Foucault's (1978, 1979) articulation of power relations were particularly useful for my critical research project on fun and coaching. What these concepts allowed me to do, is to better understand the strategic role of fun in the power relations of varsity sport and the narrow connection between the politics of truth and how coaches understand effective coaching and training, and the body

and movement as a result. These theoretical concepts also enabled me to better understand what coaching and training practices are produced as a result and on that basis, to critically interrogate present coaching and sporting practices related to fun.

Summary

The aim of this chapter was to show how we might theorize fun and coaching through a Foucauldian lens and further how a Foucauldian framework might help sport scholars identify how coaches understand and articulate their coaching practices related to fun within the context of varsity sport. I also situated my research project within previous Foucauldian studies of fun, pleasure and emotion both in sporting and in wider social contexts. To do this I articulated my understanding of the main Foucauldian concepts which will be most useful to my analysis: *discursive formation* as the ensemble of rules and conditions which allow for certain knowledges to be produced and be intelligible and *power relations* as a way in which certain actions modify others, as a mode of action "which does not act directly upon others but rather acts upon their actions present and future" (Dreyfus & Rabinow, 1983, p. 220).

As I showed in my first chapter, the concept of 'fun' has mainly been theorized either from a positivist or from a humanistic/interpretivist lens. These are, thus, the dominant discourses, which shape how coaches presently understand and practice fun. Adopting Foucault's concepts of power relations and discourses to examine how coaches use and promote fun in performance sport, something that has not been done, thus, enabled this doctoral research project to make both a substantial and theoretical contribution to the existing coaching and sporting literature on fun and effective and ethical coaching. Foucault's concepts allowed me to meet my research aim: of developing a better understanding of the strategic role that fun plays in the discursive formation of performance sport to the end of developing more ethical and effective

coaching and sporting practices related to fun. In the fourth chapter of my thesis, I elaborate on

the specifics of my research design through a three-part discussion of my methodology, methods

and research ethics.

Chapter 4: Methodology

Before delving into the details of my research design and of the methods I chose to collect and analyze my data, it is necessary to briefly discuss and define some key terminology as it relates to this poststructuralist research project. Although I will be discussing epistemology, ontology, methodology, methods and research ethics separately, it is important to note that as King and Horrocks (2010) specified, "ontology, epistemology and methodology and methods are all connected and cannot be viewed in isolation" (p. 10).

1) Epistemology, Ontology, Methodology

King and Horrocks (2010) defined *epistemology* as "the philosophical theory of knowledge" (p. 8), while *ontology* refers to the study of being, nature or reality. Drawing on Schwandt (2001) then Kaplan (1964), Carter and Little's (2008) definition of *methodology* sought to emphasize the difference between methodology and methods. They defined methodology as "the analysis of the assumptions, principles, and procedures in a particular approach to inquiry" (p. 1317) and as "the study-the description, the explanation, and the justification-of methods, and not the methods themselves" (p. 1317). According to Kaplan (1964) the aim of methodology is to:

> Describe and analyse...methods, throwing light on their limitations and resources, clarifying their presuppositions and consequences...to help us to understand, in the broadest possible terms, not the products of scientific inquiry but the process itself"
> (Carter & Little, 2008, p. 1318, cited in King & Horrocks, 2010).

Clarifying one's epistemological assumptions as a qualitative researcher is of paramount importance because, as Carter and Little emphasized, epistemology influences methodology, but also the relationship between researcher and participants in a research process, the way in which

the quality of methods is demonstrated, as well as the form, voice and representation in the method. Furthermore, it forms the basis upon which one can judge the quality of a study. All research including qualitative research should strive for 'epistemological integrity', which King and Horrocks defined as "the connections between the nature of the research, overall strategy, research questions, design and methods" (p. 8).

1.1 A Poststructuralist Theoretical Framework

As I mentioned in the previous chapter, I plan to use a poststructuralist theoretical framework. A poststructuralist theoretical framework rests on specific epistemological and ontological assumptions about the nature of reality and truth, and how researchers can gain knowledge of it. In poststructuralist research, 'reality' and 'truth' are understood to be multiple and subjective. Furthermore, the role of the researcher is understood as one that involves actively participating in the production of knowledge/truth/reality. As Markula and Silk (2011) emphasized, "each individual is a part of power relations and thus, part of the negotiation, circulation and alteration of discourses" (p. 51). This relational and productive understanding of power necessarily carries within it important and complex ethical implications.

Moreover, to claim a poststructuralist theoretical framework for this PhD research project on fun and coaching in varsity sport implies that I reject an essentialist view of sport as intrinsically fun, as in the positive sport psychology-coaching project. It further implies that I understand knowledge and truth as a social production tied to power relations. Therefore, rather than pursuing a line of inquiry which seeks to uncover the essential meaning of fun in sport as an asocial or depoliticized concept, I became interested in how 'fun' is actively and strategically produced within the power/knowledge nexus of varsity sport. A poststructuralist theoretical framework has thus both shaped my research question and aim, but also how I decided to go

about answering these through my choice of research methods (the emphasis being not on what but rather on *how* I use these methods). In what follows, I delve into the specifics of my research project and discuss my choice of methods. I elaborate specifically on how I plan to use these to answer my research question and aim to understand how coaches know about fun and articulate their practices related to fun within varsity sport.

2) Methods

As I briefly discussed in my theoretical chapter, it is Deleuze's (1988) work on Foucault and his articulation of a discursive formation and of the articulable which informed my choice of methods. Based on Deleuze's central concept, I decided to conduct a Foucauldian textual analysis of two major coaching websites in addition to 10 semi-structured individual interviews with varsity coaches. I chose a Foucauldian textual analysis because I believe that this method will allow me to understand what articulable forms inform coaches' understanding of fun in varsity sport, and semi-structured individual interviews because I believe that this method will allow me to understand how the articulable forms of fun inform how coaches articulate their coaching practices related to fun. This should in turn allow me to understand how the discursive production of fun connects to various dominant coaching and training practices and understandings of the body and movement. I will start with how I plan to conduct my Foucauldian textual analysis of coaching 'texts' related to fun before discussing how I plan to conduct my semi-structured individual interviews with varsity coaches.

2.1 Forms of Textual Analysis

Textual analysis focuses on "interpreting the content and meaning of already existing texts" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 112). There are many different forms of textual analysis, which follow either a deductive logic aimed to prove or disprove a theory (e.g., content analysis), or an

inductive logic (e.g., conversation analysis, Fairclough's critical discourse analysis (CDA), Foucauldian discourse analysis, Derridean deconstruction, narrative analysis). These latter forms are appropriate to qualitative research projects because they focus on "the meaning of texts" (p. 116).

There are different types of textual/discourse analyses within the qualitative research paradigm. These rest on different understandings of discourse and power. In deciding what type of textual/discourse analysis one will use as a researcher, it is important to be aware of such distinctions and how these tools fit in respect to different research paradigms (e.g., positivist, post-positivist, social-constructionist, interpretive, critical, poststructuralist). Indeed, most textual/discourse analysis techniques developed by researchers working within different paradigms are not suitable for a poststructuralist project because they rest on different ontological and epistemological assumptions and different understandings of discourse and power. They, thus, seek to make different knowledge claims about reality and truth, which are not compatible with a poststructuralist theoretical framework and understanding of knowledge as socially constructed and power as relational and productive. For example, Fairclough's critical discourse analysis method (CDA) was developed within a critical research paradigm to "critically investigate and address social problems through examining ideological workings of the text" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 118). It follows three levels of analysis (a descriptive analysis of the content of the text, an analysis which focuses on the text as a discursive practice: how the text is produced and consumed and an analysis which focuses on the text as social practice: how the text connects to ideological dominance). Fairclough's CDA is not compatible with a poststructuralist research project because it rests on an ideological and hegemonic Marxist and Post Marxist understanding of power and truth.

Unfortunately, Foucault did not develop a discourse analysis method for the analysis of texts. However, Foucauldian scholars (Liao & Markula, 2009; Markula & Silk, 2011) have drawn on his theoretical tools and genealogical work to produce a Foucauldian inspired discourse analysis method. Unlike CDA, their Foucauldian discourse analysis method rests on an understanding of power as fluid, relational and productive rather than negative, hierarchical and exercised by a dominant group over powerless individuals. In what follows, I elaborate on what conducting a Foucauldian inspired textual analysis entails and enabled me to do as a researcher.

2.2. A Foucauldian Textual/Discourse Analysis

A Foucauldian textual analysis enables researchers to develop an understanding of how power relations operate through the "tactical uses of discourses" (Liao & Markula, 2009, p. 40), defined as ways of knowing. Furthermore, it aims to detect "what knowledges dominate particular fields, where they come from, and how they have become dominant" (p. 40). In order to examine how power operates through the tactical uses of discourses, Foucault perfected a method, which combined both his earlier archaeological work (e.g., *Archaeology of Knowledge,* 1972; *History of Madness*, 2006b; *The Birth of the Clinic*, 1973) and his later genealogical work (e.g., *Discipline and Punish*, 1979; *History of Sexuality,* 1978). In his earlier archaeological work, Foucault focused on what he called 'statements'. In his work on Foucault (1988), Deleuze explained that statements of a discursive formation are "transmissions of particular elements distributed in a corresponding space" (p. 5). They are neither phrases nor propositions. Nor must they be interpreted or deciphered to uncover their 'true' and 'hidden' meaning as in a hermeneutic tradition. Deleuze further wrote:

Archaeology does not attempt to evade verbal performances in order to discover

behind them or below their apparent surface a hidden element, a secret meaning that

lies buried within them, or what emerges through them without saying so; and yet the statement is not immediately visible; it is not given in such a manifest way as a grammatical or logical structure. The statement is neither visible nor hidden. (pp. 60-61)

Accordingly, although Foucault's archaeological and genealogical method shares some aspects with other formalist and interpretivist methods for analysing texts (for example, it also seeks to isolate words, phrases and propositions); it also differs significantly from these on numerous levels. To start, it adopts a surface treatment of texts and focuses on statements as *regularities*. According to Deleuze (1988), statements are only of interest insofar as they relate to the "rules governing the particular field in which they are distributed and reproduced" (p. 5). Secondly, Foucault's method aims to "examine the relations between history, discourse, bodies and power in an attempt to help to understand social practices or objects of knowledge that have value in today's world" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 129). Importantly, unlike ideologies in CDA, discourses are neither good nor bad in a Foucauldian model. Rather, it is how discourses operate within specific power relations, how they are taken up, and what practices are produced and reproduced as a result of these, which needs to be problematized. Lastly, a Foucauldian textual analysis's major focus is not either on uncovering a subject of power as in CDA. This allows researchers to engage with questions which work to decentre the subject of power and to de-individualize its effects such as: how does power circulate through discourses (as ways of knowing) and reciprocally how do discourses support specific relations of power? These questions inform my research aim of developing a further understanding of how coaches understand and articulate their practices related to fun within the present discursive boundaries

and power relations of varsity sport. In what follows, I elaborate on what conducting a Foucauldian inspired discourse analysis entailed.

2.3. Data Analysis of Coaching "Texts"

I undertook my analysis of key coaching 'texts' with the following objectives: first, to develop an understanding of the articulable forms of the discursive formation of sport coaching at large and second, to develop a better understanding of the role of fun in the discursive articulation of effective coaching within the specific context of varsity sport. The results of my discourse analysis and the themes that emerged from it also provided the structure for the second part of my data collection and analysis: my semi-structured interviews with varsity coaches at a Canadian university. The various steps of my analysis are reflected in the charts I included in the appendices.

My Foucauldian textual analysis of coaching texts is informed by both primary (Foucault, 1972) and secondary sources (Deleuze, 1988; Liao & Markula, 2009; Markula & Silk, 2011). The secondary sources provided key insights into how modified versions of Foucault's archaeological and genealogical methods can be drawn upon to analyze 'sporting texts'. Therefore, they helped me to meet my research aim of connecting fun to the articulable forms of varsity coaching and to the power relations of varsity sport and to problematize coaching and sporting discourses related to fun.

Foucault (1972) proposed to analyze the articulable forms of discursive formations by first engaging in an 'archaeological work'. This work involves identifying various discursive elements: objects, enunciations, concepts and theories.

Objects and Enunciations

Objects are "the specific topics to which texts refer" (Liao & Markula, 2009, p. 42), while enunciations are essentially where these topics are talked about. In this project, the object of my textual analysis is fun in varsity coaching. The enunciations for my analysis could, therefore, potentially have included popular coaching magazines, websites, and manuals designed for the 'performance coach'. However, based on Markula and Silk's (2011) adaptation of Patton's (2002) criteria for purposeful sampling, which I elaborate on in the next section, I focused specifically on two coaching programs/models supported and discussed in two major Canadian coaching websites: the NCCP (National Coaching Certification Program) on the Coaching Association of Canada (CAC) website, and the LTAD (Long Term Athlete Development model) on the Canadian Sport for Life (CS4L) website.

Concepts and theories

Concepts are, according to Foucault (1972), the various discursive elements that may be linked together in order to produce intelligible theories about a specific object. In this research project on fun and varsity coaching, concepts refer to the various elements, which can be grouped together in order to produce intelligible theories about fun and coaching in performance sporting contexts. Once I identified various concepts, the next step of my Foucauldian textual analysis was to articulate these together into theories. Theories are how individualized groups of statements "link with general domains of statements" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 131). In this research project, theories are individualized groups of statements related to fun and coaching in performance sporting contexts.

The Articulable Forms of a Discursive Formation

Finally, the last step of Foucault's (1972) archaeological and genealogical method involves connecting various theories to the articulable forms of a discursive formation and further to the power relations of this specific discursive formation. In this research project, it involved connecting various theories of fun and coaching to the articulable forms of the discursive formation of performance sport and to the power relations of performance sport.

Foucault (1972) claimed that one could speak of discursive formations when groups of elements are "formed in a regular manner by a discursive practice, and are indispensable to the constitution of a science" (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 53). Thus, a key part of conducting a Foucauldian discursive analysis consists in connecting individualized groups of statements to knowledges or sciences. In this project, it involved connecting theories of coaching and fun to various knowledges/sciences to understand what are the articulable forms of performance coaching which inform coaches' practices related to fun and what is the set of choices for understanding and practicing 'fun' and coaching within varsity sporting contexts.

A Connection to Power Relations

The final step of Foucault's (1972) archaeological and genealogical method involved connecting articulable forms to power relations. As such, the objective was to "understand what effect or practice is produced through various discourses" (Liao & Markula, 2009, p. 44) by situating these within their "larger cultural and historical context" (p. 46). In this project, it involved connecting the articulable forms of the discursive formation of performance coaching to the wider power relations of varsity sport. Connecting these allowed me to understand how the wider power relations of varsity sport shape coaches' understanding of fun and effective coaching and further how these shape how coaches articulate their coaching and training

practices related to fun. This further enabled me to understand what ways of understanding and practicing coaching in varsity sport are made possible and, conversely, what ways of understanding and practicing coaching in varsity sport are hindered or obscured through the strategic deployment of fun within the specific power/knowledge nexus of varsity sport. Furthermore, connected to this, it enabled me to see what ways of understanding the performing sporting body and practicing movement are made possible, and conversely what ways of understanding the performing sporting body and practicing movement are hindered or obscured. In what follows, I discuss the specifics of sampling as they pertain to my Foucauldian textual analysis.

2.4 Sampling for my Foucauldian Textual Analysis of Coaching 'Texts'

As Markula and Silk (2011) highlighted, there are no hard rules concerning the sampling of texts in qualitative research. Quoting Patton (2002), they emphasized rather that the "logic and power of purposeful sampling lie in selecting *information-rich cases* for study in depth" (p. 114). Some things qualitative researchers should, however, consider are the type of medium (e.g., newspapers, magazines, books, films), the type of text (e.g., written articles, photographs), the time frame to assemble the data, the number of text sources (e.g., how many newspapers, magazines), and finally the number of texts (e.g., how many newspaper articles or photographs) (p. 113). These should be selected on the basis of the research topic and specific research question.

While all qualitative research is purposeful, Patton (2002) provided a number of subcategories to help qualitative researchers choose their sample and clarify their sampling procedure. I selected the NCCP or (National Coaching Certification Program) and the Coaching Association of Canada website and the LTAD (Long Term Athlete Development Model) and the

Coaching Sport for Life Canadian website as coaching 'texts' for my Foucauldian textual analysis. Patton's (2002) criterion based sampling procedure, whereby texts are selected and reviewed based on a criterion of importance informs my sampling procedure. In the process of selecting my coaching texts, I was looking for texts, which would be most likely to have informed my sample of coaches' understanding of fun and how they articulate their coaching practices related to fun. I chose coaching websites over coaching magazines or manuals because websites are increasingly popular and privileged mediums for the production and dissemination of coaching knowledge within our post-modern society. They, thus, provide important educational resources for Canadian coaches. I specifically selected these two key websites and programs because they met two important criteria for the purpose of my research. First, I was looking for coaching websites and programs, which provide foundational, non-sport specific coaching information applicable to all the Canadian coaches in my sample, which encompasses coaches of 10 different varsity sports. Second, I was looking for official, institutionalized websites and programs, which would be most likely to have informed how my research participants understand and articulate how they promote fun within their coaching practices. The Coaching Association of Canada and the NCCP national coaching certification program thus presented themselves as the most logical sampling choices. As the Coaching Association of Canada website stipulated:

> CAC was established in 1970 as a result of recommendations of the Task Force on
> Sport for Canadians. In 1974, the Association launched the National Coaching
> Certification Program (NCCP). Since its inception, CAC has developed into a world
> leader in coach training and certification. Each year, more than 60,000 coaches take an
> NCCP workshop and since it began, more than 1M coaches have participated in the

Program (http://coach.ca/who-we-are-s16630, 2011)

All the varsity coaches in my sample will be familiar with the NCCP certification program since all coaches must go through this national official certification program to become certified coaches and be allowed to coach. Thus, the NCCP program arguably strongly influenced how my sample of coaches both understand fun and further how they seek to promote fun within their coaching practices.

The Canadian Sport for Life (CS4L) and the LTAD (Long Term Athlete Development) model also met these two criteria of importance. The LTAD model is officially endorsed by most sporting federations within North America and Western Europe and has become increasingly widespread and institutionalized. In fact, within Canada, sporting federations must show that they have implemented the LTAD model in order to receive government funding. In addition, the LTAD and the Canadian Sport for Life website provide excellent resources for my Foucauldian textual analysis of coaching texts as they encompass guidelines for coaches at all stages of an individual's development including at the early stages of an athlete's development, where the focus is likely to be heavily oriented towards fun. The Canadian Sport for Life website articulates its mission as:

> A movement to improve the quality of sport and physical activity in Canada. CS4L links sport, education, recreation and health and aligns community, provincial and national programming. LTAD is a seven-stage training, competition and recovery pathway guiding an individual's experience in sport and physical activity from infancy through all phases of adulthood. CS4L, with LTAD, represents a paradigm shift in the way Canadians lead and deliver sport and physical activity in Canada.
>
> (http://canadiansportforlife.ca/, 2011)

Having elaborated on how I conducted my Foucauldian textual analysis, I now turn to a discussion of my second research method: interviews.

Interviews

As previously discussed, I chose a Foucauldian textual analysis and semi-structured individual interviews as complimentary research methods based on Deleuze's (1988) articulation of a 'discursive formation'. In line with Atkinson and Coffey (2002), I used these two research methods in complementary ways. In what follows, I discuss the type of interview mode and form I selected and how I prepared for the interviews, how I developed and used my interview guide, my role as a researcher/interviewer, the sampling of my research participants, and finally how I analyzed the data I collected through my interviews.

2.5 Interview Mode and Form

There are many different modes and forms of interviewing, which vary both in terms of how the interview data is collected and also in terms of how the data is then analysed. For example, interviews can be conducted face-to-face, assisted by a compute, with focus groups, and via phone while interview forms can be factual, conceptual, narrative, and discursive (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). With that said, these various interview forms and modes are more generally described as being either structured, semi-structured, or unstructured.

Structured interviews "involve formulating, prior to the interviews, the precise questions to be asked, the order in which they are asked, and potentially even the wording of the questions" (Gibson & Brown, 2009, p. 86). This type of interviewing is particularly well suited to research conducted by quantitative researchers who aim to produce objective knowledge that is verifiable and generalizable. Thus, structured interviews are not especially well suited to most qualitative

research projects and especially not to poststructuralist research projects, which purport to produce rich, nuanced, and subjective knowledge.

Unstructured interviews "involve asking questions without any or with very little pre-definition of the topical concerns of the interview" (Gibson & Brown, 2009, p. 89). These forms of interviews are particularly well suited to long-term ethnographic projects, where there is both the time and the need to familiarize oneself with a specific research context. These are also useful as pre-pilot studies "when the analytic concern is in the process of being formulated or involves quite an 'open' question or the exploration of the personal experience or biography of an interviewee" (p. 90). Unstructured interviews are, thus, unsuitable for my research project which aims to produce specific knowledge about a well-defined aspect of coaching in varsity sporting contexts: how coaches understand and articulate how they promote fun within their coaching practices.

Semi-structured interviews involve "specifying the key themes of the interview that are, in turn, formulated as key questions" (Gibson & Brown, 2009, p. 88). However, although semi-structured interviews follow an interview schedule, they afford the researcher the latitude to "vary the order of the questions according to the 'natural flow' of the conversation" (p. 88). Furthermore, semi-structured interviews are based on the notion that "the researcher tries to fit his/her pre-defined research interests into the unfolding topics discussed rather than forcing the interviewees to fit their ideas into the pre-defined question order" (p. 88). Semi-structured interviews have the advantages of both providing enough structure to ensure that the interviews produce rich and in-depth data relevant to a specific research question while also allowing "for topics to emerge that were not included in the interview schedule" (p. 88). These also fit well

within a poststructuralist understanding of the interview process "as a site for the production of knowledge" (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 53).

While there are benefits and drawbacks associated with all modes and forms of interviewing, I chose to conduct individual, face-to-face, semi-structured interviews with varsity coaches for this research project on coaching and fun. I chose face-to-face interviews because these are arguably more personable forms of interviewing, which allow the researcher to pick up and respond 'in situ' to different bodily cues in ways that phone or computer based interviews do not. Furthermore, the nature of my sample, and the ease to which I can have access to it, makes face-to-face interviews a privileged option for this research project. Finally, I chose semi-structured interviews because they are well suited to my poststructuralist research project, which seeks to produce rich, nuanced, contextualized and specific knowledge about coaching and fun in varsity sporting contexts.

2.6 Setting the Interview Stage

As Kvale and Brinkman (2009) argued: "the setting of the interview stage should encourage the interviewees to describe their points of view on their lives and worlds" (p. 128). In order to achieve this, I made sure that my research participants were comfortable with the time and location of interviews and that these would be conducive to the successful unfolding of the interview. This implied meeting in a quiet public location and at a time of their choosing.

2.7 Scripting the Interview: The Interview Guide

The interview guide "is a script, which structures the course of the interview more or less tightly. For the semi-structured type of interview, the guide will include an outline of the topics to be covered with suggested questions" (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 130). Interview guides are different from "interview schedules" (Patton, 2002), which usually contain "a detailed set of

questions and probes" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 86) but are not organized around a series of topics or themes. For semi-structured interview guides that strive to produce in-depth knowledge about a specific topic, questions should be open-ended and specific. Notwithstanding the type of interview guide one uses, interview questions should also be "easy to understand, short, and devoid of academic language" (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 131). An interview guide should be designed:

- Thematically (to produce relevant and quality knowledge for the research project).

- Dynamically (to promote a positive interview interaction).

- Keeping the later analysis in mind (to facilitate data analysis).

Following these recommendations and Gibson and Brown's (2009) advice concerning the design and scripting of interview questions, I started with more general questions and progressed towards research specific questions pertaining to my sample of coaches' understanding and use of fun in their coaching practices. I also organized my 'Foucauldian' themed interview guide (Markula & Pringle, 2006) based on my theoretical framework and Deleuze's (1988) articulation of Foucault's concept of power/knowledge, and based on the findings of my Foucauldian discourse analysis of key coaching texts. I appended a copy of my Foucauldian themed interview guide in the appendices section of my dissertation.

2.8 Sampling: The Selection of Participants

As Markula and Silk (2011) emphasized, there are no hard rules in qualitative research when it comes to the sampling of research participants; nor is there a required set number of research participants, which can range from 1 to 100. As I previously mentioned in my discussion of sampling for my Foucauldian textual analysis, sampling in qualitative research is always purposeful (Patton, 2002) and should be driven by one's specific research project and

question. My sampling of participants is, just like my sampling of coaching texts, based on

Markula and Silk's (2011) adaptation of Patton's (2002) subcategories for purposeful sampling.

I selected my research participants based on Patton's convenience sampling, which is "doing

what is fast and convenient" and criterion based sampling technique "which involves selecting

participants who meet some predetermined criterion of importance" (p. 94). My criteria were the

following: NCCP certified Level 3, preferably from the same Canadian institution, women's and

men's sports, female and male head coaches, and lastly individual and team sports. I used these

criteria because I anticipated they would likely affect the ways varsity coaches both understood

and sought to promote fun within their practices. I limited my sample size to 10 coaches from the

following varsity sports:

• Swimming (M/W)	• Football (M)
• Soccer (M)	• Volleyball (M)
• Basketball (W)	• Hockey (M)
• Soccer (W)	• Volleyball (W)
• Curling (M/W)	• Wrestling (M/W)

2.9 The Role of the Researcher/Interviewer

In qualitative interviews, it is the interviewer who is the "key research instrument"

(Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 166). Thus, it is of paramount importance that the interviewer

is self-reflexive and that he/she strives to develop a wide-range of interview skills and

'sensitivities' to draw upon in various interview contexts. While not intended to be exhaustive

or dogmatic, Kvale and Brinkmann provided a list of these. These include being

"knowledgeable, structuring, clear, gentle, sensitive, open, steering, critical, remembering and interpreting" (p. 167). However, they also emphasized that:

> There are no unequivocal quality criteria for research interviews. A good interview rests upon the craftsmanship of the researcher, which goes beyond a mastery of questioning techniques to encompass knowledge of the research topic, sensitivity to the social relation of interviewer and interviewee, and an awareness of epistemological and ethical aspects of the research interviewing. (p. 174-175)

I worked to develop Kvale and Brinkman's (2009) interviewer and interview quality criteria by conducting two pilot interviews with varsity coaches. These helped me to refine my interview research questions before I started my interviews with my sample of varsity coaches and, thus, to be more 'knowledgeable', 'clear, and 'structuring'. In addition, they allowed me to develop my interview skills and sensitivities. For example, I developed sensitivity and experience as to when and how to be gently steering in the interviews.

2.10 Interview Data Analysis

Data Recording and Transcribing

I used an audio-recorder in my interviews with coaches. I chose to use an audio-recorder because it "frees the interviewer to concentrate on the topic and the dynamics of the interview" (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 179). I transcribed all the interviews myself. Following Markula and Silk's (2011) recommendations, I did not transcribe these verbatim, but rather sought to faithfully transcribe these from oral to written form. Doing this acknowledges that a fluent oral conversation is not necessarily well captured by a verbatim written transcription, nor does it necessarily do justice to my research participants. I also

offered my research participants the opportunity to follow up and clarify some of their statements if they felt the need to do so.

Data Analysis

There are many data analysis techniques in qualitative research, which vary as a function of one's paradigmatic orientation (Markula & Silk, 2011). For example, post-positivists draw on processual, formalized, and more empirically driven data analysis techniques such as grounded theory data analysis (Strauss & Corbin, 2008) or discourse analysis, which focuses on the transactions-exchanges, moves, and acts in a conversation (e.g., Edwards & Potter's (1992) discursive psychology) or conversation analysis, which seeks to understand talk as a social activity (e.g., Smith & Sparkes, 2005). These data analysis techniques, however, do not seek to show how meanings are produced within a larger social context and were, thus, not appropriate for my research project, which sought to contextualize coaches' understanding and use of fun within the dynamic power relations of performance sport.

Similarly, interview analysis techniques within the interpretive paradigm (e.g., various phenomenological approaches) were not suitable for my research project because they rest on the assumption that there is one reality and focus more on individual meaning making and less on contextualizing individual meaning making within wider social contexts. Nor were interview analysis techniques developed within the critical paradigm (e.g., Johnston et al., 2004) suitable since, despite being designed to "work the hyphen between the private world of that researched and the public worlds of the wider social contexts" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 106). These are based on an ideological and hierarchical understanding of power and truth which is not compatible with a poststructuralist research project.

Poststructuralist research in contrast to post-positivist research tends to rely on less formalized and more theoretically driven data analysis techniques. However, as Markula and Silk (2011) pointed out, researchers working within this paradigm should be very clear "about how they analyze their empirical material through their theoretical lenses" (p. 108). There are specific theory-based analysis techniques developed by various poststructuralists such as Foucault's 'genealogy', Derrida's 'deconstruction' or Deleuze's 'rhizomatics'. However, Foucault did not develop a method to specifically analyze interviews. As such, I drew on Pringle's (2006) modified version of Foucault's genealogical method informed by Foucault's theorization of power/knowledge. This modified version follows the following steps:

- Identification of themes based on my themed interview guide

- Analysis of the themes (intersection of themes, discrepancies between themes and emergence of 'new' themes)

- Connection with power relations, theory and previous literature (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 109).

In line with Pringle's (2009) Foucauldian analysis of rugby pleasures, I too drew on Foucault's concept of power/knowledge to organize my semi-structured 'themed interview guide' into themes which helped me to understand how dominant coaching discourses shape coaches' understanding of fun and how they articulate their practices related to fun. In doing this, I was also careful to not simply "identify discourses or divide them into either dominant or marginalized ones" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 109), but rather I looked for the numerous and even contradictory discourses that govern the interviewees perceptions.

Once I identified themes related to my interview guide and research questions, I analyzed the variations and patterns of relationship between these different themes in my

interviews. I specifically looked for the intersections and discrepancies between themes as well as for 'new' themes, which I did not account for in my themed interview guide. Doing this allowed me to develop various theories to address my research questions, but it also allowed me to refine my themed interview guide as I continued to explore and theorize the relationship between fun and effective coaching within varsity sport through my interviews with varsity coaches.

The final part of my data analysis involved connecting these theories to power relations, to my theoretical framework, and to the previous literature on coaching and fun. My Foucauldian textual analysis also provided the general theoretical backdrop for my interview analysis. More specifically, moving back and forth between the articulable forms (the set of coaching knowledges related to fun) I identified in my Foucauldian textual analysis and the ways coaches articulate their coaching practices related to fun in my interview analysis enabled me to theorize how these various discursive elements intersect, overlap, and collude to produce specific understandings of effective coaching and of the performing sporting body which in turn result in specific coaching and sporting practices in varsity sport. Moving back and forth between the articulable forms of fun and the ways coaches articulated their practices related to fun also enabled me to reveal the 'tactical productivity' (Markula & Silk, 2011) of fun within coaching and sporting discourses: how fun is strategically put in play within various coaching and sporting discourses, how coaches strategically use fun "to position themselves and others" (p. 109), and finally the role of fun in the (re)-production of dominant power relations within varsity sporting contexts.

3) Research Validation

As in sampling, there are no hard rules when it comes to assessing the quality of qualitative research. Rather as Markula and Silk (2011) highlighted: "there are several ways of defining what constitutes good qualitative research depending on the paradigmatic assumptions which underpin different research projects" (p. 196). As numerous qualitative researchers have argued (e.g., Denzin, 1989; Guba & Lincoln, 1982; Katz, 1983; Mishler, 1990), it is of paramount importance that qualitative researchers develop and continue to refine their own criteria for research validation rather than applying criteria based on a scientific objectivist quantitative approach dominant in the natural sciences (e.g., researcher objectivity, validity, reliability and generalizability). But even within the broad umbrella of qualitative research, it is important to establish and refine criteria for validation appropriate to different paradigms and theoretical frameworks. As Markula and Silk (2011) argued, a poststructuralist research project calls for a different set of validation criteria than does an interpretive or a constructivist research project. In what follows, I discuss various criteria for validation as they specifically pertain to my poststructuralist doctoral research project on coaching and fun.

3.1 Validation in Poststructuralist Research: Researcher Reflexivity

In this research project, reflexivity implies being reflexive about the ways in which my own subjectivity, biases, and prejudices as a researcher shape all stages of the research process. This implies 'carefully writing oneself into one's research' and acknowledging the ways in which my own experiences and subjectivity as a white, female, heterosexual, middle-class, former high-performance soccer player have shaped how I consider my research question and how I enter and navigate the 'interview space'. I aimed to address this carefully when conducting my pilot interviews.

3.2 Clarity and Methodological Consistency

Being reflexive as a researcher also implied being as articulate as possible about the specific methods I used to produce knowledge. Following King and Horrocks (2010), it involved insuring a degree of coherence between the way I chose to produce, represent, and disseminate research knowledge and my overarching theoretical framework and ontological and epistemological assumptions. As Kvale and Brinkmann (2009) articulated, there is a need to reconceptualize validation no longer as a "separate stage of an investigation, but rather as permeating the entire research process" (p. 248). Validation and a concern for clarity and methodological consistency was a focal concern at all the different stages of the research process from thematizing to designing, interviewing, transcribing, analyzing, validating, and reporting. I ensured this by submitting my different chapters to my supervisory committee but also by sharing my writing with my peers while being cautious to not compromise my research participants' rights to anonymity, privacy, and confidentiality.

3.3 Crystallization (Richardson, 2000)

Richardson's (2000) concept of 'crystallization' which rejects the positivist and post-positivist research validation criterion of 'triangulation' is a useful concept for poststructuralist and postmodernist researchers. Unlike triangulation, which seeks to combine various methods or data sources to insure or enhance the validity, reliability, and generalizability of research results, crystallization seeks to capture the multiple and the multidimensional aspects of research knowledge through various angles of approach. As Richardson explained:

> Crystallization, without losing structure, deconstructs the traditional idea of 'validity'
> (we feel how there is no single truth, we see how texts validate themselves), and
> crystallization provides us with a deepened, complex, thoroughly partial,

understanding of the topic. Paradoxically, we know more and doubt what we

know…we know there is always more to know. (2000, p. 934)

Crystallization then as a validation criterion is not about insuring the defensibility and the

legitimacy of a particular claim to 'Truth'. Rather in line with a poststructuralist conception of

truth as subjective and multiple, it encourages researchers to always consider their topic from

multiple perspectives and to produce rich, nuanced, coherent, reflexive, and contextualized

research knowledge. This is precisely what I seek to achieve through my poststructuralist

research project on coaching and fun. Approaching my research question from multiple angles

through a Foucauldian textual analysis of specific coaching 'texts' and semi-structured

individual interviews with varsity coaches allowed me to capture the complex and multiple

dimensions of my research question and to further the understanding of the productive role that

fun plays within the discursive formation of varsity sport.

3.4 Quality of Craftsmanship

Last, Kvale and Brinkmann's (2009) criterion of quality of craftsmanship defined "as

communication and pragmatic action" (p. 247) seems particularly relevant as a judgment

criterion "within a postmodern/poststructural approach and dismissal of an objective reality

against which knowledge is to be measured" (p. 248). Quality of craftsmanship includes a strong

degree of coherence between the conceptualization of the research project and the choice and use

of methods, and also the researcher him/herself: his or her ethics and research skills and

sensitivities. The ongoing concern for research validation is, thus, narrowly intertwined with an

ongoing concern for conducting ethical research, which I next focused on.

4) Research Ethics

Similar to validation, insuring that one is conducting ethical research is not something that one should think of in isolation from the rest of one's research. Rather, a concern for ethical research conduct should be the focal concern at each and every step of the research process starting from the design of the research all the way to the final reporting and publication of one's research findings. As Markula and Silk (2011) further emphasized, a concern for ethical research conduct implies different things depending on the specific research paradigm that one locates oneself in as a researcher. For example, because poststructuralist researchers believe that the entirety of knowledge production is embedded within power relations, this implies that poststructuralist researchers "as knowledge producers, have to locate themselves as integral aspects of these relations as they create, structure, conduct and write up qualitative research work within the constraints of a particular social/academic context" (p. 109).

Conducting ethical research from a poststructuralist perspective, therefore, implied a high degree of self-reflexivity concerning one's role as a researcher in shaping, representing, and distributing research knowledge. It also implied thinking critically and taking pragmatic steps to ensure that "one is using one's power ethically, with a minimum of domination and a maximum of ethical impact" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 109). In this research project, thinking ethically and conducting ethical research involved some of the steps that I have already mentioned: validating my research at each and every step of the research process, insuring a high degree of clarity in how I choose to generate, represent, and distribute my data, insuring a high degree of coherence between my theoretical framework and my choice and use of research methods. It also involved insuring that I treat my research participants with respect by thanking them for their time and participation, listening carefully to them, and not being too forceful or pushy in steering the

interview. It also involved ensuring that I represent their views as accurately as possible for example by giving them the opportunity to read over and make corrections to the interview transcripts or follow up with me through a phone conversation, which one interviewee did. Lastly, conducting ethical research implied following the Canadian REB's (Research Ethics Board) guidelines regarding the conduct of ethical research. In what follows I discuss the pragmatic steps that I took towards meeting these ethical requirements. Ethical research conduct refers to:

Procedures that ensure that all research participants are treated with dignity and respect and is seen to be accomplished through adhering to the following principles: Respect for dignity, free and informed consent, vulnerable persons, privacy and confidentiality and justice and inclusiveness. (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 14)

4.1 Respect for Dignity

Although the notion of respect is culturally contextual, within westernized cultures, a respect for human dignity refers to the idea of individual autonomy, which Markula and Silk (2011) defined "as the right to self-governance" (p. 15). A respect for human dignity within my research context, thus, required me to take the following pragmatic steps to ensure my research participants' individual autonomy through adhering to the ethical principles of free and informed consent, vulnerability, privacy and confidentiality and justice and inclusiveness.

4.2 Free and Informed Consent

Free and informed consent entails:

Informing the research participants about the overall purpose of the investigation and the main features of the design, as well as of any possible risks and benefits from participation in the research project. It further involves obtaining the voluntary

participation of the people involved, and informing of their right to withdraw from the

study at any time (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 70).

The ethical criterion of free and informed consent is based on the Nuremberg Code for ethical

research conduct, which stipulates that research participants "have to agree knowingly to take

part in the research process" (Markula & Silk, 2011, p. 16). Part of demonstrating that one has

obtained the free and informed consent of one's research participants as a researcher involves

certain steps:

- Researchers must demonstrate clearly how they established contact with their research

  participants.

- They must also demonstrate that they have fully informed their research participants

  about their research projects. It is common to use a written information sheet, which

  provides details about the purpose of the research, what is required of research

  participants, and how the researcher plans to adhere to ethical guidelines.

In order to meet the ethical requirement of free and informed consent, I took the following steps:

- I prepared a *written information sheet* with the details of my research project and with

  information pertaining to my research participants' rights (e.g., right to withdraw from

  the study, right to not answer my questions) and how I planned to adhere to the REB's

  (Research Ethics Board) guidelines for ethical research conduct to ensure their rights are

  respected (e.g., use of pseudonyms). This written information sheet is appended (see

  Appendix C).

- This information sheet also included detailed information on how I planned to conduct

  the interviews (e.g., use of audio-recorder) and how I planned to use the research material

  as well as a specific date by which to withdraw.

- I then emailed this information sheet to the varsity coaches at my specific institution and asked them to read over it and email me back their interest in participating in my research project.

- In conjunction I prepared a separate *informed consent sheet*, which duplicates the information on the information sheet sent out to my research participants but also stood as a written research agreement (see Appendix C).

- I read over this informed consent sheet before the start of each interview and asked my research participants whether they had any questions or concerns.

- If they were still willing to participate in my research project, I asked them to sign two copies of the written informed consent form: one for them to keep and one for my own records.

- At the end of the interview, I asked them again whether they had any questions or concerns and reiterated the fact that they can email me at any time should any issues arise.

4.3 Vulnerable Persons

This specific criterion for the conduct of ethical research is particularly salient in research conducted with people with diminished competence to make decisions. Examples of such research are research projects conducted with children or the elderly or with disabled people. While my research participants of adult coaches do not fit into the category of 'vulnerable persons', this should not stop me from evaluating carefully how my research project can be both beneficial and meaningful for my research participants. While I cannot ensure that participating in my research was meaningful and beneficial to all the coaches in my sample, I am confident that participating in my research was at the very least not harmful to them. Furthermore, I am

also confident that the results of my study will be beneficial for the future development of more ethical and effective coaching and sporting practices related to fun. This will ultimately benefit both coaches and athletes in varsity sport.

4.4 Privacy and Confidentiality

> Confidentiality in research implies that private data identifying the participants will not be disclosed. If a study will publish information that is potentially recognizable to others, the participants should agree to the release of identifiable information.
>
> (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009, p. 72)

As Markula and Silk (2011) pointed out, there is often confusion between the terms of 'confidentiality' and 'anonymity'. Drawing on the work of McNamee, Olivier and Wainwright (2007), they argued that researchers should make explicitly clear that what they can guarantee is not confidentiality but rather anonymity. Following this precaution and in order to ensure the anonymity of my research participants, I used pseudonyms instead of my research participants' names and also made sure that I did not disclose any information that could be linked back to my specific research context/institution. To further ensure the privacy and confidentiality of the research, I locked up the interview material in my home. I also made explicit to my research participants that I am the only one to have access to and listen to their recorded interviews. I included all this information in the written consent form.

Despite all these precautions, I also recognize that, as Kvale and Brinkmann emphasized, "the principle of the research participants' right to privacy is not without ethical and scientific dilemmas" (p. 72). For that reason, it is important to be able to discuss ethical dilemmas as they arise with a research community of practice in conjunction with referring back to the Research Ethics Board's (REB) guidelines for conducting ethical research. Indeed, while these guidelines

provide a helpful general framework, conducting ethical research in qualitative research cannot be reduced to adhering to a fixed, standardized set of rules. Rather, it is a complex, uncertain and ongoing work, which requires the researcher to constantly problematize his/her role as a researcher and his/her practices "to minimize potential effects of domination" (Markula & Pringle, 2006) and negative consequences.

4.5 Justice and Inclusiveness

According to Markula and Silk (2011), this principle "refers to the beneficence of the research project" (p. 19). They further emphasized that "qualitative research projects should provide some benefits for the participants" and that "researchers should consider in advance what benefits one's study provides to the participants, particularly to vulnerable individuals" (p. 19). This last criterion for ethical research conduct implies thinking beyond issues of potential harm to research participants and carefully weighing the costs and benefits of the research to the research participants. As previously mentioned, while I cannot ensure that participating in my research project was immediately beneficial and meaningful for the coaches I interviewed, I believe that the knowledge gained from my study will be helpful for the varsity coaches involved in my study and more widely for sport researchers, coaches, and athletes working within performance and high-performance sporting contexts in the long term. It is my anticipated hope that my study on coaching and fun will contribute to other coaching research concerned with developing more effective and ethical coaching practices in performance sporting contexts. Additionally, participating in my research did afford my sample of varsity coaches the space and time to critically discuss their practices related to fun, something which they might have found stimulating and interesting.

In line with Foucault's ethical project (1978), I believe that the development of more ethical coaching and sporting practices starts with a problematization of the power relations involved in the production and dissemination of knowledge. Therefore, part of what I hope to achieve in this research project is to (re)-politicize fun by re-contextualizing it within the dynamic power relations of performance sport. A (re)-politicization of fun will allow for a more ethical production and dissemination of coaching and sporting knowledges and truths. This, in turn, will positively affect coaching researchers' and coaches' ability to problematize their coaching practices related to fun and therefore to minimize the dominating effects of these practices on their athletes, as well as the uncritical reproduction of dominant coaching and sporting discourses in performance sporting contexts.

Summary

In this chapter, I elaborated on the ways in which my Foucauldian theoretical framework informed my research questions and aims, but also on how I planned to go about answering my research question through my choice and use of methods: my Foucauldian textual analysis of the NCPP (National Coaching Certification Program) and the Coaching Association of Canada website and of the LTAD (Long Term Athlete Development) model and the Canadian Sport for Life website will enabled me to understand what are the articulable forms informing the coaches' understandings fun and the role of fun in varsity sport. My semi-structured individual interviews with 10 Canadian varsity coaches enabled me to understand how coaches articulate their coaching and training practices related to fun within these discursive boundaries. Thus, these two methods allowed me to contextualize fun within the power/knowledge nexus of performance sport, to understand how fun is strategically used and 'put in play' within these specific relations

of power, and further to understand what are some of the power effects produced by the discursive articulation of fun in performance sporting contexts.

Last, I detailed how I ensured that my research met the general ethical requirements outlined by the REB (Research Ethics Board) of free and informed consent, vulnerable persons, privacy and confidentiality, and justice and inclusiveness. With that said I also hope to have made evidently clear throughout my discussion that my understanding of what constitutes ethical research goes beyond that of adhering to a set of ethical guidelines. My theoretical framework implied an ongoing problematization of my role as a researcher and striving to produce knowledge "with a maximum of ethical impact" (Markula & Silk, 2011).

Chapter 5: Results of Foucauldian Discourse Analysis

In this chapter, I present the results of my Foucauldian discourse analysis of two key coaching websites: the CAC (Coaching Association of Canada) and the CS4L (Canadian Sport for Life). In addition to these two websites, I also analysed the NCCP (National Coaching Certification Program) manuals (level one, two, and three). Deleuze's (1988) uptake of Foucault's concept of power/knowledge provided the theoretical frame for this first part of my data collection and analysis. I have organized this results chapter in a way that reflects my findings: I, thus, spend a large part of this chapter discussing the connections between the various dominant concepts of effective coaching instead of focusing solely on 'fun'. I chose not to limit my discussion of results to fun despite fun being the focus of my study since fun was not such a prominent concept in these websites. I nonetheless foregrounded the presence and absence of fun in relation to the other concepts I identified and to the discursive articulation of effective coaching at large. I start with a description and broader discussion of the general layout and content of the coaching websites and of the NCCP coaching certification reference books.

Coaching Enunciations and Concepts

The CAC website, which was the first coaching website I examined, has for a mission statement to enhance "the experiences of all Canadian athletes through quality coaching". It is directly connected to the NCCP coaching certification program, whose stated goals are to "empower coaches with knowledge and skills, promote ethics, foster positive attitudes, build competence, and increase the credibility and recognition of coaches" (http://www.coach.ca/who-we-are-s13411, 2012). The CAC website is more focused in its targeted audience (coaches) and far less information rich than the CS4L website, which also targets parents, athletes with disabilities, educators, health practitioners, and recreation professionals. The CAC website acts

as a promotional tool for the NCCP coaching certification programs and encourages coaches to "Find out where they fit" (http://www.coach.ca/where-do-i-fit--s15433, 2012) and register for various coaching courses (community, competitive, instruction, or multisport).

The CS4L website officially promotes the LTAD model (Long Term Athlete Development) and outlines its various stages: "the LTAD is a seven-stage training, competition and recovery pathway guiding an individual's experience in sport and physical activity from infancy through all phases of adulthood" (http://www.canadiansportforlife.ca/, 2012). This seven stage model outlines coaching guidelines for various stages of development (Active Start, Fundamentals, Learning to Train, Training to Train, Training to Compete, Training to Win, and Active for Life) and for different streams and contexts (recreational, competitive). The first three stages (Active Start, Fundamentals and Learning to Train) provide the shared foundation for both the recreational/active for life pathway and also for the competitive/high-performance and elite sporting pathways. The coaches section of the CS4L website is organized in different rubrics (Issues in sport, LTAD stages, Ten Key Factors, and Resources). Unlike the resources in the CAC website, the coaching resources section in the CS4L is freely available to coaches and to the general public. It is comprised of five papers, which cover a range of different topics relevant to both recreational and competitive contexts (the role of monitoring growth in the LTAD, competition is a good servant but a poor master, long-term coach development concept, maximizing the sport experience for our children, and recovery and regeneration for LTAD) (http://www.canadiansportforlife.ca/resources/Coaches, 2012).

While the LTAD model is most prominent in the CS4L website, it is also present in the NCCP certification manuals, which dedicate one coaching module to outlining its various stages and principles. There is, thus, a lot of overlap between the CAC, the CS4L and the NCCP, which

all draw on the governmentally endorsed LTAD framework. The NCCP certification manuals correspond to various levels of certifications (level one, two, and three) and coaching contexts: level one 'community coach', level two 'competition sport coach', level three 'instruction coach'. These coaching reference books and workbooks are also not freely accessible online via the CAC website but are offered to coaches who undertake the various levels of coaching certification. The NCCP one, two, and three coaching reference books are organized in modules. For example, the NCCP two sport coaching reference manual is comprised of nine teaching modules (role of the coach, long term athlete development, applied anatomy and principles, energy systems, strength, safety and emergency action plan, technical elements, teaching and learning, and plan a practice) (Athletics Canada and Coaching Association of Canada, 2008).

While there is a significant amount of overlap in the concepts I identified for each website, there are also some differences with some concepts present or foregrounded in one website and absent or underemphasized in the other. For example, the concept of 'skills' in the CAC website refers to 'physical skills' and not to 'mental skills', while 'physical skills' and 'mental skills' are given equal weight both in the CS4L website but also in the NCCP coaching reference manuals. The concept of 'ethics' is also prominent in the CS4L website but less present in the CAC and NCCP coaching manuals. 'Active' is a concept that is prominent in the CAC website but less in the CS4L and NCCP manuals. These minimal differences could partially be the result of different targeted audiences for each coaching website. For example, it is perhaps unsurprising that the CAC website, which seems to act more as a 'promotional window' for the NCCP certification programs, does not elaborate on 'skill development' as much as the NCCP coaching manuals and the CS4L website. With that said, there is also unsurprisingly a tremendous amount of overlap between these coaching enunciations, with the following

recurrent concepts featuring most prominently: athletes, coaches, competition/performance, development, fun, health, instruction/learning, skills, and training.

Having described the general layout, content, and targeted audiences of each coaching enunciation I selected, as well as the concepts I identified through their holistic examination, I next discuss the next step I took in my analysis: grouping these various concepts into statements and connecting these to larger domains of statements or theories connected to sport, physical activity, and sport coaching.

Statements and Theories

My discourse analysis of the coaching websites led me to formulate statements, which reflect the relationships between the nine dominant concepts I identified. These concepts were athletes, coaches, competition/performance, development, fun, health, instruction/learning, skills, and training. My first set of statements concerns *athletes*:

- Successful athletes achieve their potential through physical and mental skill development to win in competitions;

- Athletes are well-rounded and lifelong participants in sport and physical activity;

- They stay healthy and injury free by avoiding burnout and premature specialization;

- They insure proper recovery from training and competitions.

These statements are representative of the tensions but also of the successful continued co-existence of two different sport psychology models: the achievement goal orientation motivational model, which draws predominantly on social psychology and adopts a positivistic perspective (e.g, Duda & Nicholls, 1992; Harter, 1978; Nicholls, 1984; Ommundsen & Vaglum, 1991) and the social motivational model, which draws predominantly on humanistic psychology (e.g., Allen, 2003; Anderman & Anderman, 1999; Wylleman, 2000). While the second statement

is clearly indicative of the 'humanistic' turn in sport psychology with its focus on the optimal

and holistic develop of the individual, the first statement with its instrumental focus on skill

development for the purpose of excelling and winning is reminiscent of the earlier positivist

achievement orientation sporting model. It is interesting to notice that 'fun' is absent in these

statements about athletes.

My second set of statements concerns *coaches*:

- Quality coaches are retired athletes who have been trained and certified through the

  NCCP program and who continue to learn and develop as coaches;

- Effective/positive coaches are good role models, mentors and leaders;

- Effective coaches are good planners, managers, problem-solvers who reflect and self-

  evaluate, and who are good at analyzing skills and performance.

These set of statements are reflective of current literature on coaching effectiveness (e.g., Côté &

Gilbert, 2009; Kavussanu et al., 2008; Vella et al., 2010) and of an effort to move away from

reductionist coaching models (e.g., Martens, 1987, 1990, 2004; Smoll & Smith, 1987) towards

more holistic and complex theoretical models, which better account for the social dimensions of

the coaching process. These statements also closely align with Côté and Gilbert's (2009)

definition of coaching effectiveness which differentiates between professional knowledge (i.e.,

sport specific knowledge, pedagogy and the sciences of coaching), interpersonal knowledge

(defined as the ability of a coach to communicate effectively with his/her athletes), and

intrapersonal knowledge (defined as a coach's self-understanding and ability for introspection

and reflection). Interestingly, 'fun' is also not mentioned in these statements and articulations of

'coaches'. This 'limitation', is something that Vela et al. (2010) lamented when they emphasized

that Côté and Gilbert's (2009) definition of coaching effectiveness does not account for a large

part of coach leadership, which they defined as including "the facilitation of positive emotions such as fun, happiness, joy, motivation and satisfaction" (p. 430). As they further pointed out, "recent research has suggested that coaches also desire such positive emotions as a result of their coaching, in addition to the facilitation of team related outcomes such as team cohesion, etc." (pp. 430-431).

My third set of statements concerns *competition/performance*:

- To perform is to win and achieve results and podiums in national and international competitions;

- Competition is stressful and induces physical and mental fatigue and must be carefully planned to insure athlete recovery.

These set of statements align with dominant reductionist understandings of 'performance' in competitive/performance sport 'as winning in national and international competitions' and of 'healthy competitive athletes' as injury free and not mentally 'burned out'. The second statement also resonates with my literature review and with the dominant sport psychology model for addressing athlete health issues of physical injuries and mental 'burnout' (e.g., Cohn, 1990; Raedeke & Smith, 2004). The physical and mental 'stresses' induced by competition are framed as natural, intrinsic and unavoidable and go unquestioned and unchanged. Therefore, the onus is placed on the individual athlete to develop coping skills and strategies and on the coach to 'carefully plan to insure athlete recovery' to remedy the natural physical and mental stresses of competition. This dominant sport psychology model for understanding and addressing sporting problems like 'burnout' has been problematized by various sport sociologists (e.g., Coakley, 1992) who proposed instead a model which "conceptualizes burnout as a social problem

grounded in forms of social organization that constrain identity development during adolescence and prevent young athletes from having meaningful control over their lives" (p. 271).

My fourth statement concerns *development*:

- Optimal and healthy development for athletes is long-term and holistic, focuses on fundamental skills, and follows the principles of growth and maturation.

This statement overlaps with the second statement concerning athletes and is also indicative of the humanistic turn, and of the expanding and far-reaching rhetoric around 'optimizing life' and 'optimal individual development', which was a concern for Foucault (1978, 2003). He saw this shift as indicative of a new productive form of power (bio-power) and of new mechanisms of normalization. These were designed to control and regulate no longer only individual bodies, but also to effectively manage the population at large. His genealogical works were designed to bring to the surface the power relations and historical contingencies, which enabled the development and spread of this form of power. His genealogies notably allowed him to problematize the connection between the development of bio-power and the expanding spread and hold of specific scientific knowledges like psychiatry (Foucault, 2003a, 2006b).

My fifth set of statements which is most relevant to my research project concerns *fun*:

- Fun for children is developing fundamental movement and sport skills through varied and exciting and challenging activities and free play;

- Fun is a component of true sport and of positive learning and teaching and coaching and promotes lifelong physical activity.

'True sport' defined, is "an undertaking by all Federal, Provincial and Territorial governments and leading sport organizations to collaborate on preventing unethical behaviours and promoting ethical conduct in Canadian sport. True Sport members across Canada are committed to

community sport that's healthy, fair, inclusive, and fun" (http://www.truesportpur.ca/en/page-14-secretariat, 2012).

- Lastly, fun for competitive athletes is reaching a state of flow and tied to optimal recovery and regeneration.

As discussed in my literature review chapter, 'flow' is a psychological concept of great currency in popular conceptions of optimal performance, coined by Csikszentmihalyi (1998), which refers to an ideal state of consciousness, heightened awareness, and concentration. Individuals in a state of flow are totally immersed, absorbed, and focused on the task at hand. In addition, the state of flow is generally associated with positive emotions such as enjoyment. Sport psychologists and researchers (e.g., Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Jackson, 1996, 2000) have shown a positive correlation between optimal sporting performance defined as winning, medals, and podiums in national and international competitions and the flow state.

These various statements on 'fun' align closely with my literature review and foreground the connection between fun and the positive sport psychology and coaching literature. The first two statements link fun to children, to the development of fundamental movement and sport skills through varied and challenging exercises and free play, to positive coaching and youth development, to a lifelong engagement in sport and physical activity, and to 'true sport'. These connections are supported by a large body of research and positive sport psychology literature for youth sport (e.g., Holt, 2008; Ommundsen & Vaglum, 1991; Sabock & Sabock, 2008; Smoll & Smith, 1987; Thompson, 1997, 2003; Wells et al., 2008), whose stated concern is to bring the fun back into youth sport to insure the lifelong engagement and participation of all in sport and physical activity. The third statement which connects fun to flow establishes a positive relation between fun/flow, optimal athletic performance, and recovery. As previously stated, this

statement echoes the seminal work of psychologist Csikszentmihalyi (1998) and my literature review on flow. With that said, what is perhaps more surprising is how fun/flow are connected to performance/competition through the articulation of athlete 'health' defined as 'optimal recovery from training and competition'.

What I think is most interesting about these statements about fun/flow is the paucity/absence of pragmatic information/resources regarding how coaches are supposed to implement fun/flow. There is very little information regarding how coaches should practice fun in youth sport other than applying and advocating for the true sport principles of "go for it, play fair, respect others, keep it fun, stay healthy and give back" (http://canadiansportforlife.ca/sites/default/files/flipbooks/MaximizingSportExperienceForChildren/MaximizingSportExperienceForChildren.html, 2012). Nor is there any information regarding how coaches are supposed to help athletes reach the flow state in competitive/performance sport. This paucity/absence of pragmatic information regarding fun and flow contrasts heavily with the abundance of coaching information and resources regarding how coaches are supposed to effectively train athletes for optimal performance and development. The CS4L website is the best example of this paradox, systematically encouraging coaches to follow links to 'find out more' about effective training principles such as periodization, etc. (http://canadiansportforlife.ca/ten-key-factors/periodization, 2012), whereas no further links are provided to find out about fun or holistic development.

My sixth set of statements concerns *health*:

- Health is a component of true sport and tied to the holistic development of individual athletes;

- Health is having an optimal diet and nutrition and being physically fit and leading a balanced lifestyle.

These statements about health are not surprising and reinforce the taken-for-granted connection between individual health and being physically active found both in most of the coaching/sporting literature (e.g., Holt, 2008; Ommundsen & Vaglum, 1991; Wells et al., 2008), and also in many popular magazines (e.g., *Men's Health, Shape, Women's Fitness*). Dworkin and Wachs (2009) problematized these popular magazines and how they conflate health with physical fitness and looking physically fit. They argued that these serve to reify narrowly defined gendered boundaries: men as muscular, wide, big, bursting and massive as opposed to women as little, narrow, contained, and toned.

The holistic development of the individual is further defined as the development of individuals' "emotional, cognitive, mental and physical skills and capacities" on the CS4L website (http://canadiansportforlife.ca/ten-key-factors/physical-mental-cognitive-and-emotional-development, 2012), but seems to be largely taken for granted and undeveloped (Cassidy, 2008, 2010; Nelson et al., 2012). The focus on the holistic development of athletes and pushes towards an athlete-centred coaching approach are, indeed, characteristic of the humanistic turn in some of the coaching research. Advocates of these humanistic approaches to coaching (e.g., Kidman, 2007; Miller & Kerr, 2002; Vealy, 2002) have pushed an athlete-centred and holistic approach to coaching forward as an alternative to "the narrow, unidimensional performance enhancement model employed by many sport psychologists and coaches in the past" (Vealy, 2002, p. 299). These researchers emphasized that an athlete-centred, holistic approach to coaching is best suited both in terms of pursuing personal, but also performance excellence. They also foregrounded the importance of athletes' psychological, physical, and social wellbeing.

Despite the humanistic turn in some of the coaching research and the growing rhetoric around the importance of an athlete-centred, holistic coaching approach, the coaching websites I examined were surprisingly uninformative. As Cassidy (2010) showed, holistic and athlete-centred are not well defined or conceptualized. Indeed, similarly to fun/flow, there was very little information as to how coaches should implement an athlete-centred, holistic coaching approach. These findings also corroborate Headley-Cooper's (2010) research results in her master thesis entitled "Coaches' Perspectives on Athlete-Centred Coaching". Her findings helped to illustrate coaches' lack of conceptual clarity around these terms, but also:

> How coaches attach divergent meanings to the term 'athlete-centred' sport, referring to a holistic philosophy of the athlete, coaching practices that involve athletes within the coach-athlete partnership, specific values as essential components of athlete-centred coaching, and a philosophy of success that extends beyond athletic performance. (p. ii)

Her study also helped to illustrate certain barriers that coaches identified towards implementing an athlete-centred coaching approach such as "concerns about winning and receiving funding, lack of athlete-centred coaching approaches in youth sport, coaches level of experience and confidence, structure of the national team program, etc." (p. v). These findings echo the work of Cassidy (2010) who argued that calls for holistic coaching "are based on little more than good intentions and a dictionary definition" (p. 439). Furthermore, they also support her critique of the narrow and particular definition of holism which has become dominant through the growing influence of humanism and humanistic sport psychology in coaching research and her call "to move our understanding of holism beyond the influence of humanistic psychology" (p. 439). Lastly, Cassidy (2008) provided a helpful review and discussion of various coaching research 'domains' (e.g., social-cultural, psycho-social) and their understanding and assumptions

regarding holistic sports coaching. In a similar vein, Nelson et al. (2012) lamented that "while the relationship between learner-centred (AC & CC) approaches and humanistic psychology is not new, particularly in education, in contrast, discussions in coaching 'about the application of principles taken from humanistic psychology remain limited and largely superficial' (p. 4). They further advanced that "there is a need to critically consider the goals of coaching and coach education, how knowledge is acquired and developed, qualities of effective educators and interpersonal relationships; and issues surrounding the politics of power in coaching contexts" (p. 4). In order to meet Nelson et al.'s recommendations and goals for coaching and coaching research, coaching scholars need to analyse the existing practices and dominant discourses which produce athlete-centred coaching understandings. This is precisely what my research project set out to do: to understand the dominant discourses related to fun and how these shape how coaches understand and articulate their practices related to fun.

My seventh statement concerns *instruction/learning*:

- Quality instruction/learning is positive, fun, long-term, athlete-centred (i.e., focused on the needs of athletes), promotes optimal coach-athlete relationships, and the acquisition of fundamental sport skills.

Interestingly, this statement about instruction/learning includes 'fun' while fun was absent in the statements related to coaches. With that said, the statements about instruction/learning do connect to those about coaches, since adopting a fun, athlete-centred teaching approach is positively related to two coaching outcomes present in the statements about coaches (effective skill development and effective leadership).

My eighth set of statements regards *skills*:

- Physical skills are fundamental movement and sport skills as well as sport specific and technical;

- Mental skills of focus/concentration/awareness, goal-setting, and relaxation strategies help athletes achieve flow, cope with the challenges of training and competition, and develop self-esteem and confidence.

These statements about skills foreground the importance of physical and mental skills especially with regards to how these skills positively affect athlete performance and competitive outcomes. The emphasis on physical and mental skills for athlete performance/competition contrasts with the statements regarding athlete health framed as the holistic development of individual athletes. In addition, the onus is again placed on individual athletes to develop the range of mental skills to achieve flow, and also to cope with the challenges of training and competition. As a result, the larger social context of sport and competitive/performance sport is left unproblematized. Moreover, 'positive' and 'desirable' sporting outcomes such as flow are positioned as natural bi-products of sport on the condition that athletes acquire specific mental skills. Interestingly, the specific mental skills which are said to facilitate flow are also said to facilitate optimal performance in competitive sport. The connections established in these statements about skills are enabled by a modernist understanding of 'true sport' as naturally and inherently good and socio-positive.

My final statement relates to *training*:

- Optimal training is periodized, athlete-centred, high-intensity and high-volume, specific, time sensitive, supports performance, competition and winning, ensures optimal recovery and regeneration.

'Periodization' is defined as a planned approach to sport training which involves "creating comprehensive training, competition and recovery plans to deliver peak athlete performance at the right time" (http://www.canadiansportforlife.ca/ten-key-factors/periodization, 2012). These statements about training align with the coaching and sporting literature on effective training principles. As previously mentioned, the scientific training principles of effective training (e.g., periodization, trainability, specialization) are, in contrast to fun, flow, holistic, and athlete-centred, very well defined in the coaching enunciations I selected. There is a whole section on the CS4L website dedicated to informing coaches about the '10 Key Factors' of effective training (http://www.canadiansportforlife.ca/learn-about-canadian-sport-life/ten-key-factors, 2012).

The next step of my discourse analysis was to connect these various statements about athletes, coaches, competition/performance, development, fun, health, instruction/learning, skills, and training to theories or 'individualized groups of statements' (Markula & Pringle, 2006) related to coaching. In this, a Foucauldian discourse analysis differs from a content analysis as it focuses on statements as regularities and does not seek to uncover the hidden meaning of a text by isolating phrases and propositions. While I already unpacked the various statements I identified in my analysis, connecting these statements together into theories allowed for a better understanding of how these statements connect to larger domains of statements about coaching, sport and physical activity. Indeed, theories reflect the relationships between individual statements and help to tease out the dominant discourses which presently shape varsity coaching.

Coaching and Sporting Theories

Based on the above various statements, I identified three main theories related to sport coaching: effective coaching for performance/competitive sport, positive coaching for lifelong

engagement in physical activity, and true sport for lifelong engagement in physical activity. The theory about positive coaching for lifelong engagement in physical activity in turn combines various sub-theories which I expanded upon. In addition, I also connected these theories to various articulable forms, which are the set of scientific knowledges which support various the reproduction of dominant coaching and sporting practices. Foucault (1972) claimed that one could speak of discursive formations when groups of elements are "formed in a regular manner by a discursive practice, and are indispensable to the constitution of a science" (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 53). A part of the task of analyzing the discursive formation of varsity sport coaching, therefore, involved connecting individualized groups of statements and theories to knowledges or sciences to understand "what is the set of choices for practicing coaching in varsity sport provided by these concepts" (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 54).

Effective coaching for performance/competitive sport

Effective coaching focuses on the optimal development of athletes' physical and mental skills through a periodized approach to training, competition, and recovery based on the scientific principles of human growth and maturation that keeps athletes injury free, mentally motivated, and leads to performance excellence. The sciences that support these connections and this articulation of effective coaching are performance sport coaching, sport psychology, sport, and sport physiology.

Positive coaching for lifelong engagement in sport and physical activity

Positive coaching follows the principles of true sport and focuses on developing fundamental physical, movement, and sport skills through a fun, holistic, and athlete-centred coaching/teaching approach, which promotes lifelong engagement in sport and physical activity, and optimal health, and individual development.

A fun coaching/teaching approach draws on a variety of exciting and challenging activities and free play to facilitate the development and learning of fundamental physical, movement and sport skills.

A holistic and athlete-centred coaching approach is based on athletes' individual needs and promotes athlete independence and the full development of athletes' emotional, cognitive, mental, and physical capacities. The sciences that support these connections and the discursive articulation of positive coaching are sport medicine, humanistic sport psychology and pedagogy, sport physiology, and motor learning.

True Sport for lifelong engagement in physical activity

True sport is fun, promotes lifelong physical engagement in physical activity, and leads to optimal health and individual development. The sciences that support these connections and discursive articulation of true sport are humanistic sport psychology, sport medicine, and sport physiology.

Articulating statements into theories was a crucial step in my Foucauldian discourse analysis because it enabled me to understand how statements are grouped together and relate to each other and, furthermore, to dominant discourses. This is why conducting a Foucauldian discourse analysis is again quite different than a content analysis, which would not have enabled me to move beyond the surface rhetoric of fun in these popular websites. So what *exactly* do these theories and connections to various articulable forms actually tell us that we could not simply 'read' on these websites or in the NCCP manuals? How does conducting a Foucauldian discourse analysis move us beyond a simple content analysis yet still allow us to take what is written 'seriously'? Furthermore, what does a Foucauldian discourse analysis allow us to understand which an interpretive or critical discourse analysis wouldn't? In the final part of this

analysis, I address these questions by connecting the various theories and articulable forms I identified to the power relations of varsity sport.

A Connection to Power Relations

> If knowledge consists of linking the visible and the articulable, power is its presupposed cause; but conversely power implies knowledge as the bifurcation or differentiation without which power would not become an act: There is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge that does not presuppose and constitute at the same time power relations. (Deleuze, 1988, p. 33)

Conducting a Foucauldian discourse analysis of texts based on Deleuze's (1988) articulation of a discursive formation allows sport scholars to draw attention to the power relations invested in the production of knowledge and reciprocally to how the production of knowledge supports power relations in specific sporting contexts. A Foucauldian discourse analysis sets out to uncover the rules and power relations which both allow for certain objects (e.g., sport coaching) to be intelligible and also actively produce these very objects.

My Foucauldian discourse analysis thus enabled me to focus on what is said/written about coaching and sport and physical activity in the popular coaching enunciations I selected without either taking what is written at face value, or trying to uncover the hidden meaning/ truth(s) behind it, or trying to identify specific ideologies and a dominant group of oppressors/ oppressed as in critical discourse analysis (CDA). Rather, based on a Foucauldian understanding of power as relational and productive and tied to the production and circulation of knowledge (Foucault, 1978), my analysis allowed me to gain a complex understanding of how certain 'truths' about coaching, sport and physical activity are produced, disseminated and come to be dominant. It also allowed me to gain an understanding of what discourses are reciprocally

marginalized through current dominant ways of understanding and practicing coaching and sport and physical activity.

The end goal of conducting a Foucauldian discourse analysis is to be in a better position to problematize the taken for granted (in the case of my study that 'fun' in sport and sport coaching is inherently good and desirable) and thus to effect positive change within the power relations of specific discursive domains (in my case as a sport coaching researcher within the power relations of academic sport and coaching related research). What connecting the various theories I identified to various articulable forms showed is that:

1) There is actually a great deal of overlap between the articulable forms of the discursive formation of performance/competitive sport and youth/recreational/lifelong physical activity. Both are presently dominantly shaped within the narrow confines of specific scientific knowledges of the body (e.g., sport medicine, sport physiology). Both are also shaped by sport psychology with humanistic sport psychology being more emphasized in the discursive articulation of youth/recreational/lifelong physical activity and 'true sport' than in the discursive articulation of performance/competitive sport.

2) That despite claims to the contrary (e.g., Bigelow, et al., 2001; Kidman, 2007; Mastrich, 2002), the positive coaching model for lifelong engagement in physical activity is far from 'revolutionary' and/or diametrically opposed to the performance/competitive sporting model.

These findings further problematize the increasing spread of humanistic sport psychology and of the positive sport psychology and pedagogy coaching model (e.g., Bigelow et al., 2001; Mastrich, 2002; Vernacchia et al., 1992; Thompson, 1995, 2003). They also seriously undermine

these model's claims to offering a 'real/serious' alternative to what positive sport psychology and coaching researchers identify as a 'dominant' and problematic performance oriented sporting model. Lastly, these findings also call into question the 'effectiveness' of humanistic sport psychology and the positive sport psychology coaching model in terms of effecting tangible change in the way sport coaches, and athletes both presently understand and practice sport and physical activity.

Problematizing the positive sport psychology coaching model and its increasing spread further raises a gamut of critical questions. I address these questions in chapter six and seven related to the strategic stakes involved in upholding the taken-for-granted binary opposition between the effective coaching model for performance/competitive sport and the positive coaching sporting model for lifelong engagement in physical activity: What power relations does the production of this 'binary' and 'alternative' support and enable? What are its power effects? What discourses are further marginalized through it? What possibilities for critique and understanding and practicing sport and physical activity differently does it limit? Lastly, who benefits from upholding and promoting this not so revolutionary alternative sporting and coaching model?

Furthermore, despite the increased popularity of humanistic coaching in coaching research and pushes towards an athlete-centred, holistic coaching approach which promotes both 'personal and performance excellence' (e.g., Miller & Kerr, 2002; Kidman, 2007), effective coaching and positive coaching on the one hand and performance/competitive sport and recreational/youth sport/lifelong physical activity remain articulated as two separate discursive fields/domains. The discursive articulation of performance/competitive sport coaching has, therefore, not effectively 'been moved' by the humanistic turn in some of the sport coaching

research. Put differently, and to further expand on the above arguments, according to the theories and articulable forms of effective coaching and positive coaching, a coach does not actually need to be 'positive' (i.e., adhere to the positive coaching principles of fun, athlete-centred and holistic, as defined and produced through the positive coaching for lifelong physical activity sporting model and humanistic sport psychology and pedagogy) to be 'effective'. Fun and adopting an athlete-centred and holistic coaching approach as defined and produced in the positive coaching model in support of personal excellence (Kidman, 2007) are not what really matters in performance/competitive sport since these articulations do not help coaches to be effective as defined and produced in the performance/competitive model (i.e., to obtain performance excellence and results). Performance/competitive coaches, thus, do not need to take the athlete-health, holistic development, or fun of the positive coaching model seriously or rather they only need to take these seriously inasmuch as they support performance and results. This conclusion echoes the work of various scholars (Cassidy, 2008, 2010; Nelson et al., 2012) and their critique of 'holistic' coaching.

Moreover, the tensions between positive coaching and effective coaching are evidenced in the various diverging and sometimes contradictory statements and definitions of fun or health. For example, athlete-health in performance/competitive sport is articulated as being injury free and not mentally burnout. This dominant reductionist articulation of health in performance/competitive sport contrasts with another more holistic definition of athlete-health in positive coaching for lifelong physical activity as the holistic development of the individual. This more complex and holistic understanding of athlete-health is thus marginalized and made subservient to the dominant discourse of performance/competitive sport and its stated goals and aims of producing performance and results. The power relations in the production of athlete-

health are very apparent upon closer examination of the CS4L website and LTAD model. Indeed, there are no coaching resources dedicated to how to pragmatically coach to develop athletes holistically but there is in contrast a coaching resource dedicated to the principles of training and competition recovery and regeneration for athletes (http://www.canadiansportforlife.ca/resources/recovery-and-regeneration-ltad, 2012). A critical question related to this is what then allows for these two seemingly contradictory statements about athlete-health to co-exist and yet go unproblematized? Could the ongoing re-production of the binary between performance sport coaching and coaching for lifelong physical activity as separate yet integrated and compatible domains play a part in it?

My discourse analysis also helped me to identify how fun is discursively produced and in connection to what objects. Fun is present in the theories about 'positive coaching' and 'true sport', but absent in the theory about 'effective coaching' and performance/competitive sport. Fun is, therefore, dominantly a product of humanistic sport psychology, but is also connected to the scientific knowledges of sport medicine, sport physiology, and motor learning. Fun is, thus, produced through and in support of a set of individualizing, modernist, and scientific discourses within sport coaching and physical activity contexts. As I emphasized in the third chapter, Foucault was a staunch anti-humanist and profoundly critical of the ways individual subjectivities are presently narrowly shaped within the boundaries of modern scientific and humanistic discourses. He was particularly critical of psychoanalysis and of the ways in which 'psy-discourses' work to individualize and bind people to their own identities through self-knowledge (Foucault, 2003a). Based on the above, I believe Foucault would have very similar concerns with regards to the present modernist and scientific discursive articulation of fun in coaching and sporting contexts. What I argue is most problematic about 'fun' is how it

mechanizes and depoliticizes coaching and sporting practices, and also individualizes the various

effects of these practices and experiences. Burrows (2004) expressed similar concerns about

another dominant humanistic concept: 'development'. She critiqued 'developmentalism' as an

'orthodoxy' and argued that "the developmental 'story' of human change is just that: one among

many possible tales of how people change. The fact that it has so much currency means that

other ways of thinking about and practising human development are inevitably marginalized" (p.

87). Furthermore, she also argued that 'developmentalism' serves to reproduce a white,

masculine, able-bodied norm, which marginalizes other children's bodies. According to

Burrows, developmentalism also reifies unbalanced power relations between coaches and

athletes by positioning athletes as 'unknowing' and legitimizes coaches "observing, exercising

surveillance on, assessing and remediating young athletes 'for their own good" (p. 89).

The diverging statements about 'fun' I identified in my discourse analysis are produced

through the different discursive articulations of performance sport and

youth/recreational/lifelong physical activity:

- Fun for children is developing fundamental movement and sport skills through varied and
  exciting and challenging activities and free play;

- Fun is a component of true sport and of positive learning and teaching and coaching and
  promotes lifelong physical activity;

- Fun for competitive athletes is reaching a state of flow and tied to optimal recovery and
  regeneration.

As these statements demonstrate, there is a shift towards an articulation of fun 'as a combination

of exciting and challenging activities and free play' in the positive coaching model towards an

articulation of fun as 'flow' in the competitive sporting model. The second statement about fun,

which is also tied to statements regarding quality instruction/learning and related to the theory of 'true sport', could however be applicable to both coaching contexts. This raises a gamut of research related questions, which I address in chapter six:

- Which of these statements about fun inform varsity coaches understandings of fun and how they articulate their coaching and training practices related to fun (if at all)?

- Has the humanistic coaching model and its push for a more fun, athlete-centred and holistic coaching approach as evidenced in the 'positive coaching' and 'true sport' theories I identified, actually impacted varsity coaching practices?

- Do fun, holism and athlete-centrism thus defined actually change the way varsity performance coaches both understand and articulate how they practice coaching? And if so, what modified practices related to performance varsity sport have emerged as a result of this?

- Furthermore, do varsity/performance coaches experience tensions/contradictions related to these various articulations of fun? And if so, how do they make sense of these and what discourses do they draw upon to do so?

The power relations that my discourse analysis brought to light raise serious doubts regarding the possibilities for actual change in coaching practices given the current narrow construction of both 'effective sport coaching' and 'positive coaching for lifelong physical activity'. As my discourse analysis showed, there is actually much overlap between the articulable forms which inform both sporting and coaching models which are often framed (and I argue wrongly so) as binary opposites (Bigelow, et al., 2001; Rintala, 2009) or at the very least as opposite ends of an integrated continuum (LTAD, 2012; Thompson, 1995; 2003). It is quite clear that this alternative humanistic sport psychology coaching model despite becoming

increasingly visible has not effectively moved or changed the narrow discursive articulation or the preferred practices related to performance/competitive sport, and I would also speculate is unlikely to do so. Rather, 'positive coaching' and the humanistic sport psychology alternative model actively support the current power relations of performance/competitive sport.

The point I am making goes beyond the idea that one discourse has been made subservient to the other. It is not that an 'authentic', 'true', and importantly unproblematic positive coaching model based on 'true sport' has been diverted from its original purposes and co-opted by a dominant performance sporting model as some sport scholars like Rintala (2009) have claimed. Rather, what I am saying is that the very production of the positive coaching model as an alternative model is in and of itself an effect of power, which supports the status quo and current power relations both in performance sporting contexts and in youth and physical activity contexts. Given this 'articulable' pessimism, one might be justified to ask what the point is of interviewing coaches and undertaking the second half of this research project as I had set out to do. Indeed, if I have already demonstrated through my discourse analysis that the present power relations of performance sport offer varsity coaches very little space to maneuver, then what is the point of interviewing coaches? But this would be to misunderstand the purpose of my research project. My intended purpose was not to show whether coaches resist or not the dominant sporting model of performance sport through an unproblematic 'true' fun and 'true' sport model. Rather, my aim was to find out what understandings of coaching and training and what coaching and sporting practices have emerged as a result of the present discursive articulation of fun in coaching, which combines both theories of effective coaching, positive coaching for lifelong engagement in physical activity, and true sport? More precisely what coaching and training practices related to fun have emerged within the specific context of varsity

sport? It was especially interesting and important to interview coaches given that, as I showed in my discourse analysis, there is very little written as to how coaches should implement fun within their coaching practices, despite the growing importance of humanistic coaching in sport coaching research and the increasing visibility of humanistic concepts such as 'fun', 'holistic', and 'athlete-centred'. Indeed, what I found most interesting, especially if one replaces this paradox within Foucault's power/knowledge nexus, is that despite being omnipresent, the concepts of fun, holistic and athlete-centred are also the least well-defined of all the concepts in the coaching enunciations I selected. In keeping with my Foucauldian critical framework, this paradox pushed me to ask the following questions, which I address in chapter six: What are the power effects of this increased visibility yet conceptual blurriness? What power relations does it support and enable? What articulations of specific coaching practices related to fun, holism and athlete-centrism have emerged as a result of it and through it?

I conclude this first part of my data collection and analysis with a brief summary of my findings regarding both the discursive articulation of coaching at large and the discursive articulation of fun in coaching more specifically. I end with a discussion of how these findings inform my themed semi-structured interview guide for my interviews with varsity coaches at a Canadian university.

Summary

My Foucauldian discourse analysis of key coaching websites brought a number of interesting findings to light. First, Foucault's concept of power/knowledge enabled me to problematize the various power effects and strategic stakes involved in the production of the effective coaching model for performance and the positive coaching for lifelong engagement in physical activity as opposite ends of a coaching/sporting/physical activity spectrum. A closer

examination of their 'discursive makeup' revealed that, despite being often framed and understood as two very different sporting/coaching models, they are actually very similar in the sense that they share the same articulable forms. Both models are currently shaped within the narrow confines of dominant scientific and individualizing discourses (e.g., sport science and sport psychology and pedagogy) with humanistic sport psychology featuring more prominently in the positive coaching for lifelong physical activity model. This finding, thus, pushed me to question the positive coaching for lifelong physical activity as a 'serious alternative' to the effective coaching for performance sport model and consequently, its ability to effect change within the discursive formation of sport coaching. It also pushed me to interrogate the strategic stakes involved in the production of the positive coaching model as a radical alternative to counterbalance the 'excesses of performance and professional sport' (Bigelow, et al., 2001; Hyman, 2009; Rintala, 2009) and its power effects.

Second, while humanistic sport psychology and pedagogy is emphasized and highly visible in these coaching websites through concepts like fun, flow, holistic, and athlete-centred, there are in contrast very scarce resources devoted to help coaches achieve these 'desired' aspects of sport coaching and sport participation. In addition, these various humanistic psychological concepts remain blurry in contrast to other scientific concepts related to effective training for performance, which are defined and elaborated on at great length (e.g., periodization). This paradoxical omni-visibility yet conceptual fuzziness is, I argue, a reflection of current dominant power relations and of the privileging of the current sport science based model of effective coaching for performance sport. It is also a reflection of how the alternative coaching model for lifelong physical activity is both made subservient to the dominant effective coaching for performance sport, but also more importantly is strategically produced to support

the unproblematic reproduction of dominant power relations in performance coaching and sporting contexts. Fun, flow, holism, and athlete-centrism as humanistic concepts are, therefore, strategically produced to support the unproblematic reproduction of dominant scientific, individualizing, and performance sporting and coaching discourses in performance sporting and coaching contexts, but also in support of strategic bio-political aims within recreational/youth physical activity and sporting contexts. These different strategic and bio-political stakes and investments in these humanistic concepts (to develop elite performers and competitors on the one hand and increase the overall physical activity of the population at large for health purposes on the other) lead to diverging statements about fun, athlete-development, athlete-health, quality instruction and learning, and true sport. Athlete-health for example, is both articulated as 'the holistic development of an individual's emotional, mental, physical, and cognitive capacities' and it is also simply being 'injury free and not mentally burnout'. Fun is both a 'combination of exciting and challenging activities and free play' and 'an optimal psychological state of consciousness related to optimal recovery and regeneration for performance'. It was, thus, very interesting to find out how varsity coaches understand and negotiate some of these overlapping, diverging and at times contradictory statements about fun, holistic development, optimal development, athlete-health, athlete-centred approach, quality instruction and coaching, effective coaching, and how these understandings influence how they articulate their coaching practices. It was especially interesting given the limited space of manoeuvrability for coaches in performance sporting contexts and the limited possibilities for actual change with the power relations of performance sporting and coaching contexts, which my discourse analysis revealed. In the following chapter, I explore the relationship between the articulable forms of fun and the ways coaches articulated their practices related to fun.

Chapter 6: The Practices of Fun in Varsity Coaching

In this chapter I present the results of my semi-structured interviews with 10 varsity coaches at a Canadian University. In my themed interview guide I further teased out the power effects of some of the tensions and contradictions related to various coaching theories and articulations of fun I identified in my previous chapter. I specifically focused on questions which would enable me to better apprehend what specific understandings of fun and effective coaching were produced through the discursive articulations, and what specific varsity training and competing practices emerged as a result (see appendix). I hoped to be in a position to further understand the relationship between the articulable forms of fun (Deleuze, 1988) and the ways coaches articulated their practices related to fun.

I have organized this second results chapter based on the three most prominent themes in my interviews, which I could best relate to my theoretical framework, discourse analysis, and specific research questions. In the first part of this chapter, I discuss the strategic instrumentalization of fun within varsity coaching training and competing practices specifically in relation to 'coaching effectiveness'. I then discuss the key role of fun in relation to 'varsity athlete development' and the strategic production of key humanistic constructs of 'the good varsity athlete' and 'the good teammate'. In the third part of this chapter, I discuss the strategic ongoing production of fun as a 'tacit' coaching knowledge (Nash & Collins, 2006). Importantly, as I highlight throughout this chapter, my themes and their related findings are not independent and mutually exclusive but rather deeply interrelated and mutually supportive. Thus, I also focused on highlighting the complex and strategic interrelations between 'fun and coaching effectiveness', 'fun and varsity athlete development', and the production of 'fun as a tacit knowledge' in order to gain a fuller understanding of the strategic deployment of fun within the

power/knowledge nexus of varsity sport. While I offer some discussion and analysis throughout this chapter, I give a more in depth analysis of my results in my conclusion chapter, where I connect the findings of my discourse analysis with my interview findings and with my theoretical framework. In my conclusion chapter, I also relate my research findings to the ongoing production of dominant coaching and sporting discourses and power relations within varsity sporting contexts.

The Instrumentalization of Fun in Varsity Sport Coaching

With the exception of one coach, who argued that fun/enjoyment is not central to his coaching or something that he actively tried to promote, the nine other coaches in my sample claimed 'fun' to be something critical that they actively pursued during training and competition. However, many of the coaches also stated the difficulties of including fun in training and competition because fun means different things to different people and because different people enjoy different things in sport. For example, some athletes have fun "doing silly games" (Sally, women's team sport coach) or joking around, some athletes enjoy "the team bonding and socializing aspects" of varsity sport (Will, men and women's individual sport coach), some athletes have fun "battling and competing and winning" (Harry, men's team sport coach), and some athletes have fun in "working hard in training to become highly skilled and successful athletes" (Viola, women's team sport coach).

Despite the currency of 'flow' (Jackson, 1996, 2000; Jackson & Csikszentmihaly, 1999; Lloyd & Smith, 2006) in the sporting and coaching literature, only one coach discussed the importance of it in sport. The concept of flow was originally developed by Csikszentmihalyi (1998) who described it as an optimal psychological state of consciousness experienced by an individual immersed in an activity where his/her skills matched the difficulty of the task. The

coach who discussed the importance of flow was also the coach who claimed not to think that fun was important or something that he tried to actively promote. While he didn't discourage fun, for him "fun can be equated to wasting time and it is also more of an organic thing that you can't really plan for" (Carl, men and women's team sport coach). However, he also did not actively promote flow, nor did he seem to have a clear picture as to how to promote flow through specific coaching practices. These findings echo my discourse analysis findings which showed the lack of clear pragmatic tools and resources for coaches to practice flow, holism, and athlete-centred coaching (NCCP, one, two, three, 2012; LTAD, 2012). These findings also support Cassidy's (2008; 2010) and Nelson et al's (2012) critique of 'holistic' coaching.

These different views on fun/enjoyment echo Jackson's (2000) statement that fun is a term which lacks conceptual clarity. This does not, however, diminish its stated importance for coaches both in terms of performance and success in varsity sport and in terms of athlete development. Indeed, one of the reasons 'fun' matters, is because coaches correlate it to athletic performance and success. As Viola put it: "The happier we are, the more we enjoy what we are doing, often the better we are performing". In addition, fun was seen by the coaches as critical in terms of long term athlete development in varsity sport and athlete motivation and commitment: "The fun element is really key I think around motivation and just keeping them enjoying what they are doing" (Viola, women's team sport coach). Viola's statement was echoed by many of the coaches including Victor who emphasized the importance of fun for athlete retention in the face of 'the grind' of varsity sport training and competing. Fun was seen as an antidote to athlete 'burnout', and as a way of helping athletes achieve their full potential and reach the elite levels of sport.

While my sample of coaches recognized that there were many different types of fun/enjoyment in sport, their statements overlapped more in what they considered to be the grinding or 'not fun' aspects of varsity sport. Some of these aspects were the 'long gruelling seasons', the physical demands and mental challenges of training and competing, as well as 'monotonous repetitive' training: "Well, I think that what a lot of the athletes will complain about is boredom and doing the same drills over and over again" (Viola). However, while these might be seen as obstacles to fun, these varsity sport training and competing practices were also described as necessary to produce a winning performance. As Sally (women's team sport coach) explained:

> If you want to be really good, you don't need the diversity because basically your formation is going to have you do a bunch of similar things quite frequently. So if you do it all the time, you are actually going to be better at it.

These non-fun yet effective practices of varsity sport were a source of tension and struggle which the coaches attempted to resolve or rationalize in various ways. One of the strategies the coaches resorted to was to use variations or progressions designed to avoid boredom that was seen as counterproductive both to performance and long term athlete development:

> So I think the challenge for coaches is kind of tricking them to be honest where they are doing the same things over and over again but you change a variation, you change something that just makes it feel different. (Viola)

This quote is interesting on numerous fronts. First, it shows that giving athletes the 'illusion' of fun and variety is more important than varsity athletes actually having fun and enjoying variety in training. Second, it shows that fun (at least as it is currently understood and practiced) is not a vector for change or able to motivate a deeper questioning or changing of varsity sport training

practices, which are seen as effective and/or normalized as natural and/or necessary to be successful in varsity sport. These findings also echo the results from my discourse analysis. Indeed, my discourse analysis findings had pushed me to question the construction of the humanistic positive sport psychology model for sport and its emphasis on fun, athlete-centred and holistic coaching as alternate and revolutionary. Furthermore, my discourse analysis findings had also led me to question the ability of the positive sport psychology model for sport to achieve one of its stated aims: to counterbalance the 'excesses' of the dominant competitive scientific sporting model (Bigelow et al. 2001; Hyman, 2009). The findings of both my discourse analysis and interviews with coaches here support the work of feminist theorist Hopkins et al. (2009) who emphasized the strategic deployment of humanistic discourses of emotional expressivity in support of dominant scientific discourses and their historical role in the reproduction of unbalanced power and especially gendered power relations. Although fun is not an emotion per say, it is associated with positive emotions like joy and happiness and is clearly linked to humanistic discourses of emotional expressivity in the coaching and sporting literature (Bigelow et al. 2001; Rintala, 2009). My interview findings also support the work of Cassidy (2008, 2010) and Nelson et al. (2012) and their critique of humanism and holistic coaching.

The various above understandings of fun and the ways coaches articulate their practices related to fun and the fact that fun has not fundamentally changed varsity coaching practices speak to Foucault's (1978, 1979) theorizing of the power/knowledge nexus and of the importance of 'problematizing' as a necessary first step for sport coaching researchers wishing to create real change within the discourses and power relations of different sporting/coaching contexts. Indeed, Foucault rejected the humanistic notion that social theories/models and practices are inherently good or bad or positive or negative and that it suffices to apply these

'positive' or 'good' social theories/models and practices to create long lasting positive social change. Rather, he argued that we need to focus on social practices (e.g., how fun is pragmatically practiced) and that these need to be re-contextualized within their specific socio-historical context (e.g., the power relations of 21st century Canadian varsity sport).

Aside from the use of progressions and modifications to avoid boredom and give the illusion of variety and change, coaches in my sample often resorted to 'the carrot and stick' approach in order to manage the tension between fun and effective training. Coaches in my sample instrumentalized fun as an incentive or as a reward for hard work, discipline, and excellence in training and competitions. These specific uses and practices of fun result from a dominant understanding of fun as the dichotomous opposite to hard work and discipline promoted by a large and increasingly popular body of literature on positive youth development through sport (e.g., Sabock & Sabock, 2008; Smoll & Smith, 1987; Thompson, 1997, 2003). This artificial construct and divide between hard work, skill development, and fun is something which some sport psychologists (Light, 2003; Strean & Holt, 2000) have underlined as detrimental to youth development and attempted to address by developing a different framework for developing skills in youth sport, e.g., Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU) framework that I discussed in my literature review. Once again however, while the TGfU framework might seem to be positive since it works to address problems associated with previous dominant understandings of fun, following Foucault, in order to determine the benefits and detriments of TGfU, one would need to problematize the actual practices that TGfU gives rise to, what sporting discourses it supports, and its role in the power relations of youth sport.

While the instrumentalization of fun occurred in various ways, there was also a lot of overlap in terms of how and when coaches chose to bring fun into their training. For example,

many coaches chose to incorporate fun in warm-ups for the purpose of getting athletes'

motivated, energetic, and focused for the serious hard work of training to ensue.

> Tuesday and Thursday mornings we go into the pavilion, we run a few laps we do some
>
> calisthenics we do some core work and then we play a game and they love it […] I can
>
> tell from that who is activated and ready to go and who is struggling because its early
>
> morning right 6 o'clock. (Sam, men and women's individual sport coach)

 Fun, thus, can serve the purpose of motivating athletes through the 'grind' of early morning

practices, but it is also used as a deflating time to allow athletes to switch off from school and get

focused if training occurs later on in the day as for the men's volleyball team. While fun can be

manufactured in the warm-up prior to hard work or heavily structured work to prepare athletes to

be productive, on task, and to make optimal use of training time, it can also be delivered as a

reward for the same reasons at a later date:

> And in the training I think that if you are doing a functional session then it is not fun, it is
>
> never going to be fun and so what you have to do is balance it off with having some kind
>
> of fun reward. That can be some kind of shooting competition or some kind of session
>
> that they can recognize as fun. (Sally, women's team sport coach)

 These practices related to fun, athlete productivity, and the optimal use of training time echo

Foucault's (1979) theorizing of the anatomo-political power and modern disciplinary techniques,

which involve the careful organization and control of bodies' activities through space and time.

Here, Sally's strategic partitioning and balancing of 'work' and 'fun' training sequences and

activities in the planning and delivery of training is designed for one sole purpose: to maximize

and optimize the 'serious' training time and ultimately to make her athletes more efficient.

According to current dominant scientific coaching and sporting discourses (see discourse

analysis and 'trainability' and 'periodization' in the LTAD, 2012 model), the optimal use of training time is currently equated with having athletes highly engaged in skill practices for the longest possible time and able to peak and perform when in matters. Therefore, by building 'fun sequences' into practice and partitioning fun from the serious work of becoming a highly skilled performance athlete, Sally is adhering to the scientific principles of periodization and trying to ensure that her athletes are as focused and on task as possible during the serious work of training and that they will ultimately perform when it matters.

For Sally, and for most of the other coaches I interviewed, integrating fun in warm-ups or cool downs and occasionally in drills was also used as a way to give athletes a sense of freedom and ownership over their training so that it was not just coach led, highly structured hard work, which many coaches described as counterproductive to optimal training and performance.

> I plan everything else so trying to give them a little ownership over that piece of one day
> […] Just to give them some ownership and break it up a little bit and also give them an
> insight into what we do as coaches and build a better connection between coach and
> athlete. (Bruno, women's team sport)

These manufactured and fairly tightly circumscribed player led training times were also perceived as beneficial to the development of positive relationships between players and also between the players and the coach, which most coaches also highlighted as paramount to team performance and success in the long run. These specific statements about the importance and benefits of giving athletes a sense of ownership and 'independence' through fun practices fit within a larger increasingly popular rhetoric around athlete-centred teaching and coaching approaches informed by knowledges like humanistic psychology and pedagogy (Becker, 2009; Kidman, 2005; Mageau & Vallerand, 2003; Nelson, et al. 2012). This increasingly popular

rhetoric rose from a recognition of the limitations of previous understandings of the role of the sport coach as limited to producing sporting performances, and also against previous understandings of effective coaches as possessing certain specific character traits (e.g., authoritative, charismatic) (Martens, 1987, 2004). The athlete-centred coaching rhetoric enjoys increasing popularity within coaching and sporting contexts for obvious reasons: it calls for more 'humane', 'progressive', and 'moral' practices, which are difficult to argue with or view as problematic on paper. This is precisely why Foucault's concepts of power/knowledge (i.e., the idea that power relations are inextricably tied to the formation and reproduction of knowledge and to the establishment of 'regimes of truth') and problematization of our present dominant humanistic doctrine of scientific progress are so important. In this case, these concepts push coaches and athletes to be critical of any coaching or sporting 'truth' even if they are framed as 'scientific' (read objective, unquestionable, permanent, universal, humane, and progressive). Indeed, by linking the formation and production of all knowledge to the social and to power relations and by showing its historical contingency, Foucault (1978, 1979) allows coaching researchers to debunk the powerful myth of scientific objectivity and to re-politicize all coaching and sporting knowledges and practices.

Furthermore, while the tough balancing act of fun and highly structured serious hard work was omnipresent throughout my interviews and something that all coaches wrestled with and handled in various creative ways, what was also evident was how little input players actually have over their training. Furthermore, what little input they do have is mostly circumscribed to trivial components of training or to team bonding activities outside of training practices. These practices related to fun and to promoting group cohesion and unity, and the positive relationship between group cohesion and team performance and success have been researched by

various sport psychologists (Turman, 2003; Yukelson, 1997). Yukelson notably developed a multi-dimentional framework for achieving group cohesion and unity in varsity basketball centred on common goals, valued roles, teamwork, and feelings of satisfaction and/or identification with group membership which included fun and effective team building activities designed to promote this positive team culture.

Furthermore, according to Yukelson, nurturing leadership and player ownership over activities designed to promote fun outside of training also allowed coaches more time and energy to focus on the serious hard work of training and competing and developing a successful team. Thus, while there might be a powerful rhetoric in place around the importance of player involvement, ownership, and decision making, little is in fact put in place to favour the development of critical athletes and more athlete involvement in the design of their training practices. Some coaching researchers have highlighted this disconnect between the rhetoric of athlete-centred teaching and coaching approaches and the development of athlete-centred pragmatic teaching and coaching practices (e.g., Cassidy, 2008, 2010; Nelson et al., 2012). While there is a clear disconnect between the powerful rhetoric around holistic development and athlete-centred coaching and actual coaching practices, fun does seem to be one concept which encourages athletes' active involvement in training even if often minimal and trivial.

Related to the above, most coaches in my sample showed that they did not have the critical tools to problematize the power effects of a lifetime of sporting discipline. This is not surprising since current coach education models do not presently equip coaches with the critical tools to question the power relations involved in the production of coaching and sporting discourses and their problematic effects (e.g., athlete and coach docility) (Denison & Avner,

2011). For example, Steve discussed how much his players struggled with 'letting loose' and 'just having fun' when given 'free' time in practice.

> They struggle at the beginning. They get into it after a while but we find that they are just as driven as we are as coaches. They all go to work on some serious type things whether it is their finishing, whether it is their striking a ball over distance.

Several Foucauldian coaching scholars (Denison, 2007; Shogan, 1999) highlighted the problematic long term effects of sporting discipline in high-performance sporting contexts. They notably drew on Foucault's (1979) work on discipline to problematize the disciplinary effects of dominant scientific effective sporting practices like 'periodization' (i.e., the careful planning, control, and monitoring of high-performance sporting athletes training regimes to produce sporting performances). Denison (2007) showed how this careful control and monitoring of athletes' training plans and regimes can over time produce athlete docility and unreflective, coach-dependent, compliant athletes. Shogan (1999) also problematized the ways in which athletes are disciplined into monitoring themselves and others, and how they can become 'active agents of normalization' within the power relations of high-performance sport. Steve's quote, where he talks about how his athletes struggle to 'just have fun' and how they choose instead to work on their technical skills during their 'free' athlete led practice time, is a good example of the powerful effects of long term sporting discipline on individual athletes since even when theoretically freed to do what they want, they continue to only engage in sporting practices which fit within the logic of performance sport and the norms of what being a 'good' varsity athlete entails (i.e., being driven, self-motivated, and hardworking). These norms and characteristics of what being a good athlete entails are supported by much of the sport psychology literature (Mastrich, 2002; Smoll & Smith, 1987; Thompson, 1995, 2003).

Lastly, another strategy the coaches used to manage the tension between fun and effective coaching was to attribute the not fun aspects of training to the school component of varsity sport. Indeed, when I asked what is not fun about varsity sport training and/or competing, many of the coaches attributed their athletes' lack of fun/enjoyment to school and to having to balance the heavy work load and sometimes competing demands of sporting and academic excellence within a rigorous academic institution. One coach even went so far as to say "that nothing about varsity sport was not fun" (Harry, men's team sport), or in other words that everything in varsity sport is fun. These statements which correlate the school/studying component of being a student athlete with lack of fun/enjoyment have a dual purpose within the power relations of varsity sport: they simultaneously naturalize the idea that sport is inherently essentially fun and they naturalize current dominant varsity sport training and competing practices.

While fun is put to specific strategic uses in training and outside of training, fun is also instrumentalized within competitive settings albeit to a lesser extent. Indeed, for most coaches competitions are in and of themselves fun. Therefore, coaches feel less of a responsibility to produce fun since fun happens 'organically' in competitive settings for most athletes who are 'true' competitors. As Harry (men's team sport) put it:

> The guys at this level have been weeded out and the guys that don't have fun doing that usually have not made it this far or have been cut or released or not made teams or not progressed. So, for the most part our guys have fun when they are competing and winning.

Athletes' ability to have fun during competitions and in competitive settings was important to most coaches in my sample as it is tied to performance and success, but it was particularly emphasized in some sports, which are both heavy contact and highly competitive:

128

The foundation that you are building is around competition so you have to make sure that you have the right type of people, the type of young men who want to compete, who love competing and have fun. (Fred, men's team sport)

As these quotes show, athletes' ability to have fun during competitions is tied to dominant sporting discourses of mental toughness and masculinity (Pringle, 2009; Shogan, 1999) and to the making of the 'good' varsity sporting athlete, a theme which I will develop in the next part of this chapter. My findings thus support Pringle's (2009) work, which showed the mutually supportive relationship between the ongoing production of norms of masculinity as competitive, driven, and mentally and physically tough and the ongoing production of specific sporting pleasures tied to competition, overcoming bodily pain, and rugged physicality, and violence in rugby. My findings also support the work of queer theorist Ahmed (2004) who showed how the 'truths' of this world are intimately bound with emotions: how they move subjects and 'stick them together'. They also support her view that normative pleasures are firmly embedded within discourses and regimes of truth and can be very limiting and coercive since pleasures are generally framed as a reward for good conduct, which involves being productive in a socially sanctioned way and it is very much about having the 'right' kind of pleasure.

While less emphasis was placed on strategically infusing fun within competitions than during training, some coaches did nonetheless try to incorporate fun within competitive settings mainly for the purposes of reducing pre-competition stress. This was done through bringing in a music sound system in the locker room before games or through 'cracking jokes' in the locker room and in pregame talks. Again, many coaches in my sample talked about finding a balance between players being too stressed and players being too relaxed since both are negatively

related to performance. As many coaches emphasized, there is a fine line between being too silly and too serious.

> In a team meeting before a game it is a very fine line because if you are too much business then it is boring but if you are too much fun then everybody else is not on task so I find a very fine balance between the two. (Sally, women's team sport)

Sally's quote further reflects the previously discussed dominant dichotomous construction of fun as opposed to hard work which continues to permeate sporting and coaching discourses and shape coaches' understanding of fun. This dominant dichotomous construction of fun as silly and extraneous to the serious work of developing successful varsity athletes and teams enables coaches not to take athlete fun/enjoyment seriously despite its stated importance and omnipresence in coaching and sporting discourses. Paradoxically, fun matters but cannot be taken seriously as it is presently understood and practiced. This dichotomous construction of fun, thus, further enables the unproblematic reproduction of dominant theories of 'effective training and coaching for performance' informed by the sport sciences. At the same time, fun, as a serious aspect of training, clashes with the modernist idea of sport as inherently and essentially fun further naturalized by a humanistic sport psychology and pedagogy body of literature on positive youth development through sport (Cahill & Pearl, 1993; Clifford & Feezell, 2010; Hyman, 2009). As Fred (men's team sport) put it: "It can't just be like going to the salt mines every day. There has to be some fun involved, they have to want to get together as a group of people".

In the next part of my analysis, I explore how coaches work to overcome some of these tensions and struggles associated with modernist assumptions about sport as essentially linked to positive emotions and fun and to the development of positive and socially desirable character

traits and skills. More specifically, I expand upon how they do so through differentiating between what is just fun and silly fun and the learned and developed fun tied to performance and to the development of the successful varsity athlete.

Fun and Athlete Development: The Making of the Successful Varsity Athlete

The role of fun in athlete development and the production of the 'good' varsity athlete was one that really transpired through my interviews. There were differences amongst the coaches in the way they 'recruited' fun/enjoyment depending on whether they coached males or females or both, and whether they coached team or individual sports. However, there were also significant overlaps. One of the most significant overlaps concerned the need and desire to work with passionate athletes. This imperative came back as a litany in most of the interviews:

> So you have to have that passion for the game, the program, your teammates, your team, the way the program is run, your coaches and coaching staff and everything else. It's very important if you look at it that way in terms of passion, enthusiasm. (Harry, men's team sport)

Fun and passion were also discussed interchangeably and were seen as very important to most of the coaches in my sample because of their perceived instrumental role in long term athlete retention and long term athlete development.

What I found most interesting, however, was how the idea of passion was mobilized in specific ways in varsity sport training and competing. Similar to fun, passion was also heavily instrumentalized. For example, some of the coaches used passion to overcome the struggles and tensions between the dichotomy of fun and hard work in varsity sport training:

So I always tell my girls, you have to love your sport unconditionally to do this […] And

so that means that they have to do all these things on a daily basis even if they hate it but

it does get monotonous for sure. (Bruno, women's team sport coach)

As this quote highlights, passion and the imperative of being passionate about one's sport as a

varsity athlete get mobilized in training to overcome the monotony of repetitive skill work,

which as previously discussed, many coaches viewed as not fun but necessary to successful

varsity athlete development. Implicitly, if you have the 'right' makeup to be a successful varsity

athlete (i.e., you are passionate enough about your sport), you will be able to overcome or

overlook the monotony of varsity skill training. Passion, therefore, is an important aspect of

varsity athlete development and an important athlete attribute which coaches seek out in the

recruitment process by talking to the athletes and the athletes' coaches to determine how

passionate and ambitious they are. Additionally coaches also nurture and monitor passion

throughout their athletes' careers alongside fun/enjoyment.

Furthermore, some coaches take the relationship between passion and fun and being the

right kind of athlete to be successful in varsity sport a step further. They link athletes' ability to

enjoy characteristically 'boring' aspects of varsity sport training to being a 'good' varsity athlete

and being a 'good' teammate. Viola (women's team sport) asserted:

So those restart periods, it just hurts, their bodies hurt and it is not particularly fun but it's

about that sharing of the community, they are all experiencing it. And my expectations of

the veteran players are the role modelling of how to cope with those situations. You can

feel sorry for yourself and whine about it or you can go jump in the ice bath together and

find some enjoyment in that.

Viola implied that a good varsity athlete with the right mental makeup and a good teammate is not only able to overcome or push through the not fun aspects of varsity sport training such as gruelling preseason training, monotonous skill work, injuries, and other similar challenges but that one is actually able to enjoy this process as well. These excerpts speak directly to Ahmed's (2004) work that stated how normative pleasures are very much about having the right kind of pleasure, in which "rightness is determined as an orientation towards specific objects" (p. 163). Bruno and Viola's quotes also demonstrate how fun/passion get mobilized to support the construction of specific ideas of being a good varsity athlete and a good teammate, which in turn act to normalize 'effective' varsity sporting practices and therefore ignore some of the effects of these effective dominant disciplinary sporting and coaching practices (e.g., the production of docile bodies). Within these two powerful normalizing ideas of the 'good teammate' and the 'good athlete', one can readily imagine how difficult it can be for varsity athletes to voice any concerns or struggles they might be having with any aspects of varsity sport training and competing. Fun/passion, therefore, can be said to support the unproblematic reproduction of dominant coaching discourses in varsity sport because they prevent any critical questioning of the dominant practices.

Indeed, given the present dominant humanistic coaching and sporting discourses, being critical or expressing struggles around some of these dominant varsity sporting practices would necessarily involve a questioning of one's 'selfhood' as a varsity athlete. Previous research has demonstrated (Pringle, 2009; Shogan, 1999) that most varsity athletes are not willing to see their athletic identity compromised or challenged in any form or fashion. Notably, from a Foucauldian perspective, Pringle (2009) discussed and problematized how rugby pleasures intersect with the pleasures of securing a sense of self, of fitting within the norm, of gaining social status and

recognition, and with the thrill of overcoming fear of injuries, and of dominating one's opponent. While some coaches in my sample took these powerful connections between fun/passion and being a good varsity athlete and teammate for granted, others actively worked to make these explicit to their athletes. These coaches viewed these connections as an integral part of successful varsity athlete development and of their role as a varsity coach. Fred (men's team sport coach) encourages his athletes to think as follows: "My sacrifice is important and although I hurt right now, I take a lot of pride in that I hurt for this, for my teammates and for what we want to accomplish together". Fred also further emphasized: "So I think that if you can make that link [between fun/passion and being a good teammate] for them it helps, it helps them have more fun and it helps them get through those hard times without getting down".

Aside from being an important aspect in terms of successful individual athlete and skill development for varsity sport, passion and fun were also mobilized in the context of team sports to develop group cohesion and homogeneity. As previously mentioned, sport psychologists (Turman, 2003; Yukelson, 2011) argued that a positive correlation between fun and group cohesion and homogeneity and team performance and productivity. The coaches' in my study supported this sport psychology discourse. For example, Viola (women's team sport coach) said: "I think that one of the keys to our success has been finding like-minded athletes who can define fun in the same way". Furthermore, developing the 'right team culture' and the 'right mind-set' for success and performance is something that Fred said is both a part of successful recruitment and successful athlete and team development:

> Guys who have fun doing that, have fun when you are practicing in a certain way but it is
> impossible for me to recruit [a whole team] of guys who immediately have fun competing

at that sort of aggressive level. You have to get kids to that point. You have to train them

to have fun in those sorts of settings.

In addition, as the above quote emphasized, recruiting and developing the art and love of

competition was something that all the coaches highlighted as quintessential to team and

individual success and varsity athlete development. Indeed, most coaches expressed the idea that

varsity athletes should enjoy competition. Competition was framed as the reward for the hard

work of training. As Fred (men's team sport coach) put it:

That is why I say that you need the right kind of athletes. As I put more competition into

practice, I always expect the fun level to go up as well. And if it is not, then we have an

issue and we have to figure out what that is. And maybe it is that we have the wrong

athletes, or maybe we have we not formed the competition periods the right way.

Framed as the 'foundation' and 'backbone' of successful athlete and team development, the art

and love of competition is naturalized through the making of the good varsity athlete and the

good teammate. Reciprocally, the essentialization and normalization of competition as fun

secures dominant disciplinary varsity training and competing practices as unproblematic. Indeed,

if as Fred put it, the simple fact of 'putting more competition into practice makes fun go up', then

coaches can adopt a 'laissez faire' attitude to fun/enjoyment since fun/enjoyment will occur

naturally through infusing more competition into training.

Additionally, the art and love of competition, something that should be 'natural' for the

'right' kind of athletes, was also an attitude that many coaches worked hard at developing in

their athletes and viewed as the result of a process of development:

[Both in the] off season and in season training we just surround them with the fact that

competition is fun. So then when we compete more and more and that competition

becomes more physical and aggressive it is still fun. We keep working and working at

[that connection] and it is progressive but then too much of that [competition and

physical aggression] and people start getting beat up and nobody has fun when they are

hurting and beat up and the coach is saying let's hit each other again. (Fred)

Fred described the love of competition as being on a spectrum. It is both something that people

are born with (i.e., they are 'wired' that way), but also something that can be developed through

finding ways of infusing competition into training in innovative ways and over time. The final

end goal is that varsity athletes will eventually learn to have fun in the specific type of aggressive

and violent competition that is normalized in some sports and that will make the team more

successful.

Lastly, the learning of fun/enjoyment was also connected to other normalizing ideas

about varsity athlete development and being a good teammate such as self-sacrifice for the team:

But to me honestly it is about that greater picture, the greater mission and you have to

have a sense of personal satisfaction when you sacrifice for that mission. So if you are

training to the point where you are puking and you are sick, if you believe that the

mission is important then you can come to terms and rationalize the fact that you feel bad

but that you have still helped our mission and the team. And it helps people have fun if

they can adopt that mindset. So much of this is having the right mindset. (Fred)

As the above quote shows, the normalizing discourse of being a good teammate is often

connected to a very specific and strategic definition of fun linked to a sense of personal

satisfaction and pride that comes from hard work and self-discipline (Smith-Maguire, 2008) and

performing well as an athlete and as a teammate. This specific definition of fun is, therefore, not

process oriented or linked to finding enjoyment in the sporting activity itself during actual

training or competing as in 'flow' ((Jackson, 1996, 2000; Jackson & Csikszentmihaly, 1999; Lloyd & Smith, 2006), but is linked more to a sense of purpose and achievement tied to the successful realization of specific individual and team goals. In this way, a concept such as flow could be said to be a subjugated knowledge within the context of varsity sport. The goal oriented definition of fun supported by the normalizing idea of the good athlete as ambitious and driven and of the good teammate as self-sacrificing is also connected to the previous theme I developed: the instrumentalization of fun in varsity coaching. Indeed, this specific goal oriented definition of fun is also strategically mobilized to help coaches negotiate and overcome some of the struggles and tensions around the dominant disciplinary practices of varsity sport training and competing, which are viewed as not fun but necessary.

Interestingly, what also came across through my interviews was the highly gendered nature of fun. For example, fun in the physical battling and in pushing one's body through pain to be successful was especially prominent in the sports of ice hockey and football. Of course the strategic instrumentalization of fun in connection with physical battling and violence and overcoming pain is a result of the very nature and demands of these heavy contact sports. However, it is impossible to disregard how this specific instrumentalization of fun coincides with dominant discourses of masculinity as being aggressive, risk taking, and physically and mentally tough (Laurendeau, 2008; Messner, 1990; Pringle, 2009; Pringle & Markula, 2005). Pringle (2009) emphasized the critical role of the heavy contact sport of rugby in the identity construction of males in New Zealand, and Laurendeau (2008) introduced the concept of 'gendered risk regimes' in connection to 'risk sports' like skydiving. He showed the narrow connection between bodily risk taking and the production of dominant constructs of masculinities. Messner (1990) thoroughly discussed the critical role of organized sports in boys'

early socialization and identity construction in North America. He notably highlighted how boys are encouraged from a young age to enjoy rugged physicality and heavy contact sports such as football.

Pringle's (2009) findings also echo the work of feminist researchers (Ahmed, 2004; Cruikshank, 1993; Fraser & Greco, 2005; Hopkins et al., 2009; Ramazanoglu, 1993) who highlighted the instrumental role that pleasures and emotions have historically played in the reproduction of dominant power relations and social and gendered inequalities. My research findings also showed that the construction of athlete identity through fun is tied to the reproduction of unbalanced power relations and norms of femininity and masculinity. The gendering of fun and its role in the reproduction of norms of masculinity and femininity was especially evident in talking with the varsity coaches who coached both female and male athletes:

> Men are a little bit more cutthroat. Women it's more the fact that they feel that they belong to something. They want to be there because they are friends and so that keeps them motivated a little bit longer. However, at the higher levels it changes and it becomes very cutthroat for women as well. Although they still have that sense of wanting to belong whereas men are a little bit more like they would rip your head off to win. I wouldn't say that they don't enjoy fun the same way but it is hard, I am trying to figure out the proper words to use". (Will, men and women's individual sport coach)

As the above excerpt shows, fun and sporting motivation for male athletes is dominantly produced as purposeful, goal oriented, and tied to winning and aggressively pursuing performance and success, whereas for females, the production of fun is also largely tied to team bonding and social interactions. Will's perception of gendered differences in fun and motivation

also impacted the way he coached his male athletes and female athletes in different ways. For example, while he had no qualms yelling at his male athletes across the room, he would take care not to do so with his female athletes because he perceived this way of correcting errors negatively affected his female athletes' performances. This is interesting because it shows how dominant gendered discourses are mobilized around the idea of fun and motivation within varsity sporting contexts, but also reciprocally how widespread societal gendered discourses get reproduced through fun in varsity sport and varsity sporting and coaching practices.

'Gendered' fun thus plays a key role in upholding gendered power relations and inequalities both in sport and in wider society. These norms continue to stifle both female and male athletes through the privileging of competitive and masculine discourses but particularly marginalize female athletes within a performance sporting context who are caught in a double-bind. Indeed, the discursive production of feminine sporting pleasures/fun is tied to the enjoyment of the social, cooperative aspects of sport participation rather than to the physicality, the competitiveness of sport and sport excellence. This is obviously tricky for female athletes involved in a high-performance, competitive sporting context and does not push female athletes to 'excel' in competitive sport to the same degree that the discursive construction of masculine sporting pleasures encourages male athletes to 'excel'. This unbalance, therefore, further reifies unbalanced gendered power relations in performance sporting contexts. The binary production of 'feminine fun' vs. 'masculine fun' and its role in gendered power relations is something which Ahmed's (2004) work best exemplified. Indeed, her work really focused on showing the historical construction of emotions as the negative binary of rationality and as tied to nature, femininity, emotionality, and passivity. It also retraced how the idea of modern civilized man has come to be historically formed in connection with the ability to control emotions, but also with

the ability to cultivate the 'good emotions': those that sustain the formation of a normative, competent self (i.e., masculine fun in a performance sporting context).

The critical role of sport in the construction and naturalization of dominant gendered discourses and power relations in sport and society has been studied quite exhaustively (Messner, 1990; Theberge, 1991; Wellard, 2002). However, as my literature review showed, fewer studies have focused on the critical role of sporting pleasures in upholding these dominant constructions of masculinity as goal and performance oriented, and physically and mentally tough (Pringle, 2009; Pringle & Markula, 2005) and even fewer studies have highlighted the role of sporting pleasures in upholding dominant constructs of femininity. This is clearly an area of research which warrants more attention and contradicts Pringle's (2009) statement that "discourses of gender, although important, should not be overemphasized in the examination of sporting pleasures after athletes have become committed participants" (p. 223).

In addition, my interviews highlighted another important aspect of varsity sport: the notion of 'holistic' development of the student-athlete. While my Foucauldian discourse analysis of coaching websites had already highlighted holistic development's importance within coaching and sporting discourses, it was especially interesting to see how coaches practiced holistic development within the specific context of varsity sport. Indeed, many coaches expressed the idea that it was important for them not only to develop successful student athletes but also to develop specific kinds of people who are autonomous, self-motivated, respectful, appreciative, and aware and open to other cultures. This is interesting because based on this description, it would appear that coaches strive to create 'non-docile' athletes (Foucault, 1979), that is athletes who are the opposite of coach dependant, unreflective, mechanistic bodies:

So for example, I try to take them to different parts of Canada so they can get a sense of the culture and community and when we go to those places we try and see all the touristy things and try and give them a sense of their nation. (Bruno, women's team sport coach)

However, as my interview findings showed the actual practices of varsity sport tied to fun and holism that the coaches put in place are most often anything but conducive to producing critical athletes capable of having shared input and ownership over their training. Indeed, fun and holistic athlete development are mainly put in practice through team bonding activities outside of the serious work of training and becoming a successful varsity athlete such as travelling and sightseeing. Moreover, some of the coaches discussed the importance of developing people who will go on to be successful in their personal and professional lives when their varsity sporting careers are over. As Bruno put it: "I view varsity sport as a good training ground for their professional careers and I try and teach them how to behave". These excerpts capture the importance of the discourse of holistic athlete development in varsity sport, and also dominant ideas of sport as character building and as developing socially desirable character traits and skills, which in turn get reproduced through these varsity coaching practices related to fun.

Interestingly, some of the coaches found ways of practicing holistic development and fun in varsity sport, and to conciliate these with the imperative of competition and performance relatively easy. However, some of the coaches in my sample expressed difficulty in the effective management of both 'mandates' of varsity sport. Will (men and women's individual sport coach) for example, expressed his sense of frustration with coaching evaluations and with the disconnect he perceived between what 'really' matters (i.e., success and winning) and what matters 'rhetorically' and 'theoretically' (i.e., fun and the holistic development of the student athlete):

Well you are asking kids if they are having fun but you are not asking them whether they were successful. As coaches, we are measured on the fact that we are successful. So in those evaluations, it is not asking were you successful, did you learn something or did you achieve your goals. You are asking evaluations to evaluate what we are not actually asking the coaches to do.

Will also expressed his frustration with the lack of financial and educational resources to 'practice' fun and holistic development: "For a sport coach to go look up something online and find something fun [to do at practice] at a high level sport, you are not going to find anything". This quote also highlights the lack of any formalized coaching education around fun/enjoyment despite its stated importance. This is an interesting disconnect and paradox which I explore in the final part of my analysis.

The 'Tacit' Knowledge of Fun

Some coaches have encouraged the notion of coaching as an art form, where decisions are made as a result of "gut feeling". Other coaches operate completely instinctively, approaching coaching as an apparent art form. These coaches are unable to articulate why they make decisions, how they structure feedback, and the place of experience and knowledge within this process. This reflects tacit knowledge, which can be abstract and unarticulated, the type of knowledge, which is routinely used and taken for granted. (Nash & Collins, 2006, pp. 465-466)

As this quote reflects, for coaches, tacit knowledge is presently just as important if not more important than formal coach education in terms of becoming an effective coach. In fact, when asked how they had learned about fun, my participants all replied that it was mostly through their personal experiences as players, and also through their experiences coaching. Furthermore, they

emphasized the fact that fun/enjoyment had not been a part of any formal coaching education they had received: "Almost all personal experience. I can't think of anything in the coaching certification programs that really talked about fun" (Sam, women and men's individual sport coach). Interestingly, when I probed Sam further about this fact, and about the apparent disconnect between the stated importance of fun and the lack of any formal education related to fun, he answered:

> You know now that you say it, it really is surprising. I actually just came back from a coaching training course and it is all about physiology and management and all about sport psychology.

This statement echoes the work of critical and sociological sport scholars (Cassidy et al., 2008; Cushion et al., 2003; Denison, 2010b; Denison & Avner, 2011) who problematized the disconnect between the highly complex and messy nature of coaching as a social endeavor and the privileging of technical scientific and linear approaches in coaching and coach education programs.

Sam was not the only coach to highlight the privileging of certain technical knowledges in coaching:

> I think it [fun] is really important. I think we just need to learn how to do it. I think we all want to do it but we don't know how to do it because when you go to a coaching clinic you are learning skills, technical skills. You are not sitting down; you are not doing a session on fun. You do team building yes but it is not about fun, it's about team building to help you win. We never use just that whole idea of fun as the end point. Everything we do is about trying to help us win. So I think it's having the coaches value that because it isn't our priority. (Will, men and women individual sport coach)

143

In addition to expressing regret over the privileging of certain technical knowledges over other knowledges, Will also critiqued the instrumentalization of all aspects of coaching education in support of winning and performance. Moreover, Will's quote also highlights that coaches are not uncritical 'dupes' with regards to the growing rhetoric around the importance of fun, and holistic athlete development in governmentally endorsed coaching and sporting models (e.g., LTAD, 2012). Here, Will was clearly aware that his coaching practices are not aimed at developing fun or holistic athlete development despite a coaching and sporting rhetoric which claims that fun and holistic athlete development are just as important as winning and performance (e.g., LTAD, 2012). He was also clearly aware that the rhetoric of fun and holistic athlete development has not fundamentally altered his coaching practices. Will's quote, therefore, also corroborates one of my discourse analysis findings: that fun and holistic athlete development cannot be taken seriously or effect change within coaching and sporting discourses and power relations given their present discursive articulation as separate from dominant 'effective' scientific and performance sporting and coaching discourses.

In contrast, most coaches expressed the idea that fun/enjoyment is self-evident and something that 'expert' coaches are proficient at detecting in their athletes regardless of its absence in coaching education: "You can tell, their body language is so evident, for a trained eye they can't fool you" (Sally, women's team sport coach). Not only is the development of fun not part of any formal coach education program, but neither is it something that coaches look to assess or evidence in any formal way. Fun, its development, its assessment, and evidencing are all part of the tacit knowledge of coaching experts (Cushion, et al., 2003; Jones et al. 2003, Nash & Collins, 2006), what Carl called his "spidy sense" and what Victor called coaching "by feel".

In line with this, many coaches did not express the need for any formal learning or assessment of fun because of their understanding of fun as a character trait of the coach:

> I am pretty lucky with the fun thing because I think that is my personality. That is what I am trying to do all the time because it is good for me as well as my athletes and they seem to enjoy it. (Sam, men and women individual sport coach)

Aside from their athletes' body language, several coaches talked about evidencing fun through athlete retention, their players' loud and energetic responses during training, or their players' willingness to show up early at practice or stick around to work on their skills after training. Other coaches measured fun in more surprising ways. For example, Harry (men's team sport coach) measured his athletes' fun through whether they are active and aggressive in helping him recruit other players to the program or not. In addition, he believed fun could be measured through team performance and success:

> Measuring? I guess a big thing for me for measuring the team is if we overachieved. So I would correlate the two together because I don't think you could overachieve if you were not having fun. (Harry)

Other coaches also made this link between evidencing and measuring fun and team performance. Bruno (women's team sport coach) for example, tracked what he called "happy points", which are the number of times players gave each other high-fives during a game. These happy points were seen to be strategic in fostering a positive team culture but as he also pointed out: "We have noticed this season just tracking this that if the happy points were really high, then we usually win the games". As these quotes show, and perhaps not too surprisingly, the tacit knowledge of fun is also informally and indirectly measured through evidence tied to performance assessments and to the effective production of the good varsity athlete and good teammate in varsity sport.

Thus, the ongoing production of fun and of the evidence of fun as a tacit coaching knowledge can also be said to reproduce power relations by supporting the dominant modernist and scientific coaching discourses in varsity sporting contexts and vice versa.

With some exceptions (e.g., Will) most of the coaches in my sample felt no need to formally learn about fun or effectively measure their athletes' fun/enjoyment. One coach I interviewed, nevertheless, discussed the steps he took to formally assess his players' fun/enjoyment on an ongoing and formal basis through encouraging his players to keep a journal:

> I ask them to do a lot of reflecting on paper to me and it is never about their role. It is about where they are at as an athlete, how they are feeling, and their enjoyment of the sport. (Bruno, women's team sport coach)

Bruno also put strategies in place to develop his athletes more 'holistically': "So I always do, 'can't talk to a teammate day'. So they are not allowed to call coaches, they are not allowed to see their teammates […]". This 'can't talk to a teammate day' is intended to help Bruno's athletes meet other university students and motivate them to get involved in other campus activities. Bruno did not view this strategy as a 'one off' but as a sort of wake-up call for his athletes to realize that making friends outside of the team is important for the full experience of the university but also for avoiding "coming in with a very small world and leaving with a very small world" (Bruno). Bruno's coaching 'strategy' echoes many other coaches' good intentions to "do right by each athlete" (Carl, men and women team sport coach) and "to create the best experience for each student athlete" (Victor, men's team sport coach). The fact that the coaches are well intentioned is certainly not at stake here. However, Foucauldian coaching scholars (Denison, 2007; Denison & Avner, 2011; Shogan 1999, 2003) have demonstrated that a desire to 'do well' and having the 'right intentions' does not mean that one coaches 'ethically'. In fact,

many coaches are unaware of some of the damaging and problematic effects of their coaching practices, including the effects of discipline (Denison & Avner, 2011). Denison and Avner (2011) argued that ethical coaching in the Foucauldian sense is distinct from morality in the sense that it involves an active and ongoing work of problematization rather than the simple adherence to a set of fixed moral principles to be a good coach (e.g., positive sport psychology coaching models; LTAD, 2012). This active and ongoing work of problematization and of ethical self-formation requires coaches to engage in various critical steps whereby they first connect their coaching knowledge and practices to power relations and dominant sporting and coaching discourses and then interrogate some of the potential problematic effects of these taken for granted dominant coaching and sporting practices on their athletes. It is only following this critical work that real change and innovation within coaching and sporting discourses and within the power relations of varsity sport can happen. Otherwise, 'positive' coaching will remain at the level of 'tinkering' with coaching practices, as my interviews showed. For example, Steve tried to develop athlete independence and give athletes some 'free' down time in practice to do what they wanted but did not have the critical tools to problematize the effects of long term discipline and why his athletes 'chose' to use their athlete time to work on coach approved specific performance oriented technical skills. Viola tried to give her athletes a sense of ownership and autonomy in the program but then only allowed her players to have input over trivial outside of practice team bonding activities instead of over actual coaching and training practices.

In conclusion, this second results chapter highlighted three main themes which emerged from my interviews with varsity coaches: the instrumentalization of fun in varsity sport coaching, fun, athlete development, and the making of the successful varsity athlete, and the tacit knowledge of fun. These interrelated and mutually supportive themes crystallized both the

various roles of fun as a political technology (Lauss & Szigetvari, 2010) within the present power/knowledge nexus of varsity sport but also reciprocally showed how fun is itself enabled (i.e., what are the conditions which allow fun to become such a powerful political technology within the present power relations of varsity sport). In the final chapter of my dissertation, I connect the key findings from my interviews to my theoretical framework and Foucauldian discourse analysis of key coaching texts. I end with a discussion of the implications of my findings and make recommendations for the development of more ethical and effective coaching practices related to fun in varsity sporting contexts.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

"To make an end is to make a beginning. The end is where we start from." (T.S. Eliot)

The aims of my dissertation project were twofold: first, to develop a deeper understanding of the ways in which different coaching/sporting discourses intersect, conflict, and combine to produce specific understandings of fun in relation to effective coaching in performance sporting contexts; second, to develop a deeper understanding of how varsity coaches understand, negotiate, and articulate how they promote fun within the boundaries of coaching and sporting discourses.

In the first part of this conclusion, I address the two aims of my dissertation project and connect the results from my discourse analysis to my interview results. I examine the relationship between the coaching knowledges of fun and coaches' articulations of their practices related to fun. I then relate these to the power/knowledge nexus of varsity sport in order to understand the strategic role of fun in the reproduction of dominant coaching and sporting discourses and power relations within varsity sporting contexts (Foucault, 1978, 1979). Throughout this chapter I also make links between my research findings and my theoretical framework and previous coaching and sporting literature. In the second and final part of this conclusion, I make recommendations based on my Foucauldian critical study of fun within varsity coaching. These recommendations are designed to promote more ethical and effective coaching practices related to fun within varsity sporting contexts.

The Discursive Production of Fun and the Power Relations of Varsity Sport

My research project allowed me to identify key power effects of the current discursive production of fun in varsity sport. The first one was the marginalization of flow and fun/holism.

The Marginalization of Fun/Flow and Fun/Holism

My discourse analysis highlighted three main theories. The first one was *effective coaching for performance sport*, which focuses on the optimal development of athletes' physical and mental skills through a periodized approach to training, competition, and recovery based on the scientific principles of human growth and maturation that keeps athletes injury free, engaged, and enthusiastic, and leads to performance excellence. The second one was *positive coaching for lifelong engagement in sport and physical activity*. This follows the principles of true sport and focuses on developing fundamental physical, movement, and sport skills through a fun, holistic, and athlete-centred coaching/teaching approach. This approach promotes lifelong engagement in sport and physical activity and optimal health and individual development. The third one was *true sport for lifelong engagement in physical activity*, which is fun and promotes lifelong physical engagement in physical activity, and leads to optimal health and individual development.

I identified fun in the theories about 'positive coaching' and 'true sport' where it was articulated as "a combination of exciting and challenging activities and free play". However, fun was not a part of the articulation of 'effective coaching' and performance/competitive sport. Although fun was not a part of effective coaching for performance/competitive sport, the concept of flow was defined in relation to competitive performance sport. As previously discussed, flow refers to an optimal state of consciousness, heightened awareness, and concentration in which individuals are totally immersed, absorbed, and focused on the task at hand. In addition, the state of flow is generally associated with positive emotions such as enjoyment and is positively related to performance (Csikszentmihalyi, 1998; Jackson, 1996, 2000). Interestingly, my interviews of varsity coaches showed that it was the statements related to the theories of positive coaching and

true sport for lifelong engagement in physical activity which predominantly shaped both their understanding and practices related to fun. Indeed, the interviews did not reflect a shift from an understanding of fun articulated in the theories of positive coaching and true sport for lifelong engagement in physical activity towards an understanding of fun as flow despite it being arguably an articulation of fun more closely aligned with the aims and goals of competition and varsity sport. While my interviews provided valuable information in terms of showing the marginalization of flow in varsity coaching and sporting discourses, which remain dominantly shaped by the sport sciences, it also arguably provided me with a better understanding of how this marginalization happens in terms of what discourses enable the ongoing reproduction of this power effect.

Fun: An Imperative and the Binary Opposite of Hard Work

My interviews revealed the instrumental role of the binary construction of 'fun' versus 'hard work' and of the modernist 'imperative of fun' in sport in sustaining the current dominant discourses and power relations in varsity coaching contexts. More specifically, the binary construction of fun and hard work and the need for sport to be fun reinforce an understanding of fun as silly and as separate from actual serious coaching and sporting practices of varsity sport. This binary construction normalizes varsity coaching practices related to fun, such as the 'carrot and stick approach' (Sally) where fun is used as a reward or as an incentive for 'good' athlete behavior and performance. Furthermore, the binary discursive production of fun versus hard work and the need for sport to be fun also help naturalize other coaching practices related to fun such as 'tricking athletes' (Viola). According to Viola, 'tricking athletes' is giving athletes the illusion of fun and variety in training through integrating progressions and slight modifications to skill development and training exercises. However, these training practices remain largely

unchanged despite coaches highlighting that they are often monotonous and not fun. Foucault (1979) problematized seemingly anodyne modern disciplinary techniques like graduated exercise, and how they work to discipline and normalize individuals to the ends of making them more 'productive' and 'efficient'. Drawing on Foucault's (1979) work, Denison et al. (2013) similarly argued that graduated exercise, while useful can, just like any other disciplinary technique, be very problematic and constraining and lead to athlete docility if not used cautiously and reflectively by coaches.

To elaborate, the binary construction of fun versus hard work and the imperative of fun in sport help produce varsity coaching and training practices, which further enable dominant 'effective' scientific sporting and training practices (e.g., monotonous repetitive skill training, periodization of training, athlete training logs, athlete dietary logs and plans). Furthermore, this binary production also supports the various disciplinary power effects of these dominant scientific sporting and coaching practices (e.g., narrow mechanistic and linear understanding of training, and the body and performance, athlete docility) to be un-problematically reproduced and normalized. The results of my two-fold study, therefore, showed the mutually supportive relation between how fun is talked about in the official coaching discourse and by individual coaches and the power/knowledge nexus of varsity sport. Indeed, the discursive production of fun supports unbalanced power relations through the production of a dominant scientific and linear model of coaching expertise and truth. This dominant model of coaching expertise is based on the notion of the coach as the expert holder of knowledge and as athletes as the recipients of this expert knowledge. Furthermore, this dominant scientific model supports an understanding of athlete performance as the linear and mechanistic application of scientific coaching expertise.

My results also showed the instrumental role of fun as a political technology "through which modern power is articulated on the body" (Foucault, 1983, p. 113) and its instrumental role in enabling the further spread of various sciences of the body and the mind (e.g., positive sport psychology, sport physiology). Additionally, as the example of the 'carrot and stick' coaching approach to fun showed, the combination of the binary construction of fun and of the imperative of fun in sport also help reproduce norms of the good varsity athlete and teammate that uncritically and even enthusiastically adheres to these effective varsity sport training and competing practices including the ones which the varsity coaches in my sample highlighted as not fun, but necessary. This specific discursive construction of the good varsity athlete and teammate which fun helps reproduce is quite clearly not conducive to the development of more balanced power relations in varsity sport, quite the opposite in fact. Rather the discursive construction encourages the development of athlete docility (Denison et al. 2013; Shogan, 1999, 2003) and of highly disciplined, obedient, coach dependent, and mechanistic bodies. Furthermore, the discursive construction of the good varsity athlete and teammate is neither conducive to coaches making more than 'tinkering' changes to actual training and competing practices to facilitate athlete fun/enjoyment/flow and holistic development within varsity sporting contexts. These findings speak to Denison et al.'s (2013) argument that:

> Coaches are taught to tinker endlessly with the details-the 'series upon series' of exercises, the 'disciplinary polyphony' of exercises, the what to do and when of coaching that defines each individual athlete's level or rank and so maximizes time and efficiency. (p. 393)

But as my interview findings showed, the production of fun as an imperative and as the binary opposite of hard work is not the only factor which enables coaches to just keep doing what they do and simply tinker endlessly with the details.

Fun: An Official Coaching Rhetoric and a Tacit Coaching Knowledge

My interview findings can be connected and shed further light on one of my main discourse analysis findings: the absence of pragmatic resources for coaches to develop 'fun', 'flow', and 'athlete-centrism' and 'holism' despite their stated importance and paradoxical omni-presence in governmentally endorsed coaching frameworks such as the LTAD model. My interview findings further revealed how developmental constructs such as fun, flow, athlete-centrism, and holism are strategically produced as part of the tacit knowledge of coaching (Nash & Collins, 2006): the set of ideas and practices about effective coaching acquired either through experience and/or learned from other coaches but not through formal coaching education. My findings also shed further light on the power effects of this strategic production of fun as a tacit coaching knowledge separate from actual effective, performance-related, varsity coaching and training knowledges and practices, which are, in contrast, fully and lengthily developed through formal coach education programs, as evidenced in my discourse analysis of key coaching texts (NCCP one, NCCP two, NCCP three, 2012; LTAD, 2012). For example, the strategic production of fun as a tacit coaching knowledge further cements the idea that varsity coaches do not need to take developmental constructs like fun or athlete-centrism seriously since they are not part of effective coaching, training, and competing practices for performance sport. This binary construction of 'development' versus 'effectiveness' also mirrors the instrumental binary construction of 'fun' versus 'hard work' which I discussed previously. One of the power effects of this strategic production of fun and developmental coaching as tacit and distinct from

coaching effectiveness, is that effective coaching continues to be narrowly understood and practiced as the linear application of scientific knowledges of the body such as sport physiology.

Another power effect of this strategic production of fun as tacit and distinct from coaching effectiveness is that the various problematic disciplinary effects (e.g., athlete docility) of these understandings and practices of effective coaching, training, and competing are also largely ignored. This, in turn, further cements the reproduction of unbalanced power relations between coaches and athletes and also between athletes in varsity sporting contexts. For example, from my personal experience as a former high-performance soccer player, athletes' sense of self and self-worth and their appreciation of other athletes' self-worth often become narrowly and sometimes exclusively tied to their productivity and their ability to perform in training and competition. This internalized ranking system of athletes is a problematic effect of modern disciplinary power which is most often tacit and naturalized through various seemingly 'anodyne' training and competing practices (e.g., planning). Indeed, Denison et al. (2013) argued, that naturalized scientific training and competing practices like planning designed to optimize the use of the training space and training time to most efficiently "organize and develop productive sporting bodies" (p. 389) can have problematic effects and lead to unethical and ineffective sporting and coaching practices: "Training programs can, if the coach is not careful how she or he implements them, place athletes in positions, or lead to the formation of relations, that stifle their autonomy and control and limit their personal development" (Denison et al., p. 391).

In what follows I elaborate on how the above interview findings helped me to answer my discourse analysis question of whether the humanistic turn in some of the coaching research and its push for a more fun, athlete-centred and holistic coaching approach as evidenced in the

'positive coaching' and 'true sport' theories I identified, had actually impacted varsity coaching practices.

A Critique of the Humanistic Turn in Varsity Coaching

My interviews go some way in showing that the humanistic turn in coaching has actually had very marginal to no effects on understandings of coaching effectiveness and dominant varsity sporting and coaching practices. As previously mentioned, at the most it has pushed coaches to tinker with some of these dominant coaching, training, and competing practices, but for the most part humanistic coaching practices are understood as extraneous to training and competing and implemented outside of the serious, hard work of varsity training and competing. Humanistic understandings and practices related to fun-holism, athlete-centrism, and athlete development are marginalized and trivialized, or as my interviews also showed, actually made subservient and instrumentalized in support of dominant scientific and performance discourses of varsity sport.

The strategic role of humanistic fun in upholding dominant coaching and sporting discourses and power relations is something which I had already anticipated through my discourse analysis of key coaching texts (NCCP one, two, three, 2012; LTAD, 2012). Indeed, it had revealed that despite being framed as two separate vastly different coaching and sporting models, the performance coaching model and the positive athlete development model are actually very similar from a discursive standpoint. This finding had pushed me to question the positive sport psychology and pedagogy models abilities to effect change within the discursive formation and power relations of varsity sport, something which my interviews with varsity coaches confirmed. This was most evident in the ways that fun/flow and fun/holism did not actually change or help to problematize dominant performance scientific coaching and sporting

156

practices in varsity sport (e.g., periodization, monitoring of athletes, athlete training logs, repetitive and monotonous skill practices) or their disciplinary effects (e.g., athlete docility). In addition, this finding also made me suspect that the ongoing reproduction of a dichotomous understanding of the performance model, and of the positive youth development sporting model as separate might rather be a strategic effect of power. This was also confirmed through my interviews, which revealed the strategic role of fun in upholding this binary construction, which not only gives the 'illusion of choice', but also gives the 'illusion of change' that coaching practices have been positively influenced and changed through this increasingly popular 'alternate' positive sport psychology and pedagogy humanistic coaching and sporting model outlined in the governmentally endorsed LTAD. Fun also plays a strategic role in enabling coaches to just keep coaching the way they have always coached without seriously interrogating or looking to change their coaching practices. In that sense, fun serves to reify dominant coaching and sporting practices and maintain the power status quo.

My findings support the work of feminist Foucauldian scholars (Hopkins et al., 2009), who problematized both the positive sport psychology model of fun and the pleasure movement pedagogical model by drawing attention to how discourses of emotional expressivity are strategically deployed in support of a dominant scientific and instrumental logic in performance sport. Foucault (1983) crystallized this relationship between humanistic and scientific discourses when he argued that "modern power masks itself by producing a discourse, seemingly opposed to it but really part of a larger deployment of power" (p. 130). My findings also support Hopkins et al.'s (2009) argument for the need for a theoretical framework, which highlights the dynamic interplay between the rationalist and the romantic expressive aspects of modernization, as well as their call for more studies which purport to show how emotions are caught up within a modern

neoliberal discourse of individual optimization. As Lauss and Szigetvari (2010) argued 'fun' is indeed "the core question to answer for those who govern within such a political framework" (p. 738).

Additionally, my interviews provided valuable information in terms of two other main questions that emerged out of my discourse analysis. First, they enabled me to develop a better understanding of how coaches actively negotiate and seek to overcome some of the tensions and contradictions related to different coaching theories and the related understandings of fun and whether they even perceived these as sources of struggle and tension. Second, my interviews also enabled me to better understand some of the specific coaching and sporting practices related to fun, which have been produced as a result of these tensions and contradictions, within varsity sporting contexts. In what follows I specifically elaborate on what the varsity coaches in my sample called learned fun.

Developmental/Learned Fun

Most interestingly, the combination and privileging of a dichotomous understanding of fun versus hard work and of the modernist imperative of sport as fun is instrumental in terms of the production of another type of 'fun' intimately connected to being an effective coach and to the serious hard work of becoming a successful varsity athlete. This second privileged type of fun I called the developed and developmental fun in my interview chapter and the varsity coaches called the 'learned' fun of varsity sport. The production of this developmental and developed/learned fun is connected to specific and strategic varsity coaching and sporting practices and is instrumental in the reproduction of dominant scientific and competitive coaching and sporting discourses.

Furthermore, the naturalization of some of these dominant scientific and 'effective' disciplinary practices and their effects through learned fun is problematic from an ethical standpoint because it reproduces unbalanced power relationships between coaches and athletes. It is also problematic in terms of athlete performance and skill development and of coaching effectiveness and innovation (Denison, 2010b; Denison & Avner, 2011; Denison et al. 2013). Indeed, as we articulated in our paper (Denison & Avner, 2011), ethical coaching and coaching effectiveness are not two mutually exclusive discrete discursive domains, nor should they be understood and practiced as such. In fact, their present discursive articulation as two separate domains is very counterproductive in terms of coaching effectiveness and innovation, and precisely one of the main road blocks to the development of the coaching profession at large as a "respected profession worthy of deep and intellectual thought" (Denison & Avner, 2011, p. 209). As Denison et al. (2013) further articulated: "effective coaching is defined in line with the principles of discipline and docility that ironically can run counter to athlete development as the individual attainment of an 'exquisite performance' (Shogan, 1999)" (p. 392).

To elaborate on the above argument, my interviews showed how developmental fun is strategically deployed to give athletes a sense of freedom and autonomy, as well as a sense of ownership and control over their training and their sporting practice. The development of autonomous, independent, and critically reflective athletes is something which is, as both my review of literature (Becker, 2009; Kidman, 2005; Mageau & Vallerand, 2003; Nelson, et al. 2012) and discourse analysis showed (LTAD, 2012), highly valued 'in theory' and tied to increasingly popular theories of 'positive coaching' and 'true sport for lifelong physical activity'. However, as my interviews showed, this more holistic understanding of athlete development is marginalized and instrumentalized in the context of varsity sport where it is largely only taken

seriously insofar as it is positively related to positive coach-athlete relationships and to performance and success. As a result, the 'ownership', 'freedom', and 'autonomy' of athletes is tightly circumscribed and largely promoted through activities outside of training and competing. Furthermore, these activities to promote athlete 'ownership' are disconnected from 'effective' training and competing practices, which remain unproblematic and unchanged. One example of this was the development of athlete leadership through taking responsibility for the planning and organizing of fun team bonding activities outside of training and competing. This gives athletes the 'illusion' of control over their training when in reality they would never be given responsibility over a more 'serious' aspect of training related to 'effective training'. My findings, thus, demonstrated that fun plays an instrumental role in naturalizing effective scientific varsity training and competing practices and in de-problematizing their various problematic disciplinary effects (e.g., athlete docility, privileging of a narrow mechanistic understanding of the body and performance, narrow understanding of the self and others, athlete underperformance). They also demonstrated that fun is key in manufacturing a tightly circumscribed and regulated varsity athlete freedom and ownership, which itself supports the reproduction of dominant scientific performance discourses and unbalanced power relations between coaches and athletes in varsity sporting contexts.

The role of developmental/learned fun in the reproduction of dominant discourses and power relations speaks to Foucault's (1994) critique of the humanistic notion of 'autonomy' and of the assumed idea of an autonomous pre-existing subject holding power. Foucault saw such an assumption as very problematic and constraining. His critique stemmed from an understanding of power as relational and of the subject as being produced in and through relations of power. In that sense, 'power' and 'freedom' do not cancel each other out. A subject can only exercise

his/her freedom in and through power relations and reciprocally a power relation can only exist between free subjects: "power is exercised only over free subjects and insofar as they are free" (p. 139). His critique of autonomy was part of a larger critique of modern techniques of individualization and of humanistic identity rights based movements:

> On the one hand, they assert the right to be different and underline everything that makes individuals truly individual. On the other hand, they attack everything that separates the individual, breaks his links with others, splits up community life, forces the individual back on himself, and ties him to his own identity in a constraining way. (p. 129)

Similarly, the production of fun/autonomy in varsity sport 'championed' by positive sport psychology coaching models is also related to modern techniques of individualization and tied to problematic processes of discipline and normalization. Additionally, as my discourse analysis and interviews showed, varsity athletes' identities are constructed through these dominant individualizing discourses. My interviews demonstrated that the 'learning' of varsity fun actively supports the ongoing reproduction of varsity athletes' identities: a good varsity athlete (and teammate) is obedient, self-sacrificing, hard-working, and mentally tough. Fostering these qualities/attributes does not encourage athlete ownership and ongoing critical reflection, or change within varsity coaching and sporting discourses. Following Foucault (1994), this understanding ties the athletes to a particular identity in a constraining way by underlining specific aspects that makes an athlete truly a successful athlete. These findings echo the work of critical feminist scholar (Ahmed, 2004) and of sport scholars (Pringle, 2000, 2009, 2010; Tinning, 1997), who highlighted the intricate relationship between normative pleasures, discourses, and regimes of truth in the ongoing production of the normative, socially sanctioned, and desirable self. Ahmed (2004) also emphasized the productive aspects of normative pleasures

indicating how people often become attached to the very conditions of their subordination through these. This was confirmed through my interviews with coaches who showed how athletes' sense of self-worth is secured through normative practices of being a good teammate and athlete and how they take pleasure in it. I do not doubt that the athletes might 'genuinely' take pleasure in organizing and taking part in scavenger hunts. The issue is not whether the athletes' fun, enjoyment, or pleasure is real. The issue is that this normative fun/pleasure helps trivialize other form of fun/pleasure/enjoyment tied to the experience of flow, for example, or tied to being able to actively and critically participate in the planning and implementation of their own 'development' as athletes, actual training, and competing practices. It could be argued that is not necessary for athletes to have control and ownership over their training and that coaches' experiences and knowledge make it only right that they control the training plan. Here it is important to note that Foucault (1986) did not reject the importance of pedagogical relationships. Nor did he negate the fact that teachers have valuable knowledge/expertise to share with their students. Foucault was concerned that teachers use their knowledge/expertise ethically (i.e., with minimal domination):

> I don't believe that there can be a society without power relations, if you understand them as a means by which individuals try to conduct and determine the behavior of others. The problem is not trying to dissolve them in the utopia of a perfectly transparent communication, but to give one's self the rules of law, the techniques of management, and also the ethics, the *ethos*, the practice of self, which would allow these games of power to be played with a minimum of domination. (Foucault, 1987, p. 18)

While coaches should be concerned with using their knowledge ethically to minimize unbalanced power relationships, they should also be concerned with it from an effectiveness

standpoint. Indeed, as Denison and Avner (2011) discussed, unethical pedagogical power relationships (i.e., coach-athlete relationships in which coaches do not work to minimize power unbalances and use disciplinary techniques uncritically to produce docile bodies) can have very problematic effects ranging from athlete under-performance to athlete early retirement. As such, a concern for the development of more ethical and effective coaching and training practices should push coaches to take the trivialization and marginalization of other forms of athlete fun/enjoyment tied to flow, holism, and control/ownership over training and competing seriously.

Pringle (2009) drew similar conclusions in his examination of rugby pleasures in New Zealand, highlighting how most rugby players remain wedded to a strictly positive view of high-performance sport, and rugby in particular, despite having had ambivalent personal sporting experiences. According to Foucault (1978, 2006a), one of the most pernicious aspects of modern disciplinary-regulatory power mechanisms is how they work to individualize and bind people to their own identities through self-knowledge. Denison et al. (2013) similarly argued that sporting discipline is attractive to athletes precisely because it is not simply 'negative' or 'repressive'. Rather, discipline is productive: "it rewards, providing awards for attaining higher ranks and places-another form of punishment that operates in reverse" (pp. 395-396). This makes disciplinary-regulatory power mechanisms more difficult to problematize. Sporting discipline is so effective precisely because it is compelling to athletes: it carries forms of pleasure, which help obscure its problematic effects and the ways individuals are subjected through it. These conclusions also speak directly to Foucault's (1983) assertion that "people know what they do; they frequently know why they do what they do; but what they don't know is what what they do

does" (p. 187; emphasis added). In what follows I elaborate on how fun operates through gendered discourses to construct varsity athletes' identities.

The Gendering of Fun

As discussed in my interview chapter, fun was also instrumental in the 'gendering' and gendered production of the good varsity teammate and athlete. As such, it can be argued that sporting fun is key in the ongoing reproduction of dominant gendered sporting and wider societal discourses and gendered power relations. My findings support the work of feminist scholars (e.g., Ahmed, 2004; Cruikshank, 1993; Fraser & Greco, 2005; Hopkins et al., 2009; Ramazanoglu, 1993) who emphasized the role that pleasures and emotions have historically played in the reproduction of dominant power relations and social and gendered inequalities. More specifically, my interview data, although limited, did point to how the production of fun and of the good varsity athlete and teammate through fun might help to naturalize dominant norms of masculinity: mentally and physically tough, naturally enjoying heavy contact and rugged physicality, naturally goal oriented and risk taking, single minded and driven, and naturally predisposed to enjoy and excel in competitive settings (Laurendeau, 2008; Messner, 1990; Pringle, 2009; Pringle & Markula, 2005). Furthermore, it could also be argued that these norms of masculinity connected to fun both overtly and tacitly reify norms of femininity which are constructed through these as their dichotomous opposite: naturally less competitive and goal oriented, naturally more process and relationship oriented, and naturally enjoying sporting settings which privilege the latter. These normative constructions of masculinity and femininity through fun were most evident in my interviews with coaches who coached both male and female athletes. One could argue that the gendering and ongoing gendered production of 'learned' fun is, thus, important to the reproduction of dominant relations and gendered

discourses both within sport and wider society. In the final section of my conclusion I discuss the implication of my study for the development of more ethical and effective coaching and sporting practices related to fun.

Implications for the Development of Positive Varsity Coaching Practices related to Fun

The recommendations which I outline below are based on my study's findings but also on my theoretical framework and more precisely on Deleuze's (1988) elaboration on Foucault's theorization of the power/knowledge nexus. Deleuze reinforced Foucault's idea of mutually productive and co-dependent relationship between power relations and the production of knowledge:

> If knowledge consists of linking the visible and the articulable, power is its presupposed cause; but conversely power implies knowledge as the bifurcation or differentiation without which power would not become an act: "There is no power relation without the correlative constitution of a field of knowledge that does not pre-suppose and constitute at the same time power relations". (p. 33)

As previously discussed in my theoretical chapter, Foucault was a staunch anti-humanist, and developed his genealogical method to show the historical contingency of knowledge and its deep connection to power relations in order to liberate thought from the double bind of individualizing knowledges and individualizing power relations within modern society. He was profoundly critical of the ways individual subjectivities are presently narrowly shaped within the boundaries of modern scientific and humanistic discourses. He was particularly critical of psychoanalysis and of the ways in which 'psy-discourses' work to individualize and bind people to their own identities through self-knowledge. The objective of his work was to disrupt these individualizing knowledges and their effects.

One of the biggest obstacles to the development of more effective, ethical, and innovative coaching practices in varsity sport are longstanding, romantic ideas about sport being apolitical or that sport should be devoid of politics (Mastrich, 2002; Rintala, 2009). These ideas are often perpetuated by humanistic movements like the positive sport psychology model for youth sport (e.g., Thompson, 1999, 2003). Foucault (1983) similarly emphasized the allure of humanistic social science models and movements when he argued:

> We offer ourselves the opportunity to speak out against the powers that be, to utter truths and promise bliss, to link together enlightenment, liberation and manifold pleasures; to pronounce a discourse that combines the fervour of knowledge, the determination to change the laws, and the longing for the garden of earthly delights. Who could resist?
>
> p. 129)

Furthermore, as my interview results showed, there is a narrow and mutually supportive relationship between humanistic, scientific, and competitive discourses. More precisely, humanistic discourses often serve to reinforce and de-problematize dominant scientific and competitive discourses in varsity sporting contexts. This was most evident in the ways fun was strategically produced to reinforce humanistic notions of the good teammate and athlete, itself strategically produced to reify dominant scientific and competitive discourses in varsity sport. For example, fun was strategically produced to reinforce the notion that a good teammate and athlete enjoys competition, rugged physicality, and pushing through pain and adversity. Fun was also strategically produced to reinforce the notion that a good teammate and athlete enjoys working to build the program and being actively involved in the recruitment of other players. These uses of fun are good examples of Foucault's (1979) concept of 'docility-utility'. Indeed, these disciplinary and normalizing uses of fun are 'productive' and 'useful' as they are connected

to the production of a varsity athlete identity in support of individual and team performance. However, as Foucault (1979) also showed, while disciplinary and normalizing practices are useful, they can also be problematic and produce docile bodies. Similarly, disciplinary and normalizing practices related to fun while useful and productive, can also produce docile athletes and run counter to both athlete development and athlete performance in varsity sporting contexts. Indeed, the disciplinary and normalizing sporting and coaching practices related to fun limit coaches' and athletes' ability to think critically about dominant sporting and coaching practices which might not be working for them and, thus, limit their ability to experiment with other training approaches. Moreover, disciplinary practices limit the ways that athletes can experience their bodies, training, competing, and also the ways they relate to others.

Positive Uses of Fun

The first step towards positively affecting the discursive formation and power relations of varsity sport is to develop key critical tools and frameworks to re-politicize fun and the production of coaching knowledge at large. A Foucauldian politics and ethics starts with a critical investigation of how 'fun' is tied up with relations of production in order "radically democratize the experience, expression and possibility for a political engagement" (Ruddick. 2010, p. 40). Without the development of such critical tools and their integration within formal coach education, varsity coaches will continue to, albeit often unknowingly, perpetuate detrimental coaching and sporting practices through fun. Fun will continue to sustain the ongoing reproduction of dominant scientific and humanistic discourses and their various problematic effects (e.g., athlete docility, narrow mechanistic understanding of the body and of training and performance, narrow essentialist understandings of the self and others, coaching ineffectiveness, athlete underperformance) and unbalanced power relations between coaches and athletes and

amongst athletes within varsity sporting contexts. As my interview results showed, by maintaining the status quo, fun will also continue to impede the development of truly innovative, ethical, and effective coaching practices within varsity sport by enabling coaches to keep coaching the way they have always coached while believing they are coaching differently.

However, what is important to note is that the development of more effective and ethical coaching and sporting practices in varsity sport does not entail a rejection of the dominant competitive scientific discourse. Indeed, as feminist and queer theorists like Ahmed (2004) and Hopkins et al.'s (2009) argued, the construction of a new ethics has little to do with rejecting a problematic model in order to adopt a different model of truth. Rather, it has to do with the ongoing critical task of a problematization of thought itself. Pringle (2010) similarly argued against the reduction of ethical coaching to the promotion of body movement pleasures in lieu of the scientific performance based model. Following his argument, fun or emotions such as joy and happiness are not *essentially* superior to other emotions or sporting experiences nor should they be pursued as political and moral ends in themselves (e.g., politics of happiness, positive sport psychology models). Rather, the worth of sporting emotions, sporting experiences, and coaching and sporting knowledges lies in how they impact us in an ongoing self-constituting process of becoming and in how they help or hinder our capacity to continually affect and be affected.

Denison et al. (2013) showed that the various disciplinary techniques in varsity sport should not be discarded but should be continuously problematized by coaches for their various effects on their athletes. Indeed, a Foucauldian ethic would not call for the simple substitution of fun/flow and fun/holism in lieu of the problematic instrumentalized fun tied to the reproduction of narrow essentializing norms of the good teammate and varsity athlete evidenced through my study. Foucault argued,

We must not imagine a world of discourses divided between accepted discourses and excluded discourses, or between the dominant discourse and the dominated one; but as a multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies. (Markula & Pringle, 2006, p. 215)

A Manichean and dichotomous understanding of 'accepted' and 'excluded' discourses was precisely one of the main problems with previous humanistic efforts to 'revolutionize' present coaching and sporting practices in performance sport (e.g., positive sport psychology and pedagogy model or pleasure movement model). Furthermore, humanistic coaching models do not actually lead to coaching and sporting practices which help coaches and athletes situate their knowledges and practices within the present, evolving power/knowledge nexus of competitive sport. Nor do they help coaches to continuously critically interrogate their role as coaches in the power relations of competitive sport. As a result, humanistic concepts such as holistic athlete development or fun end up being co-opted and commodified. More precisely, as my study showed, holism and fun end up being actively produced in support of the present unbalanced power relations between coaches and athletes and in support of dominant scientific and performance discourses. For example, my interviews showed how fun is tied to the reproduction of narrow and disciplinary essentializing norms of the good varsity athlete and teammate as obedient, uncritical, and able to 'happily' enjoy all aspects of varsity sport training and competing discipline. These findings support Cassidy's (2008) critical review of 'holistic coaching'. She drew on the work of Denison (2010) to argue that "coaches and coach educators need to acknowledge how power relations have influenced their taken-for-granted assumptions about how to coach and how to educate coaches, respectively". Without such an acknowledgement, "it will be difficult to identify alternatives to challenge the many dominant

discourses that surround sport and coaching and subsequently advance the practice of coaching"
(p. 181).

Positive Coaching Practices

Therefore, in order to promote more ethical, effective, and innovative coaching and
sporting practices within the current power relations of varsity sport, I argue for two
developments: first, coaching frameworks should promote a re-politicization of coaching and
sporting knowledges and practices in order to help coaches and athletes develop tools to
continuously and critically interrogate these knowledges and practices and their various effects
(Denison et al. 2013; Markula & Pringle, 2006). Second, these critical political coaching
frameworks need to be incorporated within formal coaching education programs and lead to
actual coaching and sporting practices. Based on my findings, I suggest that ethical coach
education programs should integrate the following questions in their curricula:

1) How is fun understood and practiced in varsity coaching and training?

2) What coaching and sporting knowledges have shaped a coach's understanding and
   practices related to fun in varsity sport?

3) What understandings of the body, training, and performance are promoted through
   coaching practices related to fun?

4) What understandings of the self and others are promoted through coaching practices
   related to fun?

5) How might this be problematic?

6) In what ways does coaches' understanding and use of fun within varsity coaching and
   sporting practices enable/hinder athletes' capacities to continually affect and be
   affected?

7) How does fun enable/hinder the capacity to continually affect and be affected as a coach?

8) How does fun enable/hinder the capacity to problematize coaching practices, and as a consequence implement "real" changes and innovate within my coaching practices?

9) What coaching and sporting knowledges and understandings of the body and of training are obscured or marginalized as a result of the understanding and use of fun in relation to effective coaching?

10) What understandings of the self and others and relationships are obscured and marginalized as a result of the understanding and use of fun in relation to effective coaching?

11) What sporting pleasures are obscured/ marginalized as a result of the understanding and use of fun in relation to effective coaching?

Integrating such critical questions related to fun within coach education frameworks would, however, require that coach educators begin to be trained in Foucauldian thought in order to know how to help coaches apply his theoretical tools within their coaching practices. This would also imply making changes to national coach development curricula, which is presently almost exclusively informed by the sport sciences (e.g., NCCP one, two, three). These critical questions related to fun fit within Foucault's project of liberating thought from the double bind of individualizing knowledges and individualizing power relations. They also point to the need to redefine effective coaching not as a state to be reached, a set of coaching accolades and results, or a set of coaching knowledges to master and implement, but rather as an ongoing process of becoming and a critical engagement with the politics of truth within coaching and sporting contexts. Reframing the production of coaching knowledge as a game of truth allows for greater

ethical transformative possibilities both for the subjects of knowledge (the coaches and the athletes) and the object of knowledge (sport coaching). This work of 'fictionalization' (Foucault, 1983) could open up an important ethical discursive space to think ourselves otherwise. As Winterson put it:

> If we can fictionalise ourselves, and consciously, we are freed into a new kind of communication. It is abstract, light, changeful, genuine. It is what Wordsworth called 'the real solid world of images'. It may be that to understand ourselves as fictions is to understand ourselves as fully as we can." (1996, p. 60)

In summary, my findings demonstrated that tacit coaching knowledge often leads to the unproblematic reproduction of dominant scientific and competitive coaching and sporting practices and unbalanced power relations between coaches and athletes within varsity sporting contexts. For example, the making tacit of fun or holism as a separate coaching knowledge (which cannot be taught) trivializes fun or holistic development and, thus, retains the 'coaching as the way coaches have always coached'. Thus, the production of fun and holism as a tacit knowledge hinders coaches' abilities to think critically about their effect of their practices and to develop more effective and ethical coaching and sporting practices. As a result, tacit fun is also linked to the unproblematic reproduction of narrow essentializing norms of the good athlete and teammate and to the potential continued production of docile bodies. Denison et al. (2013) crystallized the relationship between tacit coaching and sporting knowledge and disciplinary-regulatory power and its various problematic effects in the following quote: "athletes continuously subject themselves to someone else's idea of 'normal'. Such power, because it functions 'largely in silence', does not need coercion or force to fulfill its need of surveillance and control and the making of docility" (p. 395). This form of disciplinary-regulatory power

which tacit fun sustains is problematic because it reifies unbalanced power relations between coaches and athletes and amongst athletes in varsity sporting contexts and because it can lead to athlete underperformance, coaching ineffectiveness, stifle coaching innovation, and hinder the development of the coaching profession at large (Denison et al., 2013).

Consequently, taking fun as a starting point for fictionalizing ourselves and our sporting and coaching practices is paramount if we are to move towards more ethical and effective coaching and sporting practices within varsity sporting contexts. This work of fictionalization could start with one of the limitations of this study: its heavier focus on the articulable forms of fun (i.e., the knowledges of fun) and on the ways that varsity coaches articulated their practices related to fun rather than on the visible forms of fun (i.e., of coaching practices related to fun) (Deleuze, 1988). A future research project on the strategic deployment of fun in competitive sport could use observation or participant observation to gain a more complex and specific understanding of coaching practices related to fun but also importantly of how these affect varsity athletes. Such a study could then inform the design of Foucauldian based pedagogical coaching frameworks and interventions to help varsity coaches to continuously question their coaching practices related to fun and change these as a result. Another line of research, which my study did not explore, would be to examine the role of sporting fun in the spread of biopower (Foucault, 2009) and in the overall control and management of populations through discourses of health and well-being and lifelong sport participation (e.g., LTAD, 2012). Such a study would also considerably enrich our understanding of the multiple and strategic uses of fun as a biopolitical technology and help sport scholars to problematize its various disciplinary and regulatory effects within various sporting and coaching contexts.

References

Ahmed, S. (2004). *The cultural politics of emotion.* Edingburgh: Edingburgh University Press.

Allen, J. B. (2003). Social motivation in youth sport. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 25*, 551-567.

Anderman, L.H., & Anderman, E.M. (1999). Social predictors of changes in students' achievement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25,* 21-37.

Andrews, D.L. (2006). *The pleasure principle: Sport for the sake of pleasure.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

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

Barker-Ruchti, N., & Tinning, R. (2010). Foucault in leotards: Corporeal discipline in Women's Artistic Gymnastics. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 27*(3), 229-250.

Becker, A.J. (2009). It's not what they do; it's how they do it: Athlete experiences of great coaching. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching, 4*(1), 93-119.

Bell-Laroche, D. (2012). Maximizing the sport experience for our children. Retrieved from the Canadian Sport for Life website (CS4L) at www.canadiansportforlife.ca/resources/Coaches

Bengoechea, E.G., Strean, W., & Williams, D.J. (2004). Understanding and promoting fun in youth sport: Coaches' Perspectives. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy, 9*(2), 197-214.

Bernauer, J., & Rasmussen, D. (1991). *The final Foucault.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Bigelow, B., Moroney, T., & Hall, L. (2001). *Just let the kids play: How to stop adults from ruining your child's fun and success in youth sports.* U.S.A.: Health Communications, Inc.

Bonita, G. (2010). Are we having fun yet? Children's adult-organized recreational basketball as a site of discipline. *Ethnologies, 32*(1), 133-156.

174

Booth, D. (2009). Politics and pleasure: The philosophy of physical education revisited, *Quest, 61,* 133-153.

Cahill, B.R., & Pearl, A.J. (1993). *Intensive participation in children's sports.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Caillois, R. (1961). *Man, play and games.* New York: MacMillan.

Calder, A. (2012). Recovery and regeneration for long-term athlete development. Retrieved from the Canadian Sport for Life (CS4L) website at www.canadiansportforlife.ca/resources/Coaches.

Canadian Sport for Life (C4SL). (2012). www.canadiansportforlife.ca/coaches.

Cassidy, T. (2010). Holism in sports coaching: Beyond Humanistic sport psychology. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, *5*(4), 439-443.

Cassidy, T.J., Jones, R.L., & Potrac, P. (2008). *Understanding sports coaching: The social, cultural, & pedagogical foundations of coaching practice.* London, UK: Routledge.

Clifford, C., & Feezell, R.M. (2010). *Sport and character: Reclaiming the principles of sportsmanship.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Coakley, J. (1992). Burnout among adolescent athletes: a personal failure or social problem? Sociology of Sport Journal, *9*(3), 271-285.

Cohn, P.J. (1990). An exploratory study on sources of stress and athlete burnout in youth golf. *The Sport Psychologist*, *4*(2), 95-106.

Côté J., & Gilbert, W. (2009). An integrative definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise. *International Journal of Sport Sciences & Coaching, 4*(3), 307-325.

Cruikshank, B. (1993). Revolutions within: Self-government and self-esteem. *Economy & Society, 22*(3), 327-344.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1998). *Optimal experience: Psychological studies of flow in consciousness.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cushion, C.J., Armour, K.M., & Jones, R.L. (2003). Coach education and continuing professional development: Experience and learning to coach. *Quest, 5*(3), 215-230.

Davidson, A.I. (2001). *The emergence of sexuality.* London, England: Harvard University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1988). *Foucault.* London: Continuum.

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

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

Denison, J. (2010b). "Messy texts" or the unexplainable performance. *International Review of Qualitative Research, 3*(1), 149-160.

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

Denzin, N. (1989). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological method.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Dreyfus, H.L., & Rabinow, P. (1983). *Michel Foucault: Beyond structuralism and hermeneutics.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Duda, J.L., & Nicholls, J. (1992). Dimensions of achievement motivation in schoolwork and sport. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(3)*,* 290-299.

Dworkin, S.L., & Wachs, F.L. (2009). *Body panic: Gender, health, and the selling of fitness.* New York: New York University Press.

Fraser, M., & Greco, M. (2005). *The body: A reader.* London: Routledge.

Feldman, N., & Cakebread, C. (2004). Good coach or good leader? Qualities are needed that will motivate players to do their best. *Soccer Journal, 49*(2), 29-31.

Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge and discourse on language.* New York: Pantheon Books. (Chapters, 2,3,4,5).

Foucault, M. (1973). *The birth of the clinic: An archaeology of medical perception.* New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1978). *The history of sexuality, vol. 1: An introduction.* New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline & punish: The birth of the prison.* New York: Vintage Books.

Foucault, M. (1986). *The History of sexuality, vol. 3: The care of the self.* New York: Pantheon.

Foucault, M. (1987). The ethics of care of the self as a practice of freedom. In J. Bernauer and D. Rasmussen (Eds), *the final Foucault.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality, vol. 2: The use of pleasure.* London, UK: Penguin Books.

Foucault, M. (1994). The subject and power. In P. Rabinow and N. Rose (Eds), *the essential Foucault, selections from the essential works of Foucault 1954-1984* (pp. 127-144). New York: New York Press.

Foucault, M. (2003a). *Abnormal: Lectures at the Collège de France (1974-1975).* New York: Picador.

Foucault, M. (2003b). *Society must be defended: Lectures at the Collège de France (1975-1976).* New York: Picador.

Foucault, M. (2006a). *Psychiatric power: Lectures at the Collège de France (1973-1974).* New York: Picador.

Foucault, M. (2006b). *History of Madness.* London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (2009). *Security, territory, population: Lectures at the Collège de France (1977-1978).* London: Palgrave MacMillan.

Gard, M., & Meyenn, R. (2000). Boys, bodies, pleasure and pain: Interrogating contact sport in schools. *Sport, Education, and Society, 5*(1), 19-34.

Gard, M., & Wright, J. (2001). Managing uncertainty: Obesity discourses and physical education in a risk society. *Studies in Philosophy and Education, 20*, 535-549.

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

Guba, E., & Lincoln, Y. (1982). Epistemological and methodological bases of naturalistic inquiry. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal, 30*, 233-252.

Griffin, L. L., Chandler, T. J. L., & Sariscsany, M. J. (1993). What does fun mean in physical education? *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, 64.*

Harter, S. (1978). Effective motivation reconsidered: Toward a developmental model. *Human Development, 21,* 34-64.

Hawkins, A. (2008). Pragmatism, purpose and play: Struggle for the soul of physical education. *Quest, 60,* 345-356.

Headley-Cooper, K.J. (2010). Coaches' Perspectives on Athlete-Centred Coaching. Master of Science, University of Toronto.

Heikkala, J. (1993). Discipline and excel: Techniques of the self and body and the logic of competing. *Sociology of Sport Journal, 10,* 397-412.

Hohepa, M., Schofield, G., & Kolt, G. S. (2006). Physical activity: What do high school students think? *Journal of Adolescent Health, 39*(3), 328-336.

Hopkins, D., Klenes, J., Flam, H., & Kuzmics, H. (Eds). (2009). *Theorizing emotions:*

Sociological explorations and applications. Frankfuhrt, Germany: Campus Verlag.

Hughes, F.P. (1999). *Children, play, and development.* (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Huizinga, J. (1950). *Homo Ludens.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Hyman, M. (2009). *Until it hurts: America's obsession with youth sports and how it harms our kids.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Jackson, S.A. (1996). Toward a conceptual understanding of the flow experience in elite athletes. *Research Quaterly for Exercise and Sport, 67*(1), 76-90.

Jackson, S.A. (2000). *Emotions in Sport.* Australia: Human Kinetics.

Jackson, S.A., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). *Flow in sports: The keys to optimal experiences and performances.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers.

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

Katz, J. (1983). A theory of qualitative methodology: The social system of analytic fieldwork. In R.E. Emerson (Ed.), *Contemporary field research: A collection of readings.* Boston, MA: Little, Brown & Co.

Kavussanu, M., Boardley, I.D., Jutkiewicz, N., Vincent, S., & Ring, C. (2008). Coaching efficacy and coaching effectiveness: Examining their predictors and comparing coaches' and athletes' reports. *The Sport Psychologist, 22,* 383-404.

Kemper, T.D. (1990). *Research agendas in the sociology of emotions.* Albany, New York: SUNY press.

Kidman, L. (2005). *Athlete-centered coaching: Developing inspired and inspiring people.* Christchurch, N.Z.: Innovative Print Communications.

Kidman, L. (2007). Humanistic coaching – teaching games for understanding. In R. Light (Ed.),

Proceedings for the Asia Pacific Conference on Teaching Sport and Physical Education for

Understanding (pp. 59-71). Sydney, Australia: University of Sydney. Retrieved December

13, 2009 from http://www.proflearn.edsw.usyd.edu.au/resources/papers/Proceedings_

TGfU_06_AsiaPacificSport.pdf#page=59.

King, N., & Horrocks, C. (2010). *Interviews in qualitative research.* London: Sage.

Kirk, D. (2006). Sport education, critical pedagogy, and learning theory: Toward an intrinsic

justification for physical education and youth sport. *Quest, 58,* 255-264.

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *Interviews.* London: Sage.

Kretchmar, R.S. (1994). *Practical philosophy of sport.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Laurendeau, J. (2008). Gendered risk regimes: A theoretical consideration of edgework &

gender. *Sociology of Sport, 25*, 293-309.

Lauss, G., & Szigetvari. A. (2010). Governing by fun: EURO 2008 and the appealing power of

fan zones. *Soccer & Society, 11*(6), 737-748.

Liao, J., & Markula, P. (2009). Reading media texts in Women's sport: Critical discourse

analysis and Foucauldian discourse analysis. In P. Markula (Ed), *Olympic Women and the

media* (pp. 30-49). Basingstoke, England: Palgrave MacMillan.

Light, R. (2003). The joy of learning: Emotion and learning in games through TGfU. *Journal of

Physical Education, N.Z., 36*(1), 93-108.

Lloyd, R.J., & Smith, S.J. (2006). Interactive flow in exercise pedagogy. *Quest, 58,* 222-241.

Luthans, F. (2002). Positive organizational behavior: Developing and managing psychological

strengths. *Academy of Management, 16*(1), 57-72.

MacPhail, A., Gorely, T., Kirk, D., & Kinchin, G. (2008). Children's experiences of fun and

    enjoyment during a season of sport education. *Research Quaterly for Exercise & Sport,*

    79(3), 344-356.

Mageau. G.A., & Vallerand, R.J. (2003). The coach-athlete relationship: A motivational model.

    Journal of Sports Science, 21(11), 883-904.

Mandigo, J. L., & Couture, R. T. (1996). An overview of the component of fun in physical

    education, organized sport and physical activity programs. *Avante, 2*(3), 56-72.

Mastrich, J. (2002). *Really winning: Using sports to develop character and integrity in our boys.*

    New York: St Martins Press.

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

    (Ed), *Coaching knowledges: Understanding the dynamics of sport performance.* London:

    A&C 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.

Martens, R. (1987). *Coaches' guide to sport psychology.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Martens, R. (1990). *Successful coaching (2nd ed.).* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Martens, R. (2004). *Successful coaching (3rd ed.).* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

McCarthy, P.J., & Jones, M.V. (2007). A qualitative study of sport enjoyment in the sampling

    years. *The Sport Psychologist, 21*, 400-416.

McKay, J., Gore, J.M., & Kirk, D. (1990). Beyond the limits of technocratic physical education.

    Quest, 42(1), 52-76.

Messner, M. (1990). Boyhood, organized sports, and the construction of masculinities. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 18*(4), 416-444.

Miller, P.S. & Kerr, G.A. (2002). Conceptualizing excellence: Past, present, and future. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 14, 140-153.

Mishler, E. (1990). Validation in inquiry-guided research: The role of exemplars in narrative research. *Harvard Educational Review, 60*(4), 415-442.

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

Nelson, L., Cushion, C.J., Potrac, P., & Groom, R. (2012). Carl Rogers, learning and educational practice: Critical considerations and applications in Sports coaching. *Sport, Education, & Society,* ahead-of- print, 1-19.

Newton, M., & Duda, J. (1993). The relationship of task and ego orientation to performance cognitive content, affect and attributions in bowling. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 16*(4), 209-221.

Nicholls, J.G. (1984). Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice and performance. *Psychological Review, 91*(3)*, 328-346.

Ommundsen, Y., & Vaglum, P. (1991). Soccer competition anxiety and enjoyment in young boy players: The influence of perceived competence and significant others' emotional involvement. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 22*(1), 35-49.

Oslin, J. (2002). Sport education: Cautions, considerations, and celebrations. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 21,* 419-426.

Pellegrini, A.D., Dupuis, D., & Smith, P.K. (2007). Play in evolution and development. *Developmental Review, 27,* 261-276.

Peterson, C.M. & Seligman, M.E.P. (2003). Positive organizational studies: Lessons from

positive psychology. *Positive organizational scholarship,* 14-27.

Petlichkoff, L. M. (1992). Youth sport participation and withdrawal: Is it simply a matter of fun? *Journal of Pediatric Exercise Science, 4*(2), 105-110.

Pope, C. (2005). Once more with feeling: Affect and playing with the TGfU model. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 10*(3), 271-286.

Pringle, R. (2000). Physical education, positivism, and optimistic claims from achievement goal theorists. *Quest, 52,* 18-31.

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

Pringle, R. (2010). Finding pleasure in physical education: A critical examination of the educative value of positive movement affects. *Quest, 62,* 119-134.

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

Raedeke, T.D., & Smith, A.L. (2004). Coping Resources and Athlete Burnout: An Examination of Stress Mediated and Moderation Hypotheses. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *26*(4), 525-541.

Ramazanoglu, C. (1993). *Up against Foucault: Explorations of some tensions between Foucault and feminism*. London: Routledge.

Rapley, T. (2004). Interviews. In C. Seale, et al. (eds.), *Qualitative research practice.* London: Sage.

Rintala, J. (2009). It's all about the –ing. *Quest, 61,* 279-288.

Rojek, C. (1985). *Capitalism and leisure theory.* London: Tavistock Publications.

Ruddick, S. (2010). The politics of affect: Spinoza in the work of Negri and Deleuze. *Theory,*

Culture, and Society, 27, 21-45.

Scanlan, T. K., & Lethwaite, R. (1986). Social psychology aspects of competition for make

youth sport participants: IV predictors of enjoyment. *Journal of Sport Psychology, 8,* 25-35.

Shogan, D. (2007). *Sport ethics in context.* Toronto: Canadian Scholars' Press.

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

Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Siedentop, D. (1994). *Sport education: Quality P.E. through positive sport experiences.*

Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Small, E. (2002). *Kids & sports.* New York: New Market Press.

Smith-Maguire, J. (2008). Leisure and the obligation of self-work: An examination of the fitness

field. *Leisure Studies, 27*(1), 59-75.

Smith, R.E., & Smoll, F.L. (1997). Coaching the coaches: Youth sports as a scientific and

applied behavioural setting. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 6*(1), 16-21.

Smith, R.E., Smoll, F.L., & Cumming, S.P. (2007). Effects of a motivational climate intervention

for coaches on young athletes' sport performance anxiety. *Journal of Sport & Exercise*

Psychology, 29, 39-59.

Smoll, F.L., Cumming, S.P., & Smith, R.E. (2011). Enhancing coach-parent relationship in youth

sports: Increasing harmony and minimizing hassle. *International Journal of Sports Science*

and Coaching, 6(1), 13-28.

Smoll, F.L., Magill, R.A., & Ash, M.J. (1988). *Children in sport.* Champaign, IL: Human

Kinetics.

Smoll, F.L., & Smith, R.E. (1987). *Sport psychology for youth coaches.* Washington, D.C.:

National Federation for Catholic Youth Ministry.

Smoll, F.L., & Smith, R.E. (2006). Leadership behaviors in sport: A theoretical model and research paradigm. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19*(8), 1522-1551.

Strean, W.B. (2009). Remembering instructors: Play, pain and pedagogy. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 1*(3), 210-220.

Strean, W.B., & Holt, N.L. (2000). Coaches', athletes', and parents' perceptions of fun in youth sports: Assumptions about learning and implications for practice. *Avante-Ontario, 6*(3), 84-98.

Theberge, N. (1991). Reflections on the body in the sociology of sport. *Quest, 43*(2), 123-134.

Thompson, J. (1995). *Positive coaching: Building character and self-esteem through sports.* Portolla Valley, CA: Warde.

Thompson, J. (2003). *The double-goal coach: Positive coaching tools for honouring the game and developing winners in sports and life.* New York: Quill.

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

Tinning, R. (2002b). Towards a "modest pedagogy": Reflections in the problematic of critical pedagogy. *Quest, 54*(3), 224-240.

True Sport. http://www.truesportpur.ca. (2012). Retrieved from true sport.

Turman, P.D. (2003). Coaches and cohesion: The impact of coaching techniques on team cohesion in the small group setting. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 26*(1), 86-105.

Turner, J.H., & Stets, J.E. (2005). *The sociology of emotions.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Vealey, R.S. (2002). Future directions in psychological skills training. (pp. 295-304). In D. Smith & M. Bar-Eli (Eds.), *Readings in sport and exercise psychology*. Champaign, IL:

Human Kinetics.

Vella, S.A., Oades, L.G., & Crowe, T.P. (2010). The application of coach leadership models to coaching practice: Current state and future directions. *International Journal of Sport Sciences and Coaching, 5*(3), 425-436.

Vernacchia, R., McGuire, R., & Cook, D. (1992). *Coaching mental excellence.* U.S.A: Brown and Benchmark.

Wankel, L. M., & Sefton, J. M. (1989). A season-long investigation of fun in youth sports. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 11*(4), 355-366.

Wellard, I. (2002). Men, sport, body performance and the maintenance of 'exclusive masculinity'. *Leisure Studies, 21*(3-4), 235-247.

Wells, M.S., Arthur-Banning, S.G., Paisley, K., Ellis, G.D., Roark, M.F., & Fisher, K. (2008). Good (youth) sports: Using benefits-based programming to increase sportsmanship. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration, 26*(1), 1-21.

Winterson, J. (1996). *Art Objects.* London, UK: Vintage.

Wold, B., & Kannas, L. (1993/2007). Sport motivation among young adolescents in Finland, Norway & Sweden. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports, 3*(4), 283-291.

Wylleman, P. (2000). Interpersonal relationships in sport: Uncharted territory in sport psychology research. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 31,* 555-572.

Yukelson, D. (1997). Principles of effective team building interventions in sport: A direct services approach at Penn State University. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 9,* 73-96.

CAC Chart

Concepts	Concepts
Active	Play, lifelong, variety
Athletes	Confidence, active, shortcomings, potential, holistic, healthy, injury
Coach positive/relationships Leadership Management Expertise/branding	Passion, positive, interactive, surety, confidence, valuing, honour sport, respect athletes, responsible leader, motivator, facilitator problem-solving, critical-thinking, injury prevention and management, planning expert, in training, trained, certified, former athletes, competition, advanced, master, effective
Competition	Competition, performance, high-performance, national, international, win, train to compete, train to win, over-compete
Development	Optimal, skills, professional expert, fundamentals, movement, confidence, long-term, holistic
Fun	Children, fundamentals, play, free, active
Health	Individuals, safe, environment, physical, nutrition, diet, well-being
instruction/learning	Interactive, positive, fun, learning, relational, ongoing, fundamentals, empowers
Safe	Environment, certification, training, practice, physical and mental
Skills	Physical, mental, fundamentals, movement, sport-specific, development, technical, positive
Training	Planning, optimal, periodized, high-intensity, high-volume, variety, recovery and regeneration, athletes' needs, safe, fundamentals, under-training, winning, competition, specific, right time, right frequency, priorities

CS4L Chart

Concepts	Concepts	Concepts
athletes	Excellence	Recognized, identified, top performers, serious, world-class, consistent, excel, specialization, professional
	happiness/enjoyment	happiness, enjoy sport, love sport
	healthy	listen to body, look after body, healthy, well-rounded, retired, active, long-term
	stages of development	early, average, or late developers, transition, retired, specialization
	positive	give back, play-fair, positive behaviors, go for it
	issues/shortcomings	premature specialization, burnout, shortcomings
	independent	self-reliant, connecting, contributing, coordinating
coaches		Quality, retired athletes, certified, successful, role models, at play, at school, on the sidelines, long-term, development, in the office, mentors
competition/performance	Excellence	Sport, optimal, competition, international, performance, performers, elite, achievement, compete, excel, results, win, medals, podiums, maximize/maintain, Olympic, peak
	Enjoyment	Enjoy
	Physical and mental challenges	physical and mental challenges, stresses
	Planning/management	planning, recovery program, retirement, monitoring, evaluating, to training ratios
	Issues	adult-based, paradigms, costly, over-

		compete
development		Principles, optimal, holistic, peak height velocity, physical, mental, emotional, healthy, social, skills, full-genetic potential, LTAD, long-term, growth spurt, maturation, developmental/chronological age, coach career, pathway, successful-high quality coaches, performers, stage, retirement, transition into support roles
ethics		Fair-play, ethics, positive behaviours, principles, go for it, respect, have fun, healthy, give back, community, true sport
Fun		Fundamental movement skills, fun, children, exciting, variety, physical activity, challenging, enjoy, lifelong, learn, adult-based training programs, friends, true sport movement, recovery and regeneration, training session, happiness
health		True sport movement, children, full athletic potential, early burnout, one-sided development, health, fitness, all Canadians, eating, choices, diet, balanced, lifestyle, drug-use
Instruction/learning	Quality, best coaching practices	Quality
	Continuous	Ongoing, coach development
	Athlete-centred/positive/healthy	Needs of athletes, support, relationships, injury and burnout prevention
	Reflective/self-reflective	Reflect, self-evaluate
	Effective planning and management	monitor, manage, planning
	Time-sensitive	teachable/coachable moments
skills	Physical	Fundamentals, physical literacy, movement, sport-specific, flexibility, stamina, strength, ABC's, aerobic base, fitness, remedial, 5S's

	Mental	Mental skills, self-esteem, cope, mental challenges, burnout, emotional, psychological, relaxation strategies, stresses, sport psychology
Sport/physical-activity		Active, fun, daily, free, formal, challenging, lifelong, activities, children, enjoy, safe, unstructured, true sport, healthy, principles, quality, systemic alignment and integration, safe, nutrition, exciting, character building
Training	Athlete-centred	Athletes, athlete-centred, needs of athletes
	excellence	elite
	Time sensitive/trainability	Sensitive-periods of accelerated adaptation, right things at the right time, trainability
	Periodized	Periodization, training to competition ratio, loading, tapering, stage
	High-intensity and volume	Increased training hours, high-volume, high-intensity, 10,000 hours
	Issues	Under-train, fatigue, over-training
	Specific	Sport specific, specialization
	Scientific	ten key factors, scientific principles
	Monitored	diaries
	Recovery/health	recovery and regeneration

NCCP Chart

Concepts	Concepts	Concepts
athletes	Athlete-centred	Needs of participants
	Physical skills	Physical literacy
	Mental skills	Confident, concentration, focus, aware, control, relaxed, flow, positive self-talk, goal-setting
	Lifelong and well-rounded	Long-term development, mental/physical/emotional/social skills, well-rounded
	Healthy	Healthy, safe, injury, recovery
	Issues	one-sided, burnout, stress, fatigue
	successful	successful, athletic potential, win
coaches		Aware, multifaceted, teacher, leader, role model, motivator, effective, in training, trained, certified
Competition/performance		Recovery, star athletes, over-compete, sport clubs, elite, win, success, performance, competition, stress, fatigue, program, winning over process
development		Athlete, growth, maturation, chronological/developmental, long-term, mental/emotional/physical/social, males/females, capacities, potential, future star athletes
Fun		Fun, flow, happier, positive, learning, teaching, monitor, skills, fundamentals, fitness, coaching, competition, training, true sport, athletes
health		Healthy, confident, healthy environment, growth, nutrition, diet, lifestyle, expert, hydration
Instruction/learning	Physical skills	fundamentals, basic skills

	Skill analysis	skill analysis, detecting and correcting errors, analyze performance, demonstrate, observation
	Athlete-centred	athlete-centred
	Fun	fun
	Quality/branding	optimal, effective, best practices, national standards, certification, professionally
	Ethical	ethical
	Reflective	critical thinking, think
	Long-term	long-term
	Management	evaluate, decision-making, coaching strategies, management
	Leadership/relationships	athlete interaction, style, philosophy, feedback, professionally, behaviours, positive, listen, support, protect
skills	Physical skills	Technical, movement skills, fundamentals, physical, 5S's, physical literacy
	Mental skills	Focus/concentration, aware, relaxed, flow, positive self-talk, goal-setting, emotional control, mental skills, confident, simulation routines

Discourse analysis: Statements chart

Athletes	Successful athletes achieve their potential through physical and mental skill development and excel and win in competitions. Athletes are well rounded and lifelong participants in sport and physical activity who stay healthy and injury free by avoiding burnout and premature specialization and insuring that they recover properly from training and competitions.
Coaches	Quality coaches are retired athletes who have been trained and certified through the NCCP program and who continue to learn and develop as coaches. Effective/positive coaches are good role models, mentors and leaders. Effective coaches are good planners, managers, problem-solvers who reflect and self-evaluate, and who are good at analyzing skills and performance.
Competition/Performance	To perform is to win and achieve results and podiums in national and international competitions. Competition is stressful and induces physical and mental fatigue and must be carefully planned to insure athlete recovery.
Development	Optimal and healthy development for athletes is Long-term and holistic, focuses on fundamental skills, and follows the principles of growth and maturation.
Fun	Fun for children is developing fundamental movement and sport skills through varied and exciting and challenging activities and free play. Fun is a component of true sport and of positive learning and teaching and coaching and promotes lifelong physical activity. Fun for competitive athletes is reaching a state

	of flow and tied to optimal recovery and regeneration.
Health	Health is a component of true sport and tied to the holistic development of individual athletes. Health is having an optimal diet and nutrition and being physically fit and leading a balanced lifestyle Health for athletes is being safe, confident and injury free and having optimal recovery
Instruction/learning	Quality instruction/learning is positive, fun, long-term, athlete-centred, promotes optimal coach-athlete relationships and the acquisition of fundamental sport skills.
Skills	Physical skills are fundamental movement and sport skills and sport specific and technical Mental skills of focus/concentration/awareness, goal-setting and relaxation strategies help athletes achieve flow, cope with the challenges of training and competition, and develop self-esteem and confidence
Training	Optimal training is periodized, athlete-centred, high-intensity and high-volume, specific, time sensitive, supports performance, competition and winning, ensures optimal recovery and regeneration

Introduce myself (playing and coaching experience)/PhD research project/interest in fun and in the context of varsity sport as both a performance and educational institutional context

General questions: Coaching/sporting background

- How long have you been coaching the varsity team at the university?

- What is your sporting/playing background in the sport you coach?

In this interview I will be asking you specific questions related to what you do to promote fun in training, competition, and/or outside of it.

A. **Fun and athlete development and success**

1. How important is fun to success in varsity sport?

Why so?
2. How important is fun in terms of athlete development in varsity sport?

Why so?
3. Where did you learn about fun being important to success and or athlete development in varsity sport?

4. How do you know that athletes are having fun?

B. **Fun and training practices**

1. What are some ways of incorporating fun during training practices?

2. What are some ways of incorporating fun outside of training activities?

3. How do these "fun related" training practices and outside of training activities relate to specific goals of varsity sport (e.g. **success** and/or **athlete development/holistic development**)?

4. How do these "fun related" training practices and outside of training activities relate to different training foci (e.g. skill development, pre-competition preparation, post competition recovery, etc.)?

5. What are some things about varsity sport training which are not fun?

6. How can coaches motivate athletes to do these things that are not fun?

7. How does a focus on fun affect the delivery and content of these various training practices in varsity sport (If at all)?

C. **Fun and competitions**

1. What are some ways of incorporating fun during competitions to promote success in varsity sport?

2. How do these "fun related" competition practices relate to various desirable competition outcomes (e.g. pre-competition stress reduction, coping with poor competition results, overcoming performance "slumps"/plateaus, etc.)?

3. What are some obstacles or challenges to developing a fun coaching and sporting environment within the specific context of varsity sport? (E.g. injuries, playing time, etc.)

4. What are some ways of minimizing or overcoming some of these challenges and obstacles to fun tied to the demands and aims of varsity sport?

D. **Fun and coaching effectiveness**

1. How important is facilitating fun with players and amongst players to being an effective coach?

Why so?
2. How have you learned about fun being important to be an effective coach?

3. What are some ways of measuring and evaluating one's success as a coach in terms of developing a fun sporting and coaching environment?

4. To what extent and how is the facilitation of fun integrated within formal or informal coaching evaluation processes (if at all)?

Is there anything you would like to add related to any of the topics we discussed?
I would like to thank you very much for taking part in my research project related to fun and coaching.

Appendix C: Informed Consent Form

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA   Faculty of Physical Education and Recreation

E488 Van Vliet Centre
Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2H9

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Title of Project: Fun and Coaching in Varsity Sport

Principal Investigator: Zoe Avner,
Affiliation, email, phone number: PhD candidate
Physical Education and Recreation, University of Alberta
avner@ualberta.ca
780 504 2557

Doctoral Supervisors: Dr Pirkko Markula
Affiliation, email, phone number: Professor
Physical Education and Recreation, University of Alberta
pirkko.markula@ualberta.ca
780 492 7192
Dr James Denison
Associate Professor
Physical Education and Recreation, University of Alberta
jim.denison@ualberta.ca

Do you understand that you have been asked to be in a research study?	Yes	No
Have you read and received a copy of the attached Information Sheet	Yes	No
Do you understand the benefits and risks involved in taking part in this research study?	Yes	No
Have you had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss this study?	Yes	No
Do you understand that you are free to refuse to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time during the interview and up to three weeks after your interview, without consequence, and that your information will be withdrawn at your request?	Yes	No
Has the issue of confidentiality been explained to you? Do you understand who will have access to your information?	Yes	No

This study was explained to me by: _____

I have read and understood the attached information letter and agree to take part in this study:

_____   _____
Signature of Research Participant   Date

_____
Printed Name

I believe that the person signing this form understands what is involved in the study and voluntarily agrees to participate.

_____   _____
Signature of Investigator or Designee   Date

A COPY OF THIS DOCUMENT SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE PARTICIPANT.