Citation for published version:

Williams, S & Bush, A 2019, 'Connecting knowledge(s) to practice: A Bernsteinian theorisation of a collaborative coach learning community project', *Sport, Education and Society*, vol. 24, no. 4, pp. 375-389.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2017.1376638>

DOI:

[10.1080/13573322.2017.1376638](https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2017.1376638)

Publication date:

2019

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication](#)

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Sport, Education & Society* on 12/9/17, available online: <http://www.tandfonline.com/10.1080/13573322.2017.1376638>

University of Bath

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Dr. Shaun Peter Williams,
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Dept. for Health
University of Bath,
Bath,
BA2 7AY
s.williams3@bath.ac.uk
(01225)386565

Dr. Anthony James Bush
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences,
Dept. for Health
University of Bath,
Bath,
BA2 7AY
A.J.B.Bush@bath.ac.uk
(01225) 385717

Connecting knowledge(s) to practice: A Bernsteinian theorisation of a collaborative coach learning community project.

Abstract

Collaborative action learning was undertaken in response to the growing criticisms of formal coach education. Since it is strongly felt that we can no longer merely commentate on what is not happening in terms of coach learning, a key requirement now is to demonstrate there are other options. The Coach Learning and Development (CLAD) programme was devised and implemented at a community rugby club in Wiltshire, England. The CLAD programme supported volunteers to engage more with contemporary designs for learning, acknowledging a fundamental problem with formal coach education in the way learning (and knowledge) is decontextualized. The theoretical endeavours of Basil Bernstein are introduced to Sport Coaching Research (SCR) for the first time, specifically the 'pedagogical device' to illustrate a process of *recontextualisation*. Findings suggest that the CLAD programme was successful in encouraging coaches to engage with more positive forms of coaching pedagogy. Therefore, the findings draw on the pivotal outcomes of the CLAD programme to re-configure more successful outcomes for coach education, coach learning and volunteers rights to knowledge.

Keywords: collaboration, volunteers, coach learning, coaching pedagogy, community project, coaching knowledge(s).

Introduction

This paper is an attempt to meet the call for there to be more focused empirical sports coaching research (Taylor & Garratt, 2010; North, 2013) and to resuscitate the theoretical base on which a field of coach learning can be constructed. Whilst acknowledging the positive contribution that scholarly endeavour located in the theoretical and conceptual work of Pierre Bourdieu and Michael Foucault makes to the field, importantly this paper also brings to the sports coaching consciousness for the first time Basil Bernstein's 'pedagogic device' as a theoretical driver for understanding the transformation of knowledge into coaching practice. The aim of this research was to understand, theorise and develop insight into the type of educational contexts that can enrich the coach learning of volunteer coaches. The objectives of this Coach Learning and Development (CLAD) programme were twofold. Firstly, to apply and evaluate the method of collaborative action learning as a mechanism for developing affective pedagogy and curricula for volunteer coaches in regard to games based pedagogies, and secondly, to conceive the coaches of acquirers of this given pedagogic discourse deploying Bernstein's notion of the pedagogic device to theorise their coach learning. The 'pedagogic device', and consistent with Bernstein's intention for it, is a grammar or set of rules for describing and understanding the construction of a given discourse (Bernstein, 1996, 2000). Offered to have great applicability resonating with the premise of CLAD where putting a theory to work should be "less an allegiance to an approach, and more a dedication to the [coach education] problem" (Bernstein, 1977, p.171). In turn, helping to overturn the continued disconnection between research and practice though examining and developing the necessary theoretical instruments to understand changes in regard to what volunteer coaches know, do and value.

These intensions recognise the significance of volunteer coaches who come into contact with 6 million people per week (Sports Coach UK, 2015). However, there have been myriad criticisms targeted at current formalised provisions for coach learning where the unfortunate stumbling block is that by and large coaches are not learning (Cushion, Nelson, Armour, Lyle, Jones, Sandford, & O'Callaghan, 2010; Piggott, 2012; Stodter & Cushion, 2014; Griffiths & Armour, 2013). At present it is recognised that there is a lack of theorising in, or on coach learning, and without investigation *and* importantly action best learning processes will remain largely guesswork (Townsend & Cushion,

2015). Coaching as an educational endeavour is complex and multifarious and we need to prepare coaches properly for the important work they do in communities. Coaches alone cannot be left in their pursuit of professional growth and their development is stifled through attending low-impact coach education programmes (Nelson, Cushion, & Potrac, 2012). It is of no surprise that we currently have a volunteer ‘workforce’ bereft of support, left to precariously roll up their sleeves remaining ‘at risk’ due to a dire shortage of training (Griffiths & Armour, 2013; FA, 2014).

CLAD was a programme of learning developed to support a ‘critical pedagogy’ to set in motion a long standing agenda to create reflective and intelligent educators (Armour, 2011). Knowledge was distributed to create a new coaching discourse, one that privileged game based pedagogies said to be learning centered approaches (Light and Harvey, 2015; Light 2012; Davids, Button, and Bennett, 2008; Harvey and Jarrett, 2014; Roberts, 2011). Although there was no theoretical hypnosis here, rather socially, culturally and intellectually the volunteers used knowledge as they saw fit to fully participate in the creation of their new coaching self. The access to *knowledge* was critical here yet through deliberate processes of collaboration CLAD rejected the ‘McDonaldised’ formal coach education system (Ritzer, 2004). Volunteer coaches made firmer educational commitments and through exploring this transition of knowledge to learning *and* action, CLAD sought a more analytical explanation as to learning emerges in a community context leading to real change in coaching pedagogy.

Rethinking the rationalisation of coaching awards

In order to appreciate the contribution that Bernstein can bring to the ‘real-world’ of coaching, it is important to identify the current context in which coaches—from volunteer to the elite realms—become qualified. In tune with Elliott, “new times demand fresh thinking” (2014, p.7). Social theory has facilitated theoretical, intellectual and public concerns to be debated, and this paper seeks to harness the potentialities afforded by a different lens through which to interrogate the taken-for-granted assumptions surrounding coach education. To contemplate changes for coach education, it is first necessary to identify the totalising pedagogical logic that constrains coach learning, in order to then experiment with ways and means to ensure knowledge can be more effectively pedagogised through enabling a more enriching curricula.

It is argued here that vain formulised attempts to construct and impose knowledge is falling to produce different pedagogic identities. Hence, when reviewing attempts to professionalise a largely volunteer workforce evidence suggests the results are underwhelming (Griffiths & Armour, 2013; Piggott, 2013; Cronin & Armour, 2013). It is proposed here that due to the rationalisation of coaching qualifications, a mode of governance is enacted that creates a superficial learning curricula. Coaches are caricatured as objects not learners, and through stripping away any agency they merely become ‘McDonaldised’ (Ritzer, 2004). *They* become ‘qualified’ through ascending levels of accreditation allowing for the streamlining of services confronted by the virtues of McDonaldisation; efficiency, calculability, predictability and control (Ritzer, 2004). The intentions of the ‘McDonaldised’ apparatus is to produce a large, homogenous, predictable, controlled and an efficient coaching workforce reflecting neo-liberal sensibilities dictated by competition and self-interest (Darnell, 2014; Bush, Silk, Andrews & Lauder, 2013). This modus operandi has hijacked coach education, which in itself is now monopolised through a range of measures that have clearly embraced the ‘audit’ culture. Disappointingly, the capacity of this stratagem is not weakening and the rigid rules based accreditation procedures only allows for a regulated freedom (Bush et al., 2013; Piggott, 2013). This entails a ‘one size fits all’ approach that blindly attempts to modernise coaches in a manner that neglects *them* as organic pedagogical subjects through dislocating their practice from the realities of the ‘role’ (Mallett, Trudel, Lyle, & Rynne, 2009; Nash & Sproule 2012).

Such symbolic control results in a commodification process that not only views coaching as simplistic and linear, but stands accused of ‘de-skilling’ coaches—fabricating ‘human robots’ (Ritzer, 2004)—through dismembering a complex social educational process (Cushion & Jones, 2014). Mechanical learning episodes reflect a “technologising of the pedagogic” (Morais, 2007, p.127) and National Governing Bodies (NGBs) as significant bodies in this process act as the “curriculum authority” who control this educational field (Singh, 2002, p.574). Thus, for coaches wanting to develop their pedagogical practice, this top-down system is “regulating access, regulating transmission and regulating evaluation” (Bernstein, 1999, p.161) and these realities of governance are plain to see and preside over hierarchy, inequality and competence in relation to knowledge and [coaching] competence. The system works *on* coaches rather than *with* them and awards and quotas conveniently serve as a

smokescreen for declining standards and resources. Significantly, coaches are therefore coerced into acquiring additional coaching awards despite being disinterested with the content (Cushion, Armour, & Jones, 2003). The purpose of ‘rejection’ and ‘acceptance’ has capabilities that shift beyond normalisation (Foucault, 1975). What has become more indicative is that the field of coach education has now become a ‘controlled society’, where coaching levels begin to designate each coach and their position “within the mass” (Deleuze, 1992, pp. 3-7). Essentially, coaching levels are ‘markers’ of proficiency designating access to future knowledge, courses and coaching positions and these differences are served, and happily perpetuated for financial gain. Ultimately, we currently have a large scale coach education system that quite simply, is not fit for purpose.

The relationship between knowledge ‘provider’ and knowledge ‘acquirer’ is one of control and this McDonaldised system doesn’t permit rich and valued learning opportunities for coaches. Nevertheless, evidence suggests coaches want to develop as practitioners (Sports Coach UK 2014). The problem here is now twofold, one, there is a distortion between research and its application in applied coaching, and, secondly, the prevalent and constraining coach education system does little in the way of overhauling ‘common-sense’ knowledge claims. So coaches absorb the horizontal knowledge, the *common* kind knowledge described as everyday knowledge driven by wisdom and folk formed through daily interactions with the world (Bernstein, 2000). Nevertheless, conceding that historically ‘everyday’ knowledge has certainly been an important factor to encourage change. For example, looking back to the 1960’s the formation of game based learning designs emerged to challenge technique dominated approaches (e.g. Wade, 1967). Eventually, this led to the original Teaching Games for Understanding Model (Bunker and Thorpe, 1986). This rich heritage of guidance has been promoted in pedagogical settings such as schools to run alongside the formal curriculum structure that exists in physical education e.g. invasion games. However, teacher’s pedagogical choices are sealed by an established segmented logic where dominant traditional instructional and technical drill based activities take precedent and becoming a different pedagogical self is not shown to be a simple and linear process (Penney, 2012). This provides further testimony acknowledging the strength of the common-sense ‘teach the basics before the game’ discourse. To return to coach education, new knowledge(s) received on coaching courses has little longevity and coaches have been shown to

‘revert to type’ on returning to their normal coaching habitat (Cushion et al. 2010). To move forward, and also integrate more formally theorised vertical discourses such as the Constraints Led Approach (Davids et al, 2015), specialist expert knowledge cannot remain hidden and are required to support coaches in removing themselves from the shackles of the ‘everyday’. Therefore, through recognising inequalities with coach education, knowledge ‘deficits’ are maintained and ‘qualified’ remains a spurious term. CLAD as social theory [in action] focuses on establishing the pedagogical rights of its participants to blend their *everyday* knowledge with more radical insights.

Basil Bernstein and the ‘pedagogical device’

A Bernsteinian framework is called upon responding to the coach learning problem considering this issue as an education issue. One which requires significant pedagogical attention directing the field to consider more immediate impacts in terms of curricula and pedagogy. Theoretically, the ‘pedagogical device’ opens a door through having the power to diagnose and explain processes of coach learning. In CLAD various knowledge(s) can be translated with coaches through a variety of teaching methods to allow volunteer coaches to practice more positive forms of coaching pedagogy (Light and Harvey, 2015). Bernstein (2000) summarises the theoretical rules of the pedagogical device:

The device has internal rules which regulate the pedagogic communication which make the device possible. Such pedagogic communication acts selectively on the *meaning potential*. By meaning potential we simply mean the pedagogical discourse that is available to be pedagogised. (p.27).

Contemporary approaches to learning are enabled (meaning potential) though drawing on a broad set of knowledge(s) (Distributive rules), made available to be ‘curricularised’ (recontextualisation) and re-produced through coaching practices (evaluative rules) in CLAD.

Fig 1. The three fields of coaching practice (adapted from Maton, 2013, p.48)

The pedagogic device entails a set of hierarchical rules amalgamating the three main fields of the pedagogic device; specifically the fields of *production*, *recontextualisation* and *reproduction*, moving from right to left to regulate the rules of recontextualisation, notional to coach learning. This provides a specific focus for theoretically appreciating how coaching practice is guided and recontextualised in the three fields of [coaching] practice.

The three fields of coaching practice

The field of *production* largely centres on sites of research such as Higher Education where over the last 20 years there has been a significant rise in coaching based research outputs. As such there is much 'meaning potential' where the amount of knowledge available to be transmitted and acquired is vast. However, the 'meaning potential' of research and esoteric knowledge is suppressed if this knowledge produced cannot be recontextualised (Singh, 2002). Currently, it is felt that the current knowledge structures, including those associated with academia (vertical discourse), don't have any perceived benefits for coaching where new research is not seen and used by coaches because accessibility to research journals are not available to the wider coaching audience (Sports Coach UK, 2014). This kind of 'classification' only ensures knowledge is reduced to knowing or those in the know (Bernstein, 1990; 2000). Hence, inequalities remain and without representation the specifics of coaching practice that are segmentally created only belong to the horizontal discourse (Bernstein, 1999). In

practice, common-sense pedagogies are practiced in the community and become everyday through mediating the horizontal discourse (Bernstein, 1990).

The field of *recontextualisation* falls between the primary field of knowledge production and re-production and importantly involves the conversion of knowledge from the field of production within the ORF and PRF. Coach education systems operationalised in the UK are the key curriculum agency who convey and monitor a specific discourse of coaching considered as the ‘official pedagogic field’ (ORF), a sub-field for the recontextualisation of (coaching) knowledge(s) to become pedagogic discourse. From a Bernsteinian perspective, NGBs provide coaches with explicit success criteria enabling hierarchical rules to govern what is appropriate between both them as the ‘transmitter’ and the coach as ‘acquirer’ designating a certain form of consciousness. Regulating the ‘meaning potential’ this way has been noted as problematic in that educational field and more suitable forms of knowledge are not making their way into the field of reproduction (Griffiths and Armour, 2013). Thus, dissatisfaction with formal coach education and the strategies *for* learning in the ORF are ineffective in *that* “pedagogic discourse does not necessarily produce pedagogic rules and what is acquired isn’t necessarily what is transmitted” (Bernstein, 1990, p.187). A ‘skills’ rather than ‘knowledge’ approach doesn’t convert into new coaching actions in the ORF limit the effectiveness of *that* ‘pedagogical device’. Consequently, the ORF cannot relocate a pedagogic discourse into practice and the field of reproduction through offering such a mechanical transfer of learning (Nash & Sproule 2012; Cushion and Jones 2014). Thus, pedagogical texts (knowledge *for* coaching) don’t relate to the coaches everyday experiences and there is no theory-practice nexus created and these formulaic and standardised programmes ignore cumulative and embodied form of knowledge creation (Townsend & Cushion, 2015).

The effectiveness of the ‘device’ changed greatly when volunteer coaches learnt about different approaches to coaching through a trial and error process working in an ‘action learning group’ (Ainscow, Booth & Dyson, 2004). CLAD as situated in the field of production, drew knowledge (esoteric) from the *field of production* where various strategies were used to ‘decode’ and translate theoretical perspectives and concepts in order for this knowledge to be accessible for the coaches (Singh, 2002). Moreover, their learning was also strongly related to their previous experiences in the field *of*

recontextualisation in order for previous knowledge to become fully “intellectualised” into field of evaluation (Maton, 2013, p.51). In effect, a greater access to specialised knowledge(s) considered how ‘coach think’ became operationalised through examining the field plus education resembling a precarious socialised and educational knife-edge (Tinning, 2008). Thereby, demonstrating a more radical and authoritative explanation of how theory can be better integrated into the flows of real world coach settings. The coaches as dominant agents considered alternative ways of coaching characterising a more purposeful pedagogical commitment where *criterion* rules (what is legitimate), and the order and pace of knowledge or *sequencing* rules (Bernstein, 1990) were flexible in allowing a game based discourse to become pedagogised. Consequently, CLAD as an emancipatory coach learning programme demonstrated ‘weaker framing’ allowing the volunteer coaches to be largely in control because responsibility was devolved (Bernstein, 2000). Therefore, knowledge didn’t remain conceptual or distant but was brought to life through action learning strategies and newly found pedagogical self-hoods emerged into the *field of re-production*.

Methodology: Collaborative Action Research (CAR) to ‘action learning’

CAR appreciated the participants as valuable assets who are the key stakeholders in their own learning and not reluctant beings in a compartmentalised coach education structure. This process for collaboration initially entailed five orderly steps, starting with problematising (coaching), data collection throughout CLAD, the analysis of data, the representation of data, and using the data to formulate the action required to enable change (Sagor, 1992). This project was guided by an action research sensibility that located itself within the central tenets of the approach. Namely, democratic change to address more holistic pedagogical intentions (Stolz & Pill, 2014), a commitment to “insider research, not outsider research” (McNiff & Whitehead, 2010, p.18), action learning to close the discrepancy between theories and practice (Sagor, 1992; Kincheloe, 1991), the participants being active and engaged analysts and not treated as “mere amateurs” (Greenwood 2015, p.205) shaped the action research ethos. However, reflecting on the importance of the intellectual and social engagement required of those involved (e.g. Greenwood, 2015), following initial email exchanges and meetings,

issues were identified where the volunteers were not clear about formulating their own problems, being constrained by cultural intuitions.

Therefore, a specific collaborative approach, that of ‘collaborative action learning’ (see Ainscow et al., 2004) would best allow theoretical knowledges to become interrelated with real life practices through an acceptance that the coaches were empowered in a position that had equal ownership and influence (Reason and Bradbury, 2008). This reflected the messiness of ‘live’ action research and CLAD wasn’t a neat and tidy bundle and a slight change of angle still created a learning centred approach inspiring commitment from this researcher-participant partnership. Hence, the general principle of ‘action learning’ was invested in a framework of self-reflection and positive critique as coaches experimented with knowledge(s) in a collaborative action learning group (Ainscow et al., 2004). Action learning provided a template for everyone to learn from one another in various episodes coming together to overcome perplexities and challenges with coaching differently. This deductive and inductive blending ensured that knowledge applied doesn’t remain conceptual but is brought to life through action learning strategies so it becomes a social fact. In this sense, we all had to learn *from* the project and this reasoning extends to the lead author’s position as primary research tool which required a reflexive approach providing a greater understanding of themselves in this collaborative learning approach (Markula and Silk, 2011).

Context and site

Participant’s names and rugby club (Custodians RFC) used in this paper are pseudonyms to provide anonymity. Following full institutional ethical approval, the 20 participants were recruited from within Custodians RFC through a stratified sampling technique in order to generalise for volunteers in a “specially selected subgroup” (Flyvberg, 2013, p.183) drawn from within a wider coaching population. The coaches were working with the junior teams with ages ranging from the under eights team up to the under eighteens team. Eighteen of the coaches had a recognised coaching qualification (i.e. level one) and in total they had combined coaching experience of sixty-seven years. The CLAD programme and data collection was conducted at the site of Custodians RFC for an eight month period, with one session per month ‘delivered’

by the lead author. This continuity of engagement included workshops, theory classes and practical session shaping a learning curricula at this site, enabling the required “depth and detail for small populations” (Potrac, Jones & Nelson, 2014, p.34). In terms of participation, this time period was felt long enough to “spread branches and put down roots” (Brydon-Miller, Kral, Maguire, Noffke & Sabhlok, 2013, p.348) where the coaches are ‘acquirers’ of a given pedagogic discourse which privileged athlete-centred, games-based approaches to coaching.

Data Collection, analysis and (re)presentation

Remaining consistent with the sensibility of CAR an assortment of methods were deployed to elicit a deeper and more meaningful analysis. All conducted through a subjective epistemology to draw out knowledge and experience in relation to learning (Markula and Silk, 2011; Potrac, Jones & Nelson, 2014). The methods included semi-structured interviews, focus groups and blogging, deployed before, during and after CLAD to interpret reality construction and seek out explanations for change (Greenwood, 2015; McNiff & Whitehead, 2010). The unstructured data yielded from the multiple methods were inductively analysed and categorised (Corbin & Strauss, 2008). The phenomena under analysis being how coach’s learnt to integrate knowledge and words, phrases that associated with contemporary approaches to learning were identified through a visual check and a process of ‘open coding’ (Boeije, 2009). From this, recurrent themes were identified and through a process of ‘focus coding’ (and Corbin and Strauss, 2008), this inductive process represented individual and group ideas around collaborative learning which were assembled and re-assembled to provide insights into the coach learning and theory-practice problem generating theory to reconfigure a fresh approach. The data was segmented into units which corresponded to the fields of the pedagogical device allowing for lines of text to emerge to form vignettes to *represent* the data (Sparkes, 2009)

CLAD; pedagogy and curricula for coach learning

This section will present analysis which maps the formation of different coaching identities. To begin, the use of technical drill based coaching methods is outlined appreciating how this horizontal knowledge, referred to as ‘common’ or ‘mundane’, particularly because of the uncritical way it is adopted, becomes active in the ongoing

experiences and practices of coaches, for to “*know is to gaze*” (Bernstein, 1999 p.65).

This absorption begins to layer a foundation analysing these developments:

Oh, from the way I was coached...and you take bits of different people, the best bits. Because that's what I was taught, and what you see. You are comfortable with the drill approach because you are in control and you know what you want to achieve out of that drill and that's the way you did it. Greg.

A lot of what I would have done when I was at school, university and everything else really. It's more regimented, its drills um and you are just trying to ...hammer things home, reinforce through constant drilling. John

These mediating factors described have inadvertently provided reference points for coaching having been transmitted socially, being both historically and culturally accumulated creating a coaching *self* where best attempts at imitation are acted out (Jones et al., 2003). Through looking backwards, a sense of perspective emerged and these responses began to describe a recognisable coaching biography. However, these subliminal reference points are argued here to only create an illusion of expertise in terms of how *they* coach (Renshaw et al., 2012; Davids, Araujo, Seifert and Orth, 2015; Light, 2012). And, over time this results in very linear ‘drills’ and static approaches to coaching where unfortunately it is suggested that coaches have only minimal levels of self-awareness in regard to these pedagogical limitations (Partington & Cushion, 2011).

CLAD and the *official recontextualising field (ORF)*

The coaches also shared some views about the ‘McDonaldised’ coach education system alongside CLAD:

Well *ur* RFU, you go up and do one for 2, 3 hours and that's your lot. Well, um it's like, with the RFU, its up on the laptop, this is what we want to do and we will go out and do it, cos they got a structure and they just work to that structure, this is the tool the coordinator gives to and that's what you work too. Greg

(On CLAD) been enjoyable, really enjoyable. Um... (RFU) course I did was very basic. Mike.

Greg and Mike responses are cognisant with many studies highlighting the unsatisfactory formal offerings that have meagre effects on coach learning, knowledge and practice (Cushion & Jones 2014; Cushion et al., 2010; Nash & Sproule, 2012). The integration of new knowledge(s) allowed the volunteer coaches to apply more intellectual and positive forms of pedagogy. The ‘criterion’ and ‘sequencing’ (Bernstein, 1990) of knowledge(s) differed immensely with CLAD actioned through

collaboration and agency, John and Bob compared these contrasting mechanisms for learning:

Obviously the level 1 is short, a little session here, and you get a sort of, just a taste of it basically, whereas some of the sessions here, are a lot longer where we have been out and actually seen it in practice. If you actually go out and do a 30/40 minutes on it you get a much better idea and the game themselves evolve that much more. John

You haven't got the flexibility, over time...and actually, the beauty of this is that it is more of a journey for the coaches, you are not just drilling into them, you are going to do it this way, and this is always what we do when this happens, so it's a different kind of working it in'. You don't have those opportunities on a NGB course. Bob

John's response suggests that the longer learning episodes in CLAD allowed knowledge to become 'intellectualised' in comparison to the RFU 'micro-dose'. Extended opportunities for learning added more value than 'quickie' reflective episodes acknowledging that novice coaches require more time to channel new knowledge(s) due to their own limited coaching experience (Armour, 2011). Deek, Werthner, Paquette & Culver (2013) also lend their weight here, further suggesting that solutions to practical coaching solutions needs to be developed over extended time frames. In CLAD, this allowed for more critical appraisal of coaching practice. Tony, Rich, Mike, and Brian further consider the impact of CLAD:

The course gave me a very different perspective on traditional comfort zones of coaches, (to) go out and do something different. Tony

With a game centered approach I've found I can identify issues better with individuals or small groups and then work on development aside from the whole group – this works for all abilities. Rich (blog @14:15, 17/12/14).

Now, I've learnt that in game situations it's totally pointless shouting anything from the touchlines, total, absolute waste of time. Mike

(On his changing role) Role is increasingly becoming one of adding value re guidance, strategy and mentoring, less about ownership and control. Brian (blog 19/12/14 – 16:30).

Moreover, these comments acknowledged a changing coaching 'role', because what was apparent was CLAD's influence on the coaches became more 'learning-centred' and no longer did they look to preserve a dominant traditional social relationship. Thus, acknowledging the benefits of supporting coaches in their normal environment rather than placing them into superficial learning hubs where coaching practice's demonstrated there are dislocated from their realities of their 'role' (Nash & Sproule, 2012). Furthermore, the coaches had space and time to experiment with knowledge with

no obligatory socialisation to *get* a qualification (Piggott, 2012). Tony, for example, commented on these benefits of learning without blinkers:

The freedom. There is no right or wrong, you don't feel as though you have to follow a script.

CLAD didn't invoke controlling measures and the coaches were encouraged to draw on multiple knowledge structures, new and old, avoiding futile attempts to create coaching competence.

'Framing' a collaborative knowledge exchange in CLAD

The coaches were given agency to explore knowledge which governed the process of new knowledge becoming their pedagogic discourse. Bernstein (1990) used the term 'framing' to consider the structuring of communication and the pedagogic positioning of individuals. In CLAD, multiple teaching strategies were integrated e.g. practical sessions, theory classes, readings, bloggings, and workshops. These methods helped to nurture coach learning, especially as each interaction was indicative of 'weaker framing' (Bernstein, 1990) which allowed coaches the flexibility to find their own ecological niche. To kick start these outcomes considered 'truths' and assumptions about coaching, learning and best designs for learning were brought to the surface. This ensured the necessary function of "collaborative critique" to provide the required shape and purpose to move forward (Greenwood, 2015, p.201). And once created this enabled changes in coaching practice to be discharged into the field of *evaluation*. The coaches spoke about what worked best as coach learning strategies:

Practical stuff, (biggest impact) – journals have been thought provoking and interesting, earlier 1st session enjoyed. Greg

The practical ones more enjoyable, more informative, challenging you to think more, using constraints was thought provoking. Tony

More practical stuff (as) the learning base. Mike

The CLAD blueprint didn't tell them about theory but showed them, together, leading to discussions that further blended the practical sessions and the readings¹ to bolster 'criterion' rules legitimising the process as Greg noted.

For me personally, it was the readings², obviously going out– the practical was good I enjoyed the reading, the sessions in the classroom and bouncing ideas of each other there was a lot of value to that and this has fed into our own internal meetings and that wouldn't have happened if we hadn't had that cohesion through the year. Lots of value in bringing coaches together and mulling over ideas. Brian

This labour intensive but rich combination directed the shared characteristics of this Community of Practice (CoP) (Lave & Wenger, 1991). Direct experiences and continued social interaction were firmly embedded in CLAD, reminded that for Bernstein (1999), the construction of a [coaching] 'consciousness' has its roots in social activity. Kevin reflected on his learning:

Yeah, the most (I learnt), the best session is the u14's with Tony, we were all there, we all had our own ideas, [and] we went into the changing rooms and there was a lot of feedback for Tony! (chuckles) Kevin

Through a dynamic exchange with horizontal knowledge, research into learning is considered here in terms of treating 'consciousness'. The creation of a localised pedagogical discourse became shaped by theoretical insights and group critique where the volunteers had equal ownership and influence. In addition, the way in which the earlier observation of Tony's session flipped Danny into a later psychological reflective process is underscored in his blog:

I really enjoyed the session it was well organised and constructive for what was trying to be achieved. The game based approach was used throughout, the only negative I could find was I thought the game went on a bit too long before a practice came in. When they did stop to assess I thought the Q&A was good getting the feedback off the players and then getting straight back into it, sorting the previous problems and letting the players put it into practice.

To augment the 'hands on' process of CLAD this use of a social media platform supported the pedagogical development of coaches through appreciating the way knowledge and meaning was constructed. As coaches, they shared experiences that created more 'learning centred' environments that resulted in more secure educational

¹ Light and Robert, 2010; Coaching Edge: Game Sense Learning; Davids et al. 2015; Renshaw and Clancy 2009; Renshaw et al. 2012; Jacobs, Claringbould and Knoppers, 2014.

commitments. The following statements from Dave and Bob captured these emerging holistic intentions:

When they have ownership of it – players have a greater understanding, you know the change has been effective when you get advocates calling something, players in the team and their peers follow, and they get it before you have had to address it, you are not shouting – that’s when you know change has been effective – that’s when you think (clicks fingers) they have got it. Dave (Focus Group)

(I am) making it much more game related - Your making it more game related and creating an environment where guys have to work the problems out for themselves. That’s what games are about – ultimately you can send any team out on the field, but they are on the field; you want them to self-manage, don’t you? Bob

This revealed a departure away from more ‘traditional’ and exacting autocratic role where drills have been demonstrated to take precedence (Pill, 2015). There was recognition from Dave and Bob that coaching pedagogy was no longer a linear and simplistic activity and a new emphasis was now on creating more dynamic ‘problem based’ environments. Greg now considered himself as a facilitator of active learning:

Oh massive shift for me, I try to do games now, letting them make decisions. I find you let them play. Greg

This revealed a shift from static reductionist practices and CLAD established a new expressive order of coaching characteristics and expectations. Consequently, creating more opportunities for learners to freely exploit the environment in order to enhance deeper levels of learning (Ollis & Sproule, 2007). CLAD was a *co-developed coaching discourse* sensitive to the constructivist approach allowing extended opportunities for them to explore their learning (Dewey, 1960). Cognisant to my role as pedagogical leader was to demonstrate a ‘better life’ through being an “appropriate provider and evaluator” (Bernstein, 1999, p.259). Where theoretical perspectives explored with the participants constituted the rules of this ‘intrinsic grammar’, and as ‘expert’ having the key function of being the translator mechanism that allowed for syntaxes (theoretical languages) to be decoded and understood (Bernstein, 1990). Coaching pedagogy theory had to be meaningful, not simply relevant as the ‘take home message’ in the ORF has been largely ineffective (Cushion and Nelson, 2013). Here a more abstracted ‘gaze’ (Maton, 2013) developed over a considered time period was revealed where the importance of coach ‘decision making’ came to the fore.

CLAD: The field of re-production and evaluating coaching practice

The volunteer coaches experimented a new *discourse* which continually challenged old conventional ways. Principally, theoretical perspectives had to deliver the empirical realities, and these following excerpts from Bob, John and Mike reveal *the* significant outcomes of CLAD:

I have worked far more to set challenges in games and loading things up in games. If this happens what do you do? Set the problem and challenges? Bob

The start of the year it was probably, you know more than half the session, it was probably 90% drills, and 10% doing games. And toward the end of the year the three of us who had been doing the course, kept introducing things and it moved toward 80% games and 20% drills. John

(Before) Quite a lot of drills and skills then doing the game. Opened my eyes, better for the kids, they get far more out of it than constant drilling. Mike

It would be important to note that any change process was not easy for coaches, but through supporting their ‘mental disturbances’ over time the coaches were equipped to challenge their *own* thinking and explore alternative methods. As learners they needed to experience perturbations in order to shift to new patterns of coaching practice, otherwise socially structured coaching behaviours would have persisted and struggles with becoming a different coaching *self* are verified here:

Still find myself stopping and reverting to type especially when problems appear endemic. I think the concept is slowly growing on me, but it feels contrived and unnatural as we stop ourselves slipping into our old ways again. Ian (blog 17/12/14 – 14:12)

The biggest difficulty for me is actually working out um you know putting the ‘constraints’ on to get that end result. It’s all very well saying let’s play a game but we have got to try and influence this this session then how do we influence the game to get the boys to concentrate on one thing that we are trying to actually.....that’s the biggest. John.

As previous studies have suggested, changing a coaching trajectory to more contemporary pedagogies have been difficult (Roberts, 2011). These struggles and negotiations merely represent the chaotic theory practice storm which should be encouraged, as Maton (2014) suggests; “The heart of discourse is not order but disorder” (p.159). What is happening when things didn’t go as planned could be considered more intelligent failings, where the coaches can identify problems which can then help to fire new solutions as Kevin remarks:

We will have an idea about the type of session we will run, around game based stuff, but when it doesn't work we tend to go back to type, demonstrate, explain, practice – it's not like this it's like that, you fall back into your own thing – so we need to think what is the plan B which is still within the game based approach core – without reverting back to type. Kevin

In coaching, there is a modernist desire for certainty and getting things 'right' (Williams and Manley, 2014) and when Robert departed from his dominant mode of practice and the new alternative 'style' began to feel 'contrived'. As Shaffir et al., (1980) indicated, when working with the participants in CLAD it was important to manage emotions to ensure that participants were able to deal with the 'hurdles' which presented difficulties with implementing theory. The extended time frames of CLAD are again crucial in regard to 'framing', where pedagogical leadership translated theoretical knowledge's which allowed participants to continually re-asses their practices. They were consistently reassured that it takes time for learners to adapt (Roberts, 2011) and errors in player practice are important to learning (Davids et al., 2015). There was no 'pass or fail scenario' and these tensions are to be expected when considering the ebbing and froing of ongoing development (Turner, Nelson & Potrac, 2012). In effect, guiding themselves through trial and error as demonstrated by Kevin and Tony in terms of the way they integrated 'constraints' (Davids et al., 2008) into their coaching:

Parameters in games has been the key thing – having gone through some of the sessions you have run, we look to outcomes. Effective constraints? Reduced numbers, here is the scenario, this lad is injured what are you going to do? Kevin

Actually, if it's a game situation what are the different constraints involved? How can you alter those games to bring out the skills you want to do? But again the players benefit from the challenge of being constantly placed into a game based situation and this develops their skills. Tony

This growing sense of awareness about 'how' they coach rather than 'what' which allowed the participants to become "intrinsically motivated reflectors" (Huntley, Cropley, Gilbourne, Sparked, and Knowles, 2014, p.873). Explicitly we can see theory *and* coach learning in action through the further responses of Brian and Greg:

Bring in different challenges within the game, whether it is numbers or size of pitch, different challenges...you watch a game and see how it is developing, that is the value of steeping back and see how it is developing and introduce subtle challenges, not shouting. Brian

Smaller groups making the pitch smaller and we try to get the passing on the go on a smaller pitch and it makes them think. Greg

The coaches thought and reflected about getting the game ‘right’ to challenge their players at specific points of learning (Bernstein, 1967). Through the adoption of numerous strategies e.g. reduced number (Kevin), or changing the playing dimensions (Brian), these conditions are argued to better foster learning as players perceive information to guide their actions (Davids et al., 2015). Ultimately, the players as learners were now being better supported through the manipulation of the environment and made to feel comfortable in order to learn (Light & Harvey, 2015; Renshaw et al., 2012).

(Re) imagining a ‘new’ pedagogue [in the field of re-production]

We need to provide those doing valuable work in the community with more support because the current ‘distribution’ rules only result in knowledge for coaching being reduced to ‘knowing’ or those in the know. In coach education, these inequalities are appropriated through ‘McDonaldisation’ and the means (knowledge) cannot move closer to ends (practice). This is an important struggle because ultimately the winner exercises influence over ‘identity and consciousness’ (Bernstein, 1996). The challenge for CLAD as a case of activism was to offer an alternative recontextualisation experience so that specialised theoretical knowledge (s) can permeate coaches “inner logic of pedagogical practice” (Bernstein, 1996, p.17). In CLAD there was negotiated practice for change, which stripped away hierarchical control, meaning that for the coaches involved, there was no need to carefully navigate spurious evidence based practices leading to a pass or fail scenario. Knowledge were no longer anchored in the production field but was made available for recontextualisation and actioned and re-produced.

Therefore, the volunteer coaches became more reflexive where theory corresponded as guidelines for practice where such “evaluative rules [are] derived from these recontextualising rules” formed through CLAD (Singh, 2002, p.573). The coaches not only demonstrated a greater integration of theory, but developed theory in their coaching contexts and Mike looked positively on the benefits of his new approach:

What we discovered at the end of the season, our lads, that, that everything just clicked. We were doing things in games, stopping it, had a little chat, just like you did out there. We had this West Coast festival tournament in Barnstable, and everything just clicked, just clicked, support play, positional play, you know it was brilliant, not necessarily everything around the

ball, off the ball as well, kids lining up, looking becoming aware. It was good to see – you can't teach them that. You can't drill that into them. Mike

Game centred pedagogies are viewed as crucial because they have the “potential to promote change within the current adult-centric cultures of youth sport” (Harvey & Jarrett, 2014, p.278). Through changing the culture of engagement children might not so hastily reject sport and CLAD has actioned a different way to *deliver* sport as John acknowledged:

For me when I actually stand back and look, and consider what you are actually there for, and what the children actually want, um it's, it's, actually to get enjoyment out of being here, and it's not the drills, it's playing the game. Boys enjoyed games – definitely, 100%, the easiest way to compare it is that on a Thursday evening we don't have those coaches there (drill based) and it is completely game based and there is a lot more enthusiasm from the boys...they want to come and play rugby. John

The volunteer coaches in the study became more invested in the holistic development of young people who can develop beyond the realms of just being a games player (Cassidy & Kidman, 2010). Tony expressed his final approval in relation to this significance:

One of the things, is that it has developed the boys as personalities. My job was taking the water bottles on...I can now go to the clubhouse and have a beer and leave them to it! Tony

Adding such value to coaching and coaches is difficult to achieve through mass education via the usual accreditation means. Coaching matters, and such holistic development cannot be left to accident.

Conclusion

Coach learning should be, and can be, more than just the sum of what other coaches teach each other through what is experienced in the ‘everyday’. We are not suggesting that such processes cannot by themselves lead to radical knowledge production, but rather admitting that vertical knowledge has a crucial role to play and a ‘bottoms up’ approach is not, on its own, capable of professionalising the field of coaching. Particularly in a volunteer setting, where “community coaching, by definition, involves working with a very broad range of community participants, including disaffected, vulnerable and underrepresented groups” (Cronin and Armour, 2013, p.2). In

supporting their ‘survival’ it is argued there is an indispensable need for greater support to merge ‘craft and science’ to ensure new coaching identities emerge from pragmatic shadows. CLAD recontextualised knowledge(s) to promote the formation of different coaching identities to become actively internalised as ‘weaker framing’ (Bernstein, 1990) allowed coaches to think the ‘unthinkable’. Synchronic bundles of knowledge and practice become collapsed and combined, a kind of social practice blended with the structure of pedagogy (Lave and Wenger, 1991). This configuration responded to continue disconnects between theory and practice taking responsibly to demonstrate how to close and not widen this chasm.

CLAD was unashamedly pedagogic in nature and volunteer coaches who give so much to communities are akin to be deserving of pedagogic rights and access to knowledge, this is where any politics of refusal must be located (Andrews and Silk, 2012). We draw similarities with Frandji and Vitale (2016), positing that knowledge distributed this way is a public injustice because knowledge is essential to develop volunteer coaches who are making unselfish and public-spirited contributions. The later ideas of Bernstein, particularly around progressive education and the need to democratise education, embraced three pedagogical rights suggested as essential for democratic modes of education. Firstly, enhancement and the establishment of agency allowed the coaches to have the confidence to learn. Sanctioned because CLAD was inclusive, they were recognised as key stakeholders in their learning. In this sense there was no anxieties over having to produce the required ‘text’ to gain accreditation by meeting the correct and uniformed outcome. No one set of knowledges provides the only way, a best way to coach. Pedagogical leadership involved decoding specialised knowledge(s) making them accessible to the volunteers whose work takes place outside these specialised domains (Bernstein, 1990). From here, socially, culturally and intellectually they used knowledge as they saw best as a *second* right. Thirdly, the coaches fully participated in the creation of a new coaching discourse, there were no rules to follow, no boxes to tick, and they had ultimate agency over their practice and its outcomes (Bernstein, 2000). Coaches want to develop as practitioners and coach education requires a different pedagogical motor.

The warning being, that if we fail to capture the essence of coach learning and the interrelated dynamics of coach education and coach development, we cannot legitimise

this area of research. This McDonaldised learning arena disables sound pedagogic process and what is contingent is the ‘Irrationality of Rationality’ (Ritzer, 2013). Why? Because in sum, you can pass the qualification, keep updating your licence, and complete multiple CPD sessions, but as a coach, even though you tick all the boxes, impact is inadequate and coaching could still be deemed poor. CLAD demonstrated ‘weaker framing’ allowing coaches to be largely in control, responsibility was devolved (Bernstein, 2000) in comparison to the established ‘stronger ties’ as McDonaldisation tightly marshals high degrees of control. However, there is a degree of modesty attached to these epistemic claims, particularly regarding their long term investment in positive forms of pedagogy. Bernstein offers a new language of description couched empirically with insights where volunteer coaches changed what they know, what they could achieve and what they valued. This endorsed the theoretical level of our argument, in agreement with others, such as Morais (2007) that happenings only become fact in the context of theory, thus CLAD rejects any analysis of the empirical without this underlying theoretical basis and ‘game based’ pedagogies spoke through the ‘pedagogical device’ (Bernstein, 2000).

In placing the ‘education’ firmly back into ‘coach education’ CLAD outlined a persuasive case to shift toward Starbuckization (Ritzer, 2013). Here, coach learning would observe voluntary immersion, self-directed enquiry, time for coaches to problematise their coaching, access to a vertical discourse, a supportive social environment to consider, discuss and apply research not side-lined through having to pass the test. CLAD, as a small scale study, provides evidence to energise a re-think of the dominant influences of highly systematic structures that a proving futile in regard to coach education *and* learning. Therefore, through challenging this technocratic power we can ensure the volunteer workforce don’t remain marginalised as the “latent pedagogic voice of unrecognised potential” in the field of evaluation (Bernstein, 1999, p.158).

- Ainscow, M. Booth, T., & Dyson, A. (2004). Understanding and developing inclusive practices in schools: a collaborative action research network. *International journal of inclusive education*, 8(2), pp.125-139.
- Andrews, D.L., & Silk, M.L. (2012). *Sport and neoliberalism*. Temple University Press.
- Armour, K. (2011). *Sport Pedagogy: An introduction for teaching and coaching*. England: Pearson
- Bernstein, N.B. (1967). *The coordination and regulation of movements*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Bernstein, B. (1977). *Class, Codes and Control*, 2nd edn, vol. 3, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Bernstein, B. (1990). *The Structuring of Pedagogic Discourse*, Volume, IV: class, codes and control. London: Routledge.
- Bernstein, B. (1996). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Bernstein, B. (1999). Vertical and horizontal discourse: an essay. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 20(2): 157–173
- Bernstein, B. (2000). *Pedagogy, symbolic control and identity: Theory, research, critique*. Lanham, Rowman and Littlefield
- Boeije, H. (2009). *Analysis in qualitative research*. Sage publications.
- Brydon-Miller, M. Kral, M., Maguire, P., Noffke, S., & Sabhlok, A. (2013). Jazz and the banyan tree: Roots and riffs on participatory action research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry* (4th ed., pp. 347–376). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bush, A., Silk, M., Andrews, D. & Lauder, H. (2013). *Sports coaching research: Context, consequences, and consciousness*. New York: Routledge.
- Cassidy, T. & Kidman, L., (2010). Initiating a national coaching curriculum: a paradigmatic shift?. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 15(3), pp.307-322.
- Coaching Edge., 2011. Game Sense Learning, pp. 8-12
- Corbin, J. & Strauss, A., 2008. Qualitative research.
- Cronin, C., & Armour, K. (2013). Lived experience and community sport coaching: A phenomenological investigation. *Sport, Education and Society*. doi:10.1080/13573322.2013.858625
- Cushion, C., Armour, K.M., & Jones, R.L. (2003). Coach education and continuous professional development: Experience and learning to coach. *Quest*, 55, 215-230

- Cushion, C., Nelson, L., Armour, K., Lyle, J., Jones, R., Sandford, R. & O'Callaghan, C. (2010). *Coach learning and development: A review of literature*, Sports Coach UK: Leeds.
- Cushion, C.J., & Jones, R.L. (2014). A Bourdieusian analysis of cultural reproduction: Socialisation and the 'hidden curriculum' in professional football. *Sport, education and society*, 19(3), pp.276-298.
- Darnell, S. (2014). Sport and neoliberalism. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*. 6, (1), pp.139-142.
- Davids, K., Araújo, D., Seifert, L., & Orth, D. (2015). An ecological dynamics perspective. *Routledge Handbook of Sport Expertise*, 130.
- Davids, K., Button, C., & S.J., Bennett. (2008). *Dynamics of skill acquisition: A constraints-led approach*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics
- Deleuze, G. (1992). *Postscript on the societies of control*. October, 59, pp.3–7.
- Deek, D., Werthner, P., Paquette, K.J., & Culver, D. (2013). Impact of a large-scale coach education program from a lifelong-learning perspective. *Journal of Coaching Education*, 6(1), pp.23-42.
- Dewey, J. (1960). *How we think? A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative Process*, D.C. Heath and Company, Lexington, MA.
- Elliott, A. (2014). *Contemporary social theory: an introduction* (2nd Ed.). London: Routledge.
- Flyvbjerg, B., 2013. Case study. In: N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (eds.). *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*, 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, pp. 169–204.
- Football Association. (2014). The FA Chairman's England Commission Report (May), accessed 19/05/15
- Foucault, M. (1975). *Discipline and punish*. New York, NY: Vintage
- Frاندji, D., & Vitale, P. (2016). The enigma of Bernstein's "pedagogic rights". In P. Vitale & B. Exley (Eds.), *Pedagogic rights and democratic education. Bernsteinian explorations of curriculum, pedagogy and assessment*. London: Routledge
- Greenwood, D.J. (2015). An analysis of the theory/concept entries in the SAGE Encyclopedia of Action Research: What we can learn about action research in general from the encyclopedia. *Action Research*, 13(2), pp.198-213.
- Griffiths, M. A., & Armour, K. M. (2013). Volunteer sport coaches and their learning dispositions in coach education. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 8, 677-688. doi:10.1260/1747-9541.8.4.677
- Harvey, S., & Jarrett, K. (2014). A review of the game-centered approaches to teaching and coaching literature since 2006. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 19, 278–300.

- Huntley, E., Cropley, B., Gilbourne, D., Sparkes, A. & Knowles, Z. (2014). Reflecting back and forwards: An evaluation of peer-reviewed reflective practice research in sport. *Reflective practice*, 15(6), pp.863-876.
- Jacobs, F., I. Claringbould., and A. Knoppers.' 2014. "Becoming a Good Coach." *Sport, Education and Society*, pp. 1–20. doi:10.1080/13573322.2014.927756
- 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), pp.213-229.
- Kincheloe, J. (1991). *Teachers as Researchers: Qualitative Inquiry as a Path to Empowerment*, London: Falmer Press.
- Lave, J. & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
- Light, R.L. (2012). *Game sense: Pedagogy for performance, participation and enjoyment*.
- Light, R. L., & Harvey, S. (2015). Positive pedagogy for sport coaching. *Sport, Education and Society*. doi:10.1080/13573322.2015.1015977
- Light, R. and Robert, J.E., 2010. The impact of Game Sense pedagogy on Australian rugby coaches' practice: a question of pedagogy. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*. 15 (2). pp. 103-115.
- Mallett, C., P. Trudel, J. Lyle, & S. Rynne. (2009). "Formal vs. Informal Coach Education" *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching* 4 (3): 325–334.
- Markula, P., & Silk, M. (2011). *Qualitative Research for Physical Culture*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Maton, K. (2014). *Knowledge and Knowers: Towards a Realist Sociology of Education*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- McNiff, J., & Whitehead, J. (2011). *All you need to know about action research*. Sage Publications.
- Morias, A. (2007). *Critique and Utopia. New developments in the sociology of education*. Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield
- Nash, C., & Sproule, J. (2012). Coaches perceptions of their coach education experiences. *International Journal of Sport Psychology* (43), pp. 33-52
- Nelson, L., Cushion, C., & Potrac, P. (2012). "Enhancing the Provision of Coach Education: The Recommendations of UK Coaching Practitioners." *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy* 18 (2): 204–218.
- North, J. (2013). Philosophical underpinnings of coaching practice research. *Quest*, 65, 278-299.

- Ollis, S. & Sproule, J. (2007). Constructivist coaching and expertise development as action research. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 2(1), pp.1-14.
- Partington, M., & C, Cushion. (2011). An investigation of the practice activities and coaching behaviours of professional top-level youth soccer coaches. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sport*, 23 (3), pp. 374-382.
- Penney, D., 2012. Points of tension and possibility: boundaries in and of physical Education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 18(1): pp.6–20.
- Piggott, D. (2012). Coaches' experiences of formal coach education: a critical sociological investigation. *Sport, Education and Society*, 17, 535-554.
- Piggott, D. (2013). The open society and coach education: a philosophical agenda for policy reform and future sociological research. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17408989.2013.837435>
- Pill, S. (2015). Using Appreciative Inquiry to explore Australian football coaches' experience with game sense coaching. *Sport, Education and Society*, 20(6), 799-818.
- Potrac, P., Jones, R.L., & Nelson, L. (2014). Interpretivism. *Research methods in sports coaching*, p.31.
- Renshaw, I. and Clancy, J., 2009. Developing intelligent games performers. *Active Education*, 7, pp.50-52.
- Ritzer, G. (2004). *The McDonaldization of Society* (rev. ed.). London, UK: Sage.
- Ritzer, G. (2013). MOOCs and the McDonaldization of education.
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (2008). The SAGE handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice.
- Renshaw, I., Davids, K., Phillips, E., & Kerhevé, H. (2012). Developing talent in athletes as complex neurobiological systems. In J. Baker, S. Cobley, & J. Schorer (Eds.), *Talent Identification and Development in Sport: International Perspectives*, London: Routledge. pp. 64–80.
- Roberts, J. (2011). Teaching games for understanding: The difficulties and Challenges experienced by participation cricket coaches. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 16(1): 33-48.
- Sagor, R. (1992). *How to conduct collaborative action research*. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1250 N. Pitt St., Alexandria, VA 22314.
- Shaffir, W., Stebbings, R., & Turowetz, A. (1980). *Field work experience: Qualitative Approaches to Social Research*. St Martin's Press, New York.
- Singh, P. (2002). Pedagogising Knowledge: Bernstein's theory of the pedagogic device. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 23 (4), pp571-582

- Sparkes, A.C., 2009. Ethnography and the senses: challenges and possibilities. *Qualitative research in sport and exercise*, 1(1), pp.21-35.
- Sports Coach UK., 2014. *Coaching summit*. Available from: <http://www.sportcoachuk.org/people-who-develop-coaches/events/uk-coaching-summit/uk-coaching-summit-2014> (Accessed on the 15/12/2015).
- Sports Coach, UK., 2015. *Putting coaching at the heart of Sport: UKL strategy 2013-2117*. Leeds: Sports Coach UK.
- Stodter, A. & Cushion, C.J. (2014). Coaches' learning and education: a case study of cultures in conflict. *Sports coaching review*, 3(1), pp.63-79.
- Stolz, S., & Pill, S. (2014). Teaching games and sport for understanding Exploring and reconsidering its relevance in physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 20(1), pp.36-71.
- Taylor, B., & Garratt, D. (2010). The professionalization of sports coaching: relations of power, resistance and compliance. *Sport, Education and Society*, 15(1), pp.121-139.
- Tinning, R. (2008). Pedagogy, sport pedagogy, and the field of kinesiology, *Quest*, pp. 405-424.
- Townsend, R., & Cushion, C. (2015). Elite cricket coach education: A Bourdieusian analysis. *Sport, Education and Society*, 20, 1–19.
- Turner, D., Nelson, L., & Potrac, P. (2012). The journey is the destination: Reconsidering the expert sports coach. *Quest*, 64, 313–325.
- Wade, A. F. A. 1967. *The F.A. Guide to Training and Coaching*. London: The Football Association.
- Williams, S. and Manley, A., 2016. Elite coaching and the technocratic engineer: Thanking the boys at Microsoft! *Sport, Education and Society*, 21(6), pp.828-850.