“Who am I to tell them how to coach”:

A critical analysis of the work and learning of coach developers in Aotearoa, New Zealand

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfilment

of the requirements for the degree

of

Master of Health, Sport and Human Performance

at

The University of Waikato

by

JAMES DAVIDSON

THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

2021

Abstract

This thesis shares research undertaken in New Zealand on the learning and development of sports coach developers. It specifically focuses attention on how coach developers understand and perform their roles. Drawing on multiple semi-structured interviews, observations and reflexive insights, the research highlights the idiosyncratic, complex nature of coach developers' learning and development. Specifically, the data highlighted a level of ambiguity around their role and competing ideologies on how to best facilitate coaches' learning. For example, coach developers often entered the role with deeply held beliefs about learning formed through personal biography and a lifetime of learning. However, the data highlighted the multiple and competing interests and networks of power that influenced their beliefs and practices about effective coach development. This tension provided instances of ideological conflict, and a requirement for social, cultural, and contextual literacy within their individual coach development ecosystems. Finally, of interest was the ways in which the research interviews provided a learning intervention and an opportunity to reflect on previously unexplored understandings of their roles. This allowed coach developers the opportunity to reflect, build, craft, and even develop their own personal understanding of their roles. This further underlined the differential impact of existing coach developer training programmes and the need for structured reflective conversations in practitioner development. The research therefore offers novel insights into an important and previously underexplored aspect of the coach development landscape and has implications for informing coach developer trainers.

Acknowledgements

I would firstly like to thank my wife and children for their understanding and support. Enabling me to be a father to a young family, have a full-time occupation, coach and be a full-time student took a lot of support. While discovering I also needed to under-go reconstructive surgery required high level of love and encouragement. Doing this when a pandemic struck only added to its complexity. I am truly grateful, and you have allowed me to even enjoy the process overall, even if it did have its moments.

I would also like to thank my father and stepmother for their support and proof-reading skills, both of you have challenged me to make things simple and readable while helping me pull it into line when I failed at this task. Thank you for taking the time, effort and energy to support and encourage me in this.

I would also like to thank my supervisor Dr Robert Townsend for his encouragement, guidance, feedback and understanding. Encouraging and then taking on a student with such a long list of commitments was brave, doing this with someone who had not been a student in well over a decade was courageous, going into bat for me to convince others I had what it took, well… I could call that many things, but none would say it better than thank you, I am very grateful.

Without the participants this study would not be possible, I am both grateful for your time, and your thoughts, which made this possible. Thank you all.

I must also thank The School of Health, Science and Human Performance at The University of Waikato for supporting the development of this thesis.

In undertaking a thesis, I have developed my understanding, knowledge and thinking. It has also encouraged me to pursue future research areas and will continue to benefit my work, training coach developers, being a coach developer and developing coach developer training.

Table of Contents

Abstract 2

Acknowledgements 3

Table of Contents 4

Chapter 1: Introduction 6

1.1 Research Context 7

1.2 Research Question 8

1.3 Structure of the Research 9

Chapter 2: Literature Review 11

2.1 Global Interest in Coach Developers 11

2.2 Research on Coach Developers in Action 12

2.3 Professional Development in Education 16

2.4 Coaches' Experience of Coach Developers 22

2.5 Learning Theories 24

2.6 Coach Developers in New Zealand 26

2.7 Closing 29

Chapter 3: Methodology 30

3.1 Context 30

3.2 Research Paradigm 31

3.3 Qualitative Research 32

3.4 Method 32

3.4.1 Participants and Sampling 33

3.4.2 Procedure 35

3.4.3 Data analysis 37

3.4.4 Reflexive considerations 39

3.5 Ethical Considerations 42

3.6 Researcher Critique 43

3.7 Judging Qualitative Inquiry 45

3.8 Conclusion 46

Chapter 4: Results and Discussion 48

4.1 The Role of a Coach Developer 48

4.1.1 Being Comfortable, Being Uncomfortable 51

4.1.2 Thin Air Example: when others aren't there for comparison 55

4.1.3 Vulnerable 56

4.1.4 Micro-political Literacy, Emotional Labour and Precarious Work 58
4.2 Coach Developer Learning 63
4.2.1 Contrasting and Cherry-picking Pedagogies 69
4.2.2 Isolation and Learning Interventions 75
4.3 The Sporting Ecosystems' Impact on Coach Developers' Learning 80
4.3.1 "Working with the willing" 81
4.3.2 The Ecosystem is Large, Complex and Volatile 85
4.4 Discussion/Summary 88
Chapter 5: Conclusion 89
5.1 Learning to 'be' a Coach Developer 89
5.1.1 The Sporting Ecosystems' Impact on Coach Developers' Learning 90
5.1.2 The Impact of Vulnerability and Power 91
5.1.3 Isolation, Ambiguity and Learning Interventions 92
5.1.4 Contrasting and Cherry-picked Pedagogies 92
5.2 Researcher Reflections 93
Reference List 95
Appendix 1: Participant Information 115
Appendix 2: Informed Consent 117
Appendix 3: Interview Guide 118
Appendix 4: Ethics Approval 121

Chapter 1: Introduction

Recent shifts in coach education and development have led to a distinct focus on the role and practice of coach developers. I have used the term "coach developer" throughout this research as an "umbrella term to embrace the varied roles played by personnel engaged in the process of developing coaches" (International Council for Coaching Excellence or ICCE 2014: 8). However, within the literature featuring coach developers, coach developers are also referred to as mentors, "coach educators, tutors, facilitators, trainers and coach development administrators" (Trudel, Culver and Werthner, 2013; Stodter and Cushion, 2019a, p. 308).

In the literature there is a recognition that coach development has largely moved beyond the exclusive realm of the classroom (Cushion and Nelson, 2013; Woodburn, 2020; Kolb, 1984) and 'expert' knowledge transactions delivered by experts in their field, toward recognition of the value of *in situ* approaches to coach development (Denison and Kindrachuk, 2020). This refers to the practice of supporting coaches in their coaching context, enhancing practice and accelerating coach development (Cushion, 2020; Denison and Kindrachuk, 2020; Milistetd, Peniza, Trudel, and Paquette, 2018). Modern coach developers are challenged to develop, create, and grow development opportunities within their ecosystems[1]. Although some could make, and have made, a strong case that this is where the most meaningful coach development already takes place, the formal acknowledgement of this within many coach education and development systems creates an exciting and challenging time for coach developers and coach development globally.

Although coach developers are a regular feature of sports coach development settings, they are very rarely the focus of research. The literature on coaching, coach developers, coach education and development, mentorship, and more, suggests that coach developers are both a crucial yet taken-for-granted feature of sporting coach development ecosystems. Little in the literature is known about how coach developers prepare and develop the skills to develop coaches, or the experiences that have honed these skills.

Despite the centrality of coach developers to formal coach education settings, "only a handful of studies have begun to touch upon the role they play in mediating quality learning, while links between different layers of learning and impact on coach learners remains underexplored" (Stodter and Cushion 2019a, p. 308). Furthermore, there is limited understanding of what coach developer training does to the effectiveness, understanding and practice of coach developers post training (ICCE, 2014;

[1] Throughout I use the term 'ecosystems' to refer to the institutional, cultural and sporting milieu in which the coach developers perform their day-to-day roles.

Stodter and Cushion, 2019a). This research seeks to build on and extend this line of inquiry by providing insight into coach developers' understanding of their roles and how they have learned to perform them, shedding additional light on New Zealand's sporting coach developers, their influences and what they believe to be effective coach development.

1.1 Research Context

This research is anchored in my own experience as a regional coach developer, where I support and lead the development of coaches, coach developers and coach education and development programmes. Having been an athlete and coach at the international level, and as a coach, coach developer, trainer[2] and programme designer for both a National Sporting Organisation and in my current role working with multiple sports as a coach developer, trainer and programme designer in a Regional Sporting Trust, I have experienced many different aspects of the New Zealand coaching system. The insights into my current role and experience, built over my career, inform some of this work.

New Zealand has a complex coach development landscape with different organisations providing different opportunities. Sport New Zealand provides national oversight with government funding and influence into High Performance Sport New Zealand (HPSNZ), National Sports Organisations (NSOs), Regional Sporting Organisations (RSOs) and Regional Sporting Trusts (RSTs). Each organisation has its own responsibility: HPSNZ is responsible for the support and development for coaches in the high-performance context while NSOs provide leadership in each sport and community sport is led, enabled and supported by RSTs and RSOs throughout New Zealand. While academic institutions also play a role in education, developing, researching and reviewing coach development. Together, this organisational landscape provides the contextual backdrop to this research. Furthermore, in addressing coach developers it is important to differentiate between two institutions responsible for coach development in Aotearoa New Zealand (henceforth NZ). The first is academic programmes such as university degree programmes that prepare student coaches, where the role of the coach developer is filled by academics and researchers (e.g. Demers, Woodburn, and Savard, 2006; Jones and Turner, 2006, Cushion, 2020; Kuklick, and Kasales, 2020; Thompson and Pasquini, 2020; Woodburn, 2020). The second is the networks of coach developers that are employed by Regional Sports Organisations (RSOs) and National Sports Organisations (NSOs), whose role is sport-specific coach development

[2] The role of a Trainer in the New Zealand context, is to upskill coach developers.

(Cassidy, Potrac, and McKenzie, 2006; Culver and Trudel, 2006; Crocket, 2018). This research focuses on the latter.

1.2 Research Question

My interest in coach developers first began as a coach, working with several different coach developers and experiencing a range of different approaches, I became inquisitive about what was effective practice and how such different approaches had been developed. On becoming a coach developer, I started to attempt to learn my craft but quickly found little was clear in how the role was learned or effectively performed. As I was later engaged in the training of coach developers, I started to seek to understand the question in this research as well as other questions that related to my work with coach developers.

The aim of this research is to provide insight into coach developers as a means of understanding their development and socialisation into the role. This may include reference to beliefs, practice theories or "folk pedagogies" (Bruner, 1999) about 'how to' perform the role of the coach developer. These may be embedded in their experiences and understanding of how people best learn, seen in reflection on and through their customs and overt behaviours, creating what can be viewed as accepted norms in development programmes reflective of assumptions by the programme leaders and their norms about coaching, learning, pedagogy, and teaching.

Theoretically, coach developers exist to support or 'accelerate' coaches' learning (ICCE, 2014). Yet coach developers play a notable but often overlooked or misunderstood part in coaching ecosystems. They are often conceptualised as powerful validators of knowledge or as knowledgeable experts disconnected from coaching practice (Cushion, Stodter and Clarke, 2021), or a mixture of the two, which is not a balanced view of coach developers (Culver, Werthner, and Trudel, 2019; Cushion, 2020; Eade, and Reid, 2015; Stodter, and Cushion, 2019). In practice, coach developers have a wider influence on the negotiation and legitimisation of coaching practices (Cushion, Griffiths and Armour, 2018; Blackett, Evans and Piggott, 2015). Coach developers' skills are also "crucial to the effectiveness of coaching pedagogies and the enabling of coaches to learn" (Morgan, Jones, Gilbourne and Llewellyn, 2013). As such, existing work tends to focus on the tasks required, professional 'skill sets' and idealised model behaviours of a coach developer (Cushion et al., 2018; Stodter and Cushion, 2019a). The limited empirical research instead suggests that coach developers have been inadequately conceptualised and superficially understood (e.g. Vella et al., 2013).

The lack of research that currently explores how coach developers learn, means that there is little clarity and consensus for sporting organisations as to what it is that coach developers do, and it is "unclear on how they can best support the growth of these practitioners' skills" (McQuade and Nash, 2015; Stodter and Cushion, 2019a, p. 5). With limited research identifying coach developer learning and education, a range of methods have been proposed. These do not always have a direct relationship to each other, with success often linked to those that lead (Stodter and Cushion, 2019a; Culver, Werthner and Trudel, 2019). It is important to note that these leaders are often preceded by their titles, achievements 'in the game', or educational accomplishments, as a means of validating their knowledge, achieving power, and ultimately continuing a practice of knowledge reproduction (Cushion, Griffiths and Armour, 2017).

This study will attempt to contribute to the understanding of how coach developers learn and understand their roles. Therefore, the research attempts to address the following question.

How do New Zealand sport coach developers learn to develop coaches?

In answering this question, I hope to contribute to the literature on coach learning and development, specifically through the lens of the coach developer. Given the recent policy shifts across the NZ sports sector (e.g. Balance is Better), and increased focus internationally on coach education, it is important to consider the contribution of coach developers, particularly given their significant influence across sport (Sport New Zealand, 2021; Culver et al, 2019; North, 2010).

1.3 Structure of the Research

Following this introduction, I review current literature related to coach developers. Focusing on research on the global interest in coach developers, coach developers in action, professional development, coaches experience of coach developers, learning theories and importantly coach developers in New Zealand.

Chapter three outlines my methodological approach to this qualitative research, detailing specifically my epistemological and ontological approach to the semi structured interviews undertaken in this research. While considering how this position and my place as a practitioner in the field impacts this research.

My analysis is presented in chapter four, highlighting the major themes of coach developer learning and understanding of their roles as a process of socialisation, ambiguity, experiencing personal and professional vulnerability. While isolation and competing power structures often leave coach developers dependent on personal biographies and connections with those in power. The connection

to those in power was critical, while coach developers grow their “reps” which participants saw as necessary in learning the role. While the movement of the volatile wider sporting ecosystems impacts coach developers as power leaves them exposed and dependent on their own personal experience as they “stayed true” to themselves. I finish this chapter by identifying some discussion points in summary.

Finally, I conclude with an overview of this research before providing some researcher reflections on the implications and the need for further research into coach developers and coach development more broadly.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

2.1 Global Interest in Coach Developers

Coach developers have never had such a high level of exposure in coaching research. For example, a recent special issue in the International Sport Coaching Journal provided insight into how coach developers from around the world conceptualised their roles and what made for effective coach development.

In addition, Callary and Gearity's (2020) recently released an edited collection specifically focused on coach development and education with coach developers' actions revealed. Coach Developers are increasingly being recognised as essential to world class sporting systems and, as such, research interest in them is timely.

Despite the recognition internationally of the importance of coach developers, research has been slow to catch up. While some scholars have outlined some links to elements of learning principles, such as, constructivism or behaviourism (Callary and Gearity, 2020; Nelson, Groom, and Potrac, 2016). However, "the role they play in mediating quality learning, while links between different layers of learning and impact on coach learners remains underexplored" (Stodter and Cushion, 2019a, p. 308) and as such the factors that influence how coach developers learn their roles is not well understood. This lack of exploration within the literature has meant that it is not a simple process to identify how coach developers learn to develop coaches across the diverse range of complex ecosystems in which they operate. Furthermore, there is a lack of insight into the training and development that accompanies the role of coach developer. As such, the learning process that accompanies the role of coach developer is not well understood, and indeed it is not always clear 'what' exactly constitutes the role and practice of a coach developer. The relative lack of literature, and reliance on often second-hand accounts by coach learners instead of coach developers themselves, has meant that coach developers appear to have a wide range of actions, roles, and responsibilities well beyond what can possibly be covered within formal coach education. Indeed, (Stodter and Cushion, 2019a, p. 308) has argued that coach developers "often perform a mixture of formal coach education and non-formal workshop delivery, formal and informal mentoring, evaluating and assessing coaching". For the purposes of the research, this provides an overarching and somewhat 'umbrella' definition of the work of a coach developer, although it is important to note that what a coach developer does can range widely according to their context (Callary and Grearity, 2020).

In the recent publication by Callary and Gearity (2020), the authors provide some insights into coach developers' beliefs, actions, understandings and knowledge, and provide insight into their

programmes and their delivery intentions. Although this work gives insight and some valuable practical suggestions, such as programme content and design (e.g. Walters, and Rogers, 2020; Rynne, Rossi, Giles, and Currey, 2020; Potrac, Nichols, and Hall, 2020; Cushion, 2020; Milistetd, Salles, Trudel, and Paquette, 2020), and practical understandings, it does not provide a deeper understanding of how coach developers learned to develop the coaches they work with. Such oversight is important because without understanding the learning process that accompanies the role it is difficult to theorise the optimal structure for supporting coach developers' learning. First, it is important to generate some clarity on the role and function of coach developers.

2.2 Research on Coach Developers in Action

The International Council for Coaching Excellence defines coach developers to "include all those who have undergone training to fulfil one or more of the following roles: coach educators, learning facilitators, presenters, mentors and assessors" (ICCE, 2014, p.6). This definition places the emphasis on the training necessary to become a coach developer and in turn, positions the coach developer as the 'trained expert' in the optimisation of learning opportunities for the coach or coaches. However, there is very little research on the training that accompanies the role and the gap between the programmes designed to support their learning and their experiences is considerable. Stodter and Cushion interviewed twelve coach developers, arguing that the coach developers relied on their experiences, running into issues and confusion with coaches about what was effective pedagogical practice. Similarly, Culver et al drew on interviews with twenty-six coach developers and found that special training was needed for coach developers, with special consideration to their personal understanding and the need to encourage them to take coaches needs into consideration. These papers highlighted issues with power, reproduction, decontextualized learning, the execution of a 'learner centred' philosophy, trainer credibility, consistency and clarity of message, and, ultimately, intended learning outcomes.

Existing research examining coaches' perspectives on coach education has identified coach developers as powerful validators of knowledge, often reproducing and legitimating systems of coaching knowledge within their circles of influence (Blackett, Evans, and Piggott, 2017; Bush and Silk, 2012; Chesterfield, Potrac, and Jones, 2010; Cushion and Jones, 2014; Potrac and Jones, 2009; Zehntner and McMahon, 2018). For example, in their social analysis of a mentoring programme, Zehntner and McMahon (2018) concluded that coach developers exert power over what is and is not 'done' in their context, stifling creativity in a process where "accepted coach practice was normalized through the expression of disciplinary techniques" (Zehntner and McMahon, 2018 p.78).

We can only draw from their perceptions of what, who, how and where the coach developers have learned to act, react, and wield their influence. However, we can gain an understanding of how coach developers' behaviours are received and understood, what they are influenced by and how they influence these complex coaching systems. Many of these accounts paint a vastly different picture to that of the coach developers themselves and their explicit beliefs on pedagogies.

Culver, Werthner, and Trudel (2019) analysed the redesigned Canadian National Coaching Certification Program, focusing on the design and delivery of this large-scale coach education programme. The different perspectives of coach, coach developer and "Master" coach developer are described with a focus on coach developers "as an essential and important group within the coach education system" (Culver et al, 2019. p. 296). The intent of this programme is, like many national bodies' programmes, to be both 'system-led' and 'learner-centred', meaning a coach development system that meets the needs of learners. While fine in theory, there was "confusion among the CDs [Coach Developers] about the learner-centred approach, the learning outcomes in terms competencies, and the main learning activity; the PBL [Problem Based Learning]" (Culver et al, 2019. p. 296). This is suggestive of a lack of support and training for coach developers to consistently deliver coach education programmes that align with the goals and intentions of the governing bodies.

The majority of the literature on coach learning is focused on the coach learner, with the coach developers often occupying the 'back seat'. It is timely, therefore, to foreground the experiences of coach developers, and as Culver *et al.,* (2019) argued move away from focusing on "one specific aspect of the coach education system" (Culver, et al, 2019. p. 296). Of the limited literature amplifying the experiences of coach developers, Ciampolini, Tozetto, Milan, Camiré, and Milistetd, (2020) have pointed out the lifelong influences that feed into coach developers' work, such as personal and professional development and their time as athletes, coaches and with other coach developers.

This calls into question many of the current more traditional means of coach developer education, which generally occur in more formalised settings (e.g Sport New Zealand Coach Developer Program, Sport NZ 2019, ICCE, 2014). Situating the learning of coach developers into a wider context, rather than simply confined to programmes and the episode-based nature of the experiences that are presented in coach developer education, development programmes, and accounts, this work suggests that a coach development system must be viewed in its entirety to fully understand its roles and functions.

Continuing the examination of a coach development programme's impact on coaches and coach developers, Stodter and Cushion, (2019a) examined the impact of a UK based, formal coach developer programme, focusing in particular on the learning frameworks that coach developers were taught.

The authors explored the understanding and actions of three male coach developers while also hearing from sixteen coaches who participated in a coach education course delivered by the coach developers. The coaches provided an interesting contrast between the coach developers' learning principles and intentions and their actions – a disconnect that has often been described in research – and the 'learner-centred' outcomes they aspired to deliver. Coaches "perceived confusion and contradictions" (Stodter and Cushion, 2019a, p.2) while coach developers experienced challenges in applying learner-centred principles. This means that while the coach developer role is commonly linked to the application of principles of learning theory, in formal coach developer preparation programmes the translation of these principles into coach development is not always straightforward. Similar to the finding of Culver, Werthner and Trudel (2019), examining coach developer learning needs requires complexities and examination of layers within the system to highlight additional learning that could support and prepare coach developers.

Recent empirical examinations of sports coaches' learning and professional development approaches stresses the investigation of social, relational, contextual and theoretical factors throughout the base of empirical research, to provide approaches that are both sophisticated and pragmatic (Stodter and Cushion, 2019a; Lyle, 2018; Townsend, Cushion and Smith, 2017). Typically drawing on social theory, these approaches aim to capture an improved understanding of the well-established, multi-layered, and complex relational elements of both being and learning how to be a coach (Stodter and Cushion, 2019a; Cushion, Armour and Jones, 2003). The research suggests that to provide quality professional development requires active participation in opportunities to contextualise understanding, as well as actively constructing knowledge, through social interactions (Stodter and Cushion, 2019a; Phelan and Griffiths, 2018; Stodter and Cushion, 2017). Provided these factors make up quality coach development programmes, it seems safe to assume that some of these themes are required in the development of coach developers. However, research continues to approach coach developer learning through the perspective of lifelong learning (Ciampolini, et al. 2020; Dohme, Rankin-Wright, and Lara-Bercial, 2019; Brasil, Ramos, Milistetd, Culver, and do Nascimento, 2018) suggesting that coach developers, who have largely come from a coaching background, have learned from the programmes that they have experienced. These may or may not align in practice to modern understandings, leaving a coach developer's life experiences and critical filters to dictate their own willingness and ability to adapt these methods (Stodter and Cushion, 2017).

The limited research into the learning and development of coach developers (ICCE, 2014; Stodter, and Cushion, 2019) is neatly grouped into learning episodes. While a core requirement for effective coach developers is sustainable expertise in learning (Abraham, Morgan, North, Muir, Duffy, Allison, Cale, and Hodgson, 2013; ICCE, 2014; Stodter, and Cushion, 2019) appropriate to the demands placed on

the coach developers by the overall coach development approach undertaken within their ecosystem (Morgan, Jones, Gilbourne, and Llewellyn, 2013; Stodter, and Cushion, 2019). This includes the development of coaches in their practice or context which are shown to affect subsequent coach learning (e.g., Abraham et al., 2013; McQuade and Nash, 2015; Stodter, and Cushion, 2019).

Additionally, Cushion, Griffiths, and Armour (2019) showed that coach developers do not operate in isolated, compartmentalised learning episodes but are in fact "part of a broader system of power relations and interactions in contextualised social practice" (Stodter and Cushion, 2019a). Research has not yet explored how coach developers are prepared to understand and negotiate these challenges, nor the links between their own personal learning, delivery or impression management, although a number of recent articles have started to shed some light on this (Stodter and Cushion, 2019a; Culver et al, 2019). In an effort to understand what learning or knowledge may be required, I have followed the approach of Stodter and Cushion (2019a) in examining possible beliefs, theories and assumptions that may be represented by coach developers in the research.

While individual coach developers' understandings of ecosystems, beliefs, content and contexts, defines their actions, there are different philosophical underpinnings of each coach development programme and individual coach developers' approaches. These range from traditional instructive presentation where the coach developer acts as an information 'transmitter' of acquired knowledge, to programmes underpinned by participatory and constructivist assumptions. 'Constructivist' coach development increases the emphasis on pedagogical skills through listening, reacting and responding to group exchanges (Jones, Morgan and Harris, 2012; North, 2010; Stoszkowski and Collins, 2017; Stodter and Cushion, 2019a), acting as a facilitator who supports, enables and develops a coach's capacity (Stoszkowski and Collins, 2017; Stodter and Cushion, 2019a). Conceptualising coach developers' work according to constructivist principles shifts the role of coach developers from 'educators' to 'facilitators' who are tasked with supporting, enabling and even developing a coach's ability to self-direct future learning. It is likely an individual coach developer must in practice balance, gauge, and manage the learner's needs between educational content delivery and meeting a range of individual coaches' learning needs with a facilitative approach. The success of contemporary and innovative approaches to coach needs "are largely dependent on the capability and willingness of coach developers to adopt the necessary roles" (Stodter and Cushion, 2019a), requiring a departure from long practised reproductive pedagogies deep-rooted within coach education (Abraham, Collins and Muir, 2009; Savin-Baden, 2003; Stodter and Cushion, 2019a). In creating a new normal approach, it has been suggested that the developers and educators need to be effectively modelling these in their own delivery (ICCE, 2014; McCullick, Belcher and Schempp, 2005; Stodter and Cushion, 2019a), the 'dual role' created where the coach developer simultaneously 'develops' while supporting others'

learning about coaching from observing the coach developer's actions (Ben-Peretz, Kleeman, Reichenberg and Shimoni, 2010; Stodter and Cushion, 2019a). Coach developers need to effectively balance and create learning in their own coach development by drawing upon expertise in, and understanding of, learners and learning (Abraham et al., 2013; ICCE, 2014; Cassidy, Potrac and McKenzie, 2006; Stodter and Cushion, 2019a).

Abraham et al. (2013) researched fifteen professional, 'experienced' coach developers, outlining professional skills, knowledge requirements, common leadership, management, and the coaching behaviours that are indicative of an understanding of adult learning by coach developers. They maintained that an 'expert' coach developer had a "broad and deep knowledge base of learning theories and their application…a rich set of critiqued experiences within the domain of operation" (Abraham et al. 2013, p. 179) which enabled them to "develop and monitor relevant learning environments, tasks and communication strategies to meet learning goals" (Abraham et al. 2013, p. 179). Even with Abraham et al. (2013) providing a clear description of what they believe to be the required knowledge and expertise, very little is known about how coach developers learn to achieve or implement these skills in the development of coaches (Jones, et al., 2012; Stodter, and Cushion, 2019). This research project aims to provide a greater insight into this area of research. Allowing the coach developers to share their own understanding gives the opportunity to shed light on many of these issues within their own development.

2.3 Professional Development in Education

Related research into teachers' continuing professional development identifies a clear need for support to enable professional educators' engagement of the learners (Armour, 2010), emphasising how the educators' professional learning takes place in socially and culturally situated contexts, creating inseparable bonds between learning and identity (e.g., Brody and Hadar, 2011; Cochran-Smith, 2003, Swennen and Bates, 2010; Stodter, and Cushion, 2019). This perspective is one matched in sports coaching, suggesting that coach developers, coach developer training, and creators of similar systems are all shaped by and, at the same time, shaping the learning cultures and contexts they operate in (Cushion et al., 2018; Nelson, Cushion, Potrac, and Groom, 2014; Stodter, and Cushion, 2019a), by forming expectations of 'normal' practice or ways of acting that are reproduced, reinforced, and learnt in or from daily activities (Cushion et al., 2018; Piggott, 2012; Stodter and Cushion, 2019a). These learnt activities are often taken for granted assumptions of what normal is, and although a clear set of beliefs about learning may be described, the actions consistently rest on assumptions embedded within cultural contexts (Light, 2008; Cushion, 2020).

A wider perspective seen in the work of Shulman (2005) refers to sets of disciplinary assumptions and normative types of teaching and learning as "signature pedagogies": "pervasive types of teaching that shape the fundamental ways practitioners are educated for their professions, implicitly defining what counts as knowledge and how things become known." (Stodter, and Cushion, 2019a, p.7). Separating surface structure, deep structure, and implicit structure into three dimensions of signature pedagogies, Shulman (2005. p. 55) describes surface structures as concentrating on operational acts of learning and teaching, defined by the demonstration of interaction and questioning. Deep structures reflect the assumptions of how to most successfully influence a given body of knowledge or know-how. Implicit structures account for the moral dimensions that establish a set of beliefs on professional values, attitudes, and dispositions. In other words, explicit beliefs and actions commonly don't match (Stodter and Cushion, 2019a; Cushion, 2020).

A number of works on coach developers, while acknowledging the 'trained expert' and the often episodical nature of the knowledge transfer and reporting of formal coach development and education, have provided a different perspective on coach developers' roles. Dohme *et al.* (2019) defined coach developers as "Motivators for Lifelong Learning" and accompanied a coach development programme with an educational set of coach developer guidelines which they put into use in two national high schools for sport in the Philippines. The authors outlined three key mechanisms used by the coach developers that are required to achieve success, "1) being available, approachable, and supportive; 2) creating a sense of belonging; and 3) raising coaches' aspirations by increasing their sense of purpose and duty" (Dohme et al, 2019). The researchers, who are also the coach developers, were not able to conclude that this approach provided long term learning benefits. Coach developers were influenced by participant coaches reporting positive learning and improved engagement which they accredited to interpersonal connections. However, questions must be raised about how this data may have been influenced by power dynamics when the programme designer and coach developers conduct the research and report on the coaches themselves. This provides little clear evidence that the coach developers have achieved an additional motivation, or enhanced lifelong learning, or applied coaching skills. What is less evident is how the coach developers have learned the intrapersonal and interpersonal skills they believe will make them "Motivators for Lifelong Learning" (Dohme et al, 2019). What is clear is that coach developers are influenced by their own beliefs and feedback from the coaches.

Ciampolini, Tozetto, Milan, Camiré, and Milistetd, (2020) described the lifelong learning of a coach developer, from their childhood involvement in sport, past coaching, and coach developer roles, to currently being a world rugby master trainer. The coach developer is both critical of, and interested in, improving and developing the learning episodes that are credited with influencing their lifelong

learning. This critique and desire to change the system suggests that there is a deeper sense of what is impactful on them was not matched in these programmes, while in different coach development ecosystems they have learned a more real account (Jones, 2006). The sense of what has 'worked' and what has not is learnt in a process reminiscent of coaches' reports on developing through a process of "socialisation" or the "hidden curriculum" (Cushion and Jones, 2014, p. 278). This process, in turn, creates the pedagogical model from which coaches learn "how things should be done" (Lyle et al. 1999).

Using our "sociological imagination" (Mills , 1959) it is easy to theorise a similar hidden curriculum is at play with coach developers. The underlying desire to support and improve a programme from a position of power suggests that not only have they learned a different, unreported way of achieving recognition and moving through the coach developer ranks, but that they believe that what they were being taught within these programmes is not fully represented, valid or of meaningful use in impacting coach developers and, in turn, the development of coaches. This places yet another challenge to discerning what is quality, important, or valid knowledge in coach and coach developer development. We will later see how there are many differing programmes globally for coach developers. These programmes often begin by neglecting to recognise "the assumption that coaching practice and its research are always 'infected' by the values and beliefs of its community" (Cushion, 2020, p. 101), which provides a backdrop that coaching practice and research is not objective or neutral (Lyle and Cushion 2017). In developing a deeper understanding, we are forced in this research to develop data from coach developers themselves that both clearly and consistently presents trends in how they learned to develop coaches.

Ciampolini, et al., (2020) state that coach developers clearly demonstrate reflective critical skills in developing their sense of what will work. Issues of power, conflict, and cooperation (Potrac and Jones, et al 2009) build their understanding of what works for whom and how. Coach developers as lifelong learners recalled episodes that influenced them as well as sharing a general sense of their lives experiences, follows in a similar vein of research to Brasil, Ramos, Milistetd, Culver, and do Nascimento, (2018), whose work with five Brazilian surfing coach developers illuminates the learning of the coach developer over their lives. They identify socio-cultural and contextual factors and the influences of specific others, such as coaches and developers, as key, alongside a range of learning episodes over their lives that have built the base of their knowledge.

In the growing work on coach developers, power is a central concept in structuring coaches' knowledge (Potrac and Jones, 2009; Zehntner and McMahon 2018; Townsend and Cushion,2017; Potrac et al, 2020; Nelson, Potrac, and Groom, 2016; Leeder and Cushion, 2019; Jones, Bailey, and

Thompson, 2013; Downham and Cushion, 2020; Chesterfield et al, 2010). Exploring the influence of power in coach development programmes enables us to understand the validation and application of knowledge, as coaches filter learning through what they believe to work and whether that will work in their context (Stodter and Cushion, 2017). Coaching has long been established as a social setting and, like all social settings, power and power dynamics are central to what is done.

Kuklick and Kasales' (2020) reflective article describes their higher education programme for graduate level coaches. Part of a Master of Arts in Sport Coaching, this research emphasises learning intentions of the coach developers. Using their experience of running programmes based on reflective principles theorized by Schön (1983, 1887) and Kolb (2015): "experiential source of learning", this work is one of the first in which we hear coach developers' own pedagogical beliefs about how coaches learn and how this matches coach developers' own actions. The reflections on their own real-world experience provide the base for coach developers as they describe the coach development programme and its aims to provide reflection on real world coaching experiences: "bring meaning and application to knowledge, theories, and literature presented in the courses" (Kuklick and Kasales, 2020 p. 75). Outlining six components, the link between reflective learning on, and learning in action, is not hard to see as part of the intention. All six play an important part, however one of these six is worth noting: a "mentor" coach or coach developer who supports the coaches in making meaning of contextualising their own learning into their own contexts. Challenged with helping unpack the more real challenges coaches faced, this mentor group is explicitly instructed not to discuss course content. Importantly, this group is cited as often the most influential aspect of coaches' learning. Coach developer learning is again shaped in this article by the coach developers' personal beliefs. Using our "sociological imagination" (Mills, 1959), it is not hard to imagine that having researched, reflected and applied the principles of Schön (1983, 1887) and Kolb's (2015) "experiential source of learning", the coach and coach developers becoming socialised into reproductive and docile (Foucault, 1977, 1980, 1991, 1995) actions, that lack consistent alignment to the coach's needs. Kuklick and Kasales's (2020) finding that coach's valued mentorship that did not relate to program requirements, supports the need to understand coach developer learning and how to understand their role.

While Kuklick and Kasales (2020) maintain that mentoring is only part of a coach developer's role, others have placed it at the heart of a successful coach developer's learning needs. Drawing on a poststructuralist approach to learning, coach developers are encouraged to support coaches in the development of a problematization of their coaching process and avoid traditional forms of discipline towards athletes (Konoval, Denison, and Mills, 2019). Specifically, that means applying an understanding of learning and development that rejects the idea that all people independently are experiencing the same set of meanings (Avner, Jones, and Denison, 2014; Markula and Silk 2011). The

theory is that we do not produce consistent or universal understandings, instead experience life in dynamic, fractured ways. Meaning a fixed or generic coach development curriculum that is not specifically designed and delivered to meet the needs of that case, is not meeting the development needs of that coach. Human experiences and meaning are built from personal unique backgrounds and embodied histories (Flyvbjerg, 2006). Viewing power this way "recognizes how power functions in fluid, dynamic, and sometimes subtle ways, rather than in a top-down or predictable manner (Avner et al, 2014; Markula and Silk 2011). Accordingly, collaboration needs to become central to the process of teaching and learning, with the aim of creating specific strategies that recognize how learning is a reciprocal process as opposed to the objective transmission of knowledge from teacher to learner or expert to novice." (Denison and Kindrachuk, 2020. p. 93-94). This supports the concept that many learn and make meaning independently and individually. However, to suggest that this is the only space that coaches and coach developers successfully learn, is to take a narrow view of how learning is achieved.

Denison and Kindrachuk (2020) provide a first-hand account of how a mentor coach developer, supporting an individual coach, provides a different understanding of how we may understand coach developers. "Warming Up to Race" (Denison and Kindrachuk, 2020) outlines a philosophical set of beliefs built from coach education and development literature that, simply put, is not in favour of large-scale generic programmes shown to have little effect on coaches' practice. They use sociological research into coaching to describe these settings as a "complex and messy reality (e.g. Cassidy, Jones and Potrac, 2009; Jones and Turner, 2006)… this 'messy reality' is something that cannot be accounted for by coach development strategies that are based on educating large groups…. a one-on-one collaboration, have a great deal to offer coach developers." (Denison and Kindrachuk, 2020. p.92). Focusing on the one on one allows for several things to happen. First, we are able to hear in detail about the needs of the coach and the tools that the coach developer uses to support their development. Secondly, we can discover in greater detail how these are received and implemented by the coach. However, these researchers did not allow for a wider understanding of how the coach developer had decided on this approach over others.

The philosophical assumptions in coaching and coach developer practice are rarely clearly articulated and rife with implicit assumptions. Meaning a certain set of perspectives subtly underpins rational techniques for coaching research, coaching practice, coach development and coach education (Lyle and Cushion, 2017; Cushion, 2020) and, ultimately, coach developers. "Dominant ideology means that student-coaches can resist or dismiss a more critical approach that highlights issues such as conformity to dominant ideologies, one-dimensional thinking, or notions of power, control, and surveillance. The result can be a confusion that limits the development of the student-coaches' conceptual 'repertoire'

and the growth (and acceptance) of different approaches to understanding and doing coaching." (Cushion, 2020 p. 109). Coach developers are far from immune from experiencing similar challenges. The claims that assumptions in coaching research and practice are "infected" by the beliefs and values of its community imply that coach research and practice is neither objective nor neutral (Lyle and Cushion, 2017). Indeed, Lyle and Cushion (2017) have raised a number of questions of development programmes and coach developers, especially for programmes that claim to train or provide expert learning, neglecting their hidden curriculums (Cushion and Jones, 2014). Issues such as conformity to one-dimensional thinking, notions of power, control, and surveillance, provide a dominant ideology and can result in confusion or limited development.

In his description of a graduate-based coach development programme, Cushion (2020) attempts to address some of these issues, identifying a different and yet relevant aspect of learning: "Instead, aligning with the assumptions of the approach the program looks to what Mezirow (1991) describes as systematic critical reflection that focuses on probing sociocultural distortions, 'external ideologies . . . or other taken for granted cultural systems' (Mezirow 1998: 193)" (Cushion, 2020. p.110). In aligning his work to Mezirow's (1991) theory on learning, Cushion argues that we must consider whether the learning is reflexive or non-reflexive. The key difference is that non-reflexive learning does not include a critical element in the learning, such as in action contexts (Habermas, 1975; Cushion, 2020), while reflexive learning contains critical elements such as questioning and challenging practice and social arrangements.

In an approach that leaves an individual's reflective capacities as always culturally bounded, (Brookfield, 2009; Cushion, 2020) describe how "The approach in this chapter attempts to develop reflexive learning and normalize critical skepticism within the student-coaches" (Cushion, 2020. p.109). Fendler (2003) argues, maintaining a 'skeptical and critical attitude about what we do', as it is neither the programs nor my role to simply become a 'technology that reproduces (dominant) assumptions' (p. 23) regarding coaching. This is a position that is both challenging to individual beliefs and established power structures and one that may challenge the assumed values and agendas within these organisations which in reality are usually ill-defined and under-theorized (Cushion, 2020.). In other words, the starting point for this programme is that the coaches' practice is "infected" by its communities' values and beliefs, the philosophies or paradigms underlying these implicit and explicit positions, worldviews, individuals' places in it, and their relationships to the world and its parts (Schuh and Barab, 2007; Lyle and Cushion, 2017; Cushion, 2020). These are seldom highlighted themes within coaching or coach development, Cushion (2020). A coach developer who is attempting to sit outside of the coach's normal circle, challenging coaches to critically reflect and construct their coaching practice, aims to support coaches in building a coaching perspective that understands where they sit

in a social context, culturally and historically, building awareness of their social and interactive practices as well as their wider relationship to society and its impact on shaping the construction of their reality (Alvesson and Sköldberg, 2009; Young and Collin 2004; Schuh and Barab 2007; Prawat and Floden, 1994; Cushion, 2020). This results in teaching sessions where coaches gain knowledge that is both individual and social, with knowledge distributed as a shared experience (Young and Collin, 2004; Cushion, 2020). "Such a perspective challenges views of learning to coach as a linear, unproblematic transfer of knowledge (Cushion, Ford and Williams, 2012)" (Cushion, 2020 p. 102).

One of the common themes in coach developer literature is the dynamic between their power and the power of others. The ecosystems that coach developers work in, and on, provide a complex and multifaceted information-rich environment. This involves complex social systems with different cultural identities, beliefs, and understandings of acceptable norms. Organisations have validated, empowered, and impacted the development of the coach developer, meaning learning has taken place within a setting infused with cultural understandings, while coach developers, in turn, provide a similar function to the coaches they develop, bringing their own personal flair and biography as well as their understanding of the world in which they live. There are many different methods of understanding and theories of learning to explain this, however the dominant hegemonies risk creating systems that are not inclusive and may disenfranchise some groups.

2.4 Coaches' Experience of Coach Developers

Research on coaches provides first-hand accounts of how coach developers act and influence their development. Coach developers are shown as having a positive impact: they enhance learning through supporting reflection (Tillema and Van der Westhuizen, 2015), providing new knowledge (Milistetd, Peniza, Trudel and Paquette, 2018). However, research has also shown that coach developers often wield power over coaches (Potrac, and Jones, 2009), occupying a hierarchical 'expert' position that create subservient docile coaches (Zehntner and McMahon 2018). This leads to the understandable situation where some coaches are forced to 'impression manage' the coach developers' expectations, simply in order to 'pass' the course and gain accreditation (e.g Potrac, Jones, and Armour, 2002). Furthermore, it has been suggested that some coach developers strongly influence coaches' actions in a way that is at odds with the intention of the coach mentoring programme (e.g. Zehntner and McMahon 2018).

Zehntner and McMahon (2018) describes coaches' experiences in required mentor- mentee coach development as part of a national programme. These mentor coach developers are shown to be often at odds with the coaches' needs and the needs of the majority of athletes as the coach developers

apply strict controls over the coaches. According to Foucault – who has been quoted extensively in coaching research (see, for example, Denison 2007) – these methods of strict control are secured by a more powerful other holding sway over others' thoughts and movements. In this case, Zehntner and McMahon (2018) illustrate how a coach developer holding power over each coach's thinking and practice can render individuals docile, a state defined by apathy, passiveness, and disengagement. Although Foucault's work is widely quoted in coach learning research, I have yet to find a coach developer in person or throughout the literature who believes themselves to have been taught to wield power over or create a docile coach who is passive, disengaged or apathetic to their role. In fact, many of the following coach developer-featured articles describe designing programmes that have the opposite intention, which raises several questions.

With many articles establishing power and influence as a key aspect within coaching and coach learning, it is no surprise that coach developers whose positions both validate and legitimise knowledge hold power within coaching systems. In an example of sentiment recognisable in both education and coach education literature, three of the coaches in Chesterfield, Potrac, and Jones, (2010) reflect, "you completely change the way that you coach [Coach 1]…I was a lot different from how I usually coach…[Coach 2] You are only really acting to meet the coach educators' needs and requirements [Coach 3]" (Chesterfield et al, 2010. p. 16). Going beyond the power of coach developer and adaption of personal knowledge to fit with the 'experts' needs, another coach from Piggott, (2012) goes on to reflect on a coach development workshop session, "it's not a real-life situation; it doesn't allow for developing alternative philosophies towards coaching; it's just replicating the norm". Many coaches also report positive outcomes such as validation or creating new knowledge they can use in context. As such, while it is commonly reported that formal coach education has little impact on coaches, suggesting disconnection remains between what "content is presented in courses and how coaches apply knowledge" (Abraham and Collins, 1998; Irwin, Hanton, and Kerwin, 2004)." (Kuklick and Kasales, 2020 p. 75), the role of coach developers in maintaining and reinforcing this disconnect is less well understood.

The success of coach developers is often couched as facilitating change in coaching practice. Despite the variety of formal, informal and nonformal settings in which coach development occurs (Nelson, Cushion and Potrac, 2006), more formalised settings such as education programs (see Crocket, 2018) are often held in a classroom or decontextualized learning setting is not highly valued by coach learners. However, the power of informal learning in coaching has been well documented and "coaches often cite acquiring knowledge through reflection on experiences as being more applicable and meaningful to their coaching (Irwin et al, 2004; Nash and Sproule, 2012; Wright, Trudel, and Culver, 2007). The mere presentation of knowledge is "not enough to create meaningful learning

experiences that deepen and broaden coaches' knowledge" (Kuklick and Kasales, 2020 p. 75). Success is therefore dependent on the ability of coach developers to support reflective practice *in situ*, that is, reflecting on their context as a meaning-making process.

Coaches report coach developers have consistently influenced them in a variety of ways that, although mixed, are never neutral. This is not surprising as to be seen to develop coaches, change of some form is required to take place for learning to be credited. However, the level of change is not always immediately observable: perceptions of support, improved results, or coaches reporting a positive learning experience are often regarded as good coach development. However, a more critical look at learning literature suggests that these alone may not be sound grounds on which to base measures of success and they risk over-emphasizing shared beliefs, athlete performance outcomes and learner enjoyment (Cushion, 2020).

2.5 Learning Theories

Understanding how coach developers have learned to accelerate coaches' development and equip them for their roles is an under-explored area. Research has provided some insight into pedagogical approaches used by coach developers; these include competency-based models (ICCE, 2014; Walter and Rogers, 2020) and constructivist pedagogies (Eade and Read 2015; Ciampolini et al 2020; Brasil et al 2019). These approaches used by coach developers reflect a set of beliefs about learners and learning, with competency-based models reflecting a strong behavioural framework; whereas, building on and developing explicit lifelong learning themes reflects a constructivist approach. Furthermore, the application of learning theory to coach developers' practice is not well known, and based on my experience, many coach developers tend to 'pick and choose' pedagogical principles to fit around what they currently do, that is, their 'folk pedagogies' (cf. Bruner, 1999). Thus, there is a need to consider the influence of various learning theories underpinning coach and coach developer development.

There is no universal set of pedagogical beliefs in coach development programmes. Nelson, Groom and Potrac (2016) go some way to identifying the core theme of learning and its application to sport coaching. Presenting a range of theorists, Nelson et al,(2016) argue that in facilitating learning – whether that be athletes, coaches or coach developers – there are no "quick fixes" or "best way" in coaching pedagogy; "instead, coaches, coach educators and relevant policy makers ultimately have to make choices about what they think learning is and how it might be pursued, as well as interpret and respond to their subsequent engagements with learners in the field." (Nelson et al, 2016. p. 236). Inevitably, decisions about what, when, how, and why, fall to coaches, coach developers and coach

development leaders to make and implement. This still leaves unanswered the question of how do coach developers learn to develop coaches?

There is even less research into andragogical, or other non-pedagogical learning theories. These have taken little hold at all levels of sports development, with only a few paying them special attention. This is of interest as coaches and coach developers are universally adults. However, Callary and Young (2020) address a dearth of adult learning research through their focus on understanding a coach development programme for masters' sport coaches. This work attempts to explicitly bring these theories to life in a coach development context. Callary and Young (2020) suggest that coaches who frequently apply adult learning principles are highly effective at meeting masters' athletes' (over thirty-five) adult learning needs. (Callary, Rathwell and Young 2015, 2017,2018). Matching research out into principles for adult learning has proven effective when applied by learning facilitators to students in adult education (Knowles, Holton and Swanson 2012).

While useful for understanding athlete development, the implications for coach development are less well known. Callary and Young (2020) provide some clarity to the definitions, essential components, and goals of Andragogy. Addressing the utility of adult learning principles when coaching, they use adult learning principles from the 'Andragogy in Practice' model (Knowles et al, 2012) as they have been adapted for coaching masters' athletes in sport (Callary et al, 2017; MacLellan, Callary and Young, 2018, 2019). This model comprises of principles that focus on supporting coaches in self-direction for themselves and others, by explaining why skills or activities have been chosen. With consideration for adults' prior experiences, coaches aim to provide a "problem-oriented approach to training." (Callary and Young 2020; Callary et al, 2015, 2017, 2018). The coaches work with adults at their level of readiness for learning and training, facilitating a "intrinsically motivating environment." (Callary and Young 2020). These principles help to individualise to the learner's needs.

Callary and Young (2020) also claim that coach developers: "(a) are tasked with affording and integrating learner control of coach development; and (b) should not neglect aspects of planning and designing activities to enhance the learner's progress" (Callary and Young, 2020 p. 218). In other words, coach developers need to design events and activities that use adult learning principles (Callary and Young, 2020). Within the Coach Developer Academy programme delivered through the Nippon Sport Science University in collaboration with the International Council for Coaching Excellence, the Facilitation Skills Handbook (2017) suggests that coach developers should be learner centred, relating new knowledge to prior learning, advocating for development to be matched to the learner's abilities, motivation, and readiness to learn, and promotes an approach better suited to self-directed learners.

Hogg's (1995) work on coaching advocated a collaborative partnership termed "power sharing" that recommends coaches find opportunities to incorporate interdependent learning between coach and athlete with shared decision-making and reciprocal communication (MacLellan et al, 2018). Adults are provided with the opportunity to self-manage and self-determine in accordance with their maturity (Hogg, 1995; Callary and Young, 2020). In turn, coach developers who adopt strategies that will encourage coaches to feel a personal investment will develop into a respected and validated coach (Callary and Young 2020).

2.6 Coach Developers in New Zealand

Sport New Zealand, the government funded national body charged with the vision of "Every Body Active in Aotearoa New Zealand" (Sport New Zealand, 2020), uses the term "coach developer", along with many Regional and National Sporting Organisations (RSOs and NSOs) in New Zealand. Sport New Zealand provides this wide-ranging description:

> "Coach Developers play a crucial role in the initial formal training of coaches as well as in the way coaches are developed, supported and nurtured on the job. Coach Developers often work for National Sport Organisations and Regional Sport Organisations who deliver and facilitate coaching workshops and courses." (Sport New Zealand, 2019).

As such, while coach developers are central to Sport New Zealand coaching policy, research informing this professional practice is extremely limited. Although there are many coach developer and coach development programmes operating within the New Zealand sporting landscape, the Sport New Zealand Coach Developer Program is regarded by many, including Sport New Zealand and its staff, as the flagship training programme for coach developers. There is a belief that the tools, such as LEARNS, or REVIEW[3] and modelling provided by the programme will support coach developers to deliver learner-centred approaches to coach development. The closest available research on coach developer learning in New Zealand is Walters and Rogers' (2020) analysis of Sport New Zealand's Coach Developer Program. Drawing on analyses of the programme's intentions and field notes from one of the three-day residentials, Walter and Rogers (2020) describe how the programme is underpinned by a competency-based model for developing both regional and national coach developers. Furthermore, an interesting feature described in this research is the strategic placement of Sport New Zealand trainers. These trainers could be described as powerful contextual influencers of learning in the programme as they validate learning and knowledge (cf. Downham and Cushion, 2020). In this

[3] LEARNS and REVIEW are frameworks used by Sport New Zealand, and many Sport New Zealand Funded Coach Developer programmes such as ones run by National Sporting Bodies and Regional Sporting Trusts.

programme, coach developers progress through tasks designed to promote understanding of the coach developer's role and develop competencies in relationships of nurture, session delivery, reflection on themselves and others, feedback delivery and questioning skills.

As the research in coach learning continues to evidence, the majority of participants in any formalised coach development programme arrive and present a different set of beliefs on the coach developer's role (Stodter and Cushion, 2017). Walters and Rogers (2020) describe how the programme positions coach developers as demonstrating an example of how they would run a coach development session. Before describing coach developers as asking the other coach developers to act as athletic participants instead of coaches in their first practical session, after having been sent pre-workshop tasks that they are required to complete. Much of the opening day is spent helping the participants gain an "understanding" of the role of a coach developer. One finding that surprised Walters was that, given the pre-course work and the nature of the coach developer course, almost all coach developers demonstrated traditional skill-based coaching sessions as if they were coaches (Walters and Rogers, 2020). "Once all participants [Coach Developers] understand the role of a coach developer, it is then possible to move onto how to develop their competency" (Walters and Rogers, 2020). The perceived lack of "understanding" assumes they do not understand their own role, their organisations, community's, or coach's needs. While Walters and Rogers, 2020 are presenting a set of learning, development, and education as valid and others as being deficient or lacking in a coach developer's context. Although coach developers have met the Sport New Zealand (2019) definition of the role, "deliver and facilitate coaching workshops and courses" (Sport New Zealand, 2019) they are presented after their opening practical session as lacking competence in the execution of the role, suggesting they have learned different methods in practice much like the coach developer described in Ciampolini, et al, (2020). Many of the global themes on power, reproduction and a general disconnect between how things are done (Lyle, 1999; Stodter and Cushion, 2019a; Culver, et al, 2019) seem likely to be present in this group.

The shifting nature of the Sport New Zealand Coach Developer Program (Walters and Rogers, 2020) is evident in the adoption of a competency-based approach, emerging in contrast to the reflections on the opening fourteen months of this programme described by Eade and Read (2015). The programme was established with "a commitment to continuous learning (Eade and Read 2015 p. 351). This is based on two core principles: 1) asking trainers to personalise and evolve their delivery; and 2) resisting the temptation to introduce standardised competency lists and is commonly delivered through a three-day residential programme targeting the "core skill of facilitating workshops and coach observation" (Eade and Read, 2015 p. 351). One day extension modules were offered in: "system design, mentoring, building relationships and being a leader". The differences in core beliefs in the leadership of the Sport

New Zealand Coach developer program demonstrated between Eade and Read (2015) and Walters and Rogers (2020) present a wider range of issues for New Zealand's coach developers. These include negotiating power, individual learning beliefs as well as suggesting a wider organisational shift, that has led to change in socialised beliefs about "How Things should be done" (Lyle et al, 1999).

In one account by Crocket (2018), Crocket acts as the researcher, programme designer and coach developer for New Zealand Ultimate Frisbee as he strives to understand how the research can adapt to his context and provide an innovative beginner coach education programme. Crocket (2018) describes the difficulties in initiating a coach education programme in a sport that is traditionally volunteer-led and contains methods of coach development steeped in tradition. For example, he was unable to find a way to provide adequate development to volunteer coaches that avoids running block courses, suggesting there is confusion and a lack of clear understanding of how to develop a practical programme that meets the needs of their volunteer coaching base.

It would seem the scaffolding of knowledge in the process of discovering a culture of "How Things should be done" (Lyle et al, 1999) for the ultimate frisbee audience was one that challenged and uncovered both the community's and Crocket's reliance on personal experiences. In reflecting on his understanding of the learning literature, programme critics and methods of learning within the wider literature, Crocket seems both challenged by and reluctant to accept these findings as plausible for his application, or relevant to his audience. "Maybe I lack imagination, but it's hard to see how I can develop coach education without block courses. There is a clear expectation from the Ultimate community and NZU that I will develop a block course – this is what they understand coach education to be about, and this is what we've had in the past." (Crocket, 2018. p. 16). Ultimately, what Crocket (2018) provides is an insight into a more real account of a coach developer challenged by and tasked with leading the creation of a coach development programme that is valued by and develops coaches. This account is one that mirrors some of my personal experience and past observations, where the community's expectation and acceptance drives what is and is not accepted and actioned.

In reviewing the research on coach developers and their learning in New Zealand, the only aspect that seems to be clear and consistent over time is the belief that coach developers most often work for National or Regional Sporting organisations, educating, supporting, developing or nurturing coaches. A common theme is that facilitating coach workshops is seen as a key skill. Learning artifacts (Vygotsky, 1978) such as the reflective tools "LEARNS", and "REVIEW" provide examples of how this facilitation can be carried out and represent a commitment to a national formation of a coach development approach that has been undertaken by Sport New Zealand. With this undertaking Sport New Zealand

has reinforced my decision to place this research project with coach developers themselves, with my target group being those who work in National or Regional Sporting Organisations.

2.7 Closing

Research into how sports coach developers learned to develop coaches is centred around coach developer programme knowledge, or is attributed to lifelong learning (Ciampolini, et al. 2020; Dohme, et al. 2019; Brasil, et al. 2018; Jarvis, 2006). Coach Developers have taken a backseat with most research focused on the coaches they work with and how coach developers have applied learning theories. This presents a limited understanding of how coach developers learn to develop coaches even though coach developers are reported to operate in many spaces, including coaching environments, coach development programmes, in accounts of coach learning and sports organisations' education and development programmes. These ecosystems support the development of coaches, articulated in many organisations' strategies as a key deliverer of sport, and represent ties between coaches and sporting organisations. Yet this approach overlooks coach developers and the way their learning impacts these ecosystems and how this can directly influence coaching and ultimately the athletes themselves (Zehntner and McMahon 2018). The current situation where little is known about how coach developers learn to develop coaches has led to confusion and lack of clarity within the complexity of organisations' multi-layered coach development programmes (Stodter and Cushion, 2019a; Culver et al, 2019). This is an important omission, as understanding how coach developers learn can provide insight into the support structures required to train them. What we do know is that coach developers' learning is complex and lifelong. However, critical sociological research on coaches, and other multi-layered research, has suggested that there is more at play. This is an issue that has recently been recognised by some coach developers themselves in their reports on their own programmes. These issues are particularly highlighted in the New Zealand context by Crocket (2018) in his reflection on his practice, while being of central to research by both Eade and Read (2015) and Walters and Rogers (2020) on coach developer learning programs. In this research I hope to explore and discover the answers to the question through the eyes of New Zealand's regional and national sporting organisations' own coach developers.

Chapter 3: Methodology

3.1 Context

I anchor this research in my personal experience as a coach developer, with day-to-day responsibilities including supporting and leading the development of coaches, coach developers and coach developer trainers. Having been an international athlete and coach, worked across a range of sports nationally as a coach developer, trainer, and programme designer and advisor. A significant part of my professional life is spent on designing coach education programmes or providing the personal support required by coach developers. A result of this is that I have undertaken hours of conversations, observations and reflections across the sporting system in New Zealand and the insights I have gained from my role and experience inform some of this work.

There are many different opportunities across New Zealand's complex coach development landscape. Many different organisations provide different coach development and education programs with Sport New Zealand providing oversight nationally. Sport New Zealand also oversees the distribution of government investment into coaching, managing funding and holding influence over High Performance Sport New Zealand (HPSNZ), National Sports Organisations (NSOs), Regional Sporting Organisations (RSOs) and Regional Sporting Trusts (RSTs). While these organisations and others hold their own set of responsibilities: HPSNZ are responsible for supporting and developing high-performance coaches, NSOs provide coaching leadership in each sport. Sport in local communities is supported, enabled and led by RSTs and RSOs throughout New Zealand. Providing a complex and multi-faceted environment, where different organisations play differing roles across systems. Each Coach developers' personal ecosystems are often directly or indirectly influenced by many, if not all of the above, with their differing roles, agendas, and outcomes.

As global interest in coach developers and their learning has increased, so has Sport New Zealand's interest, with funding and support provided to the New Zealand sporting ecosystem (Sport New Zealand, 2019, 2020). From my personal experience I have found that although coach developers adapt their behaviours within the training programmes provided for them, it is not always clear how these ideas and behaviours translate into practice. This is compounded by a high rate of turnover of those in the roles, with many who excel 'elevating' in their ecosystem while many others are short-lived in the role. This inconsistent and, at times, hap-hazard application by coach developers sparked a personal curiosity in the learning and development of coach developers themselves.

Since its inception in 2014, the impact of Sport New Zealand's Coach Developer Program can be seen across the sporting landscape, with many sporting organisations at a national and regional level

looking to provide a level of training and support for coach developers. Given that existing literature on coaches' learning points to an overreliance on informal and experiential learning (e.g. Irwin et al, 2004; Nash and Sproule, 2012; Wright et al, 2007; Cushion et al., 2018; Piggott, 2012; Stodter and Cushion, 2019; Light, 2008; Cushion, 2020), it is worth examining the learning experiences of coach developers as a means of expanding and improving formal provision.

3.2 Research Paradigm

This is where I introduce the underpinning philosophical assumptions that guide this research. The paradigms incorporate two different sets of assumptions: The assumptions about social reality (ontology) and the assumptions about knowledge (epistemology). Two approaches are relevant in this work, either an interpretivist approach, or a social constructionist approach. They each have their own range of ontological and epistemological assumptions. Broadly speaking, each acknowledges the socially constructed nature of knowledge, and that the social realities people live in are both subjective and relative (Sparkes and Smith, 2014).

All assumptions in this research are guided and formed by the my research beliefs. A paradigm refers to a "set of interrelated assumptions about the social world that provides a philosophical and conceptual framework for the organized study of that world" (Filstead, 1979, p. 34; Denzin and Lincoln, 2018). Paradigms are "grounded in certain assumptions about nature and reality" (Mallett and Tinning, 2014, p.12; Smith and McGannon, 2018). Ontological and epistemological views have been looked at as interconnected (Denzin and Lincoln, 2008, 2018). Also providing insights into the lead researcher, their questions can also be gained (Smith and McGannon, 2018).

The researcher "must possess an idea about what can be known at all" (Atkinson, 2012, p. 148). Ontology anchors authors' efforts and how they are influenced (Gill, 2011; Hesse-Biber, 2017), while also informing our understanding of the nature of what reality is (Ponterotto, 2005) and the nature of existence (Mallett and Tinning, 2014). Epistemology explores the creation of our knowledge, or how we know what it is we know (Crotty, 1998; Sparkes and Smith, 2014). In other words, epistemology informs us about the relationship between a learner and their question (Smith and McGannon, 2018; Sparkes and Smith, 2014). A definition of epistemology can include the limitations of human knowledge, its origins, nature and methods of creation (Atkinson, 2012).

Constructionist and interpretivist methods are the two approaches used in this research. These accept the influence of biographical, historic and personal impacts (Edwards and Holland, 2013; Creswell and Creswell, 2018) on the researcher and the research. An interpretivist approach positions reality as socially constructed (Atkinson, 2012; Smith and McGannon, 2018), allowing the lived experiences of

humans to be described and interpreted by researchers (Dowling-Naess,1996; Coe, 2012; Denzin, 2017).

In this research I have taken the stance that "all knowledge, and therefore all meaningful reality", (Crotty, 2003, p. 42) stems from and is therefore "contingent upon human practices, being constructed in and out of interactions between human beings and their world" (Crotty, 2003, p. 42). The use of constructionism is consistent with existing coach developer research, such as Cushion et al., (2017) and Potrac et al., (2014), emphasising the constructed nature of coach development. My research will also focus on understanding constructed social realities through social interactions. Researchers, such as myself, when using social constructionist beliefs must stay mindful, critical and "ever suspicious", (Burr, 1995, p. 2) of taking for granted power in the relational, social world.

3.3 Qualitative Research

Qualitative research is "a form of social inquiry that focuses on the way people interpret and make sense of their experiences and the world in which they live" (Sparkes and Smith, 2014, p. 14; Crouch and McKenzie, 2006). This position is "underpinned by ontological relativism (i.e., reality is multiple, created, and mind-dependent) and epistemological constructionism (i.e., knowledge is constructed and subjective)" (Smith, 2013, p. 111; Smith and McGannon, 2018). As such, a qualitative approach is well suited to research on coach developers, enabling the researcher to "interpret and make sense" of participants' roles, learning experiences, realities, and the meaning they make of these, and in turn their actions throughout their semi-structured interviews. Semi-structured interviews are commonly used in qualitative research as a means of understanding of how people draw meaning from their settings (Denzin and Lincoln, 2011, 2018). It is important to note that this knowledge is socially constructed between myself and the participant (Lincoln and Guba, 2000; Creswell and Creswell, 2018). In this research I act as a "as a reflexive 'instrument' whose biography and positioning influence all stages of a study" (Carless and Douglas, 2013, p. 28; Burke et al., 2018; Etherington, 2004; Robbins, 2007). In this role I need to be aware that my biography, profession, position and academic work may make it tempting to project my own understanding onto others (Jones and Turner, 2006; Lave, 2012).

3.4 Method

Institutional ethical approval was obtained for the study, which involved semi-structured interviews, field notes and reflection from the lead researcher on the coach developers, and from interviews which were conducted with the coach developers. These interviews aimed to gain understanding and

insight into the biographies of coach developers, with a specific focus on the elements of their learning journey that they believe to have impacted their actions and understanding of coach development. This approach has been used to offer insight into coaches and coach educators' development, journey, dispositions, and biography (e.g., Jones et al., 2003, 2004; Callary et al., 2011; Gearity et al., 2013; Christensen, 2014; Douglas et al., 2016; Brasil et al., 2017; Watts, 2020). As a summary, this project involved four main stages.

1. Two semi-structured interviews with 9 of the coach developers and three semi structured interviews with 2 coach developers held throughout New Zealand. The participants are based within various sports governing bodies and are either regionally or nationally responsible for the development of coaches.

2. Field notes and observations of various coach developers *in situ*. This included coach developers interacting and sharing in development sessions, leading educational sessions, leading and receiving 1-1 feedback sessions and reflecting on reviews with coaches.

3. Data was analysed and reviewed for trends and patterns and reviewed alongside current literature.

4. Finding, implications and future research requirements were then identified and reported on before closing.

3.4.1 Participants and Sampling

Leaning on my knowledge and personal relationships as a well-established member of the coach development landscape, coach developers were purposely selected to act as 'information rich' participants (Creswell and Creswell, 2018) from my personal contacts in a range of sports within New Zealand. Initially, participants were identified using a criterion-based technique for sampling before adopting snowball sampling (Morris, 2015; Sparkes and Smith, 2014; Watts, 2020) which turned out coach developers who were already known to me prior to this research. I approached and asked if they wished to volunteer to be a part of this research. The participants were coach developers who worked in paid roles within sport in New Zealand for either Regional or National Sporting Organisations, ranging between twenty-eight and fifty-seven years of age. This allowed me to explore several sporting ecosystems and enabled exploration of a range of biographical, contextual and developmental insights into coach developer learning. This approach could run the potential risk of 'bias' (Groom, Cushion, and Nelson, 2011). Nevertheless, by aligning this to Groom et al.'s (2011) position, recruiting coach developers through this method increased rapport allowing me access

through insider knowledge and shared experiences, and ultimately created the ability to generate deeper understanding.

Coach developers were contacted by telephone, email or asked in person. Participants who chose to take part were sent more information on the research (See Appendix 1). Following this, times, dates and venues to take part in the interviews were arranged for the participants, as well as possible in situ observations. Finding time and venues to meet with the coach developers was at times challenging, with their wide range of commitments and locations, as well as COVID-19 restrictions, all playing a part. To work around this, many interviews were conducted online over video calls while others were done in person. I expected this as it represented the realities of their roles and the social landscape at the time. I understand this is not uncommon in qualitative studies (Carless and Douglas, 2013). However, the flexibility of this approach allowed me to gain "fruitful insight" (Carless and Douglas, 2013, p. 29) of the coach developers.

Altogether, eleven coaches agreed to participate in the study. At the beginning of this project these coach developers were employed directly by twelve sports organisations and worked directly with coaches in many more sports. The coach developers were employed by six different regional bodies, nine national bodies, as well as holding a range of other roles across regional, national and international coach development and education. These sports include five individual and ten team sports, with a wide range of experience and understanding ranging from those with well over twenty years working in the development of coaches to those with less than five years. The coach developers, like the New Zealand social landscape, have an array of different ethnic and national backgrounds, including Maori, Pacific, North American, European African, and New Zealand Pakeha. There were three females and ten males approached for this research project. The gender imbalance may be attributed to the underrepresentation of women in coach education which is a recognisable situation in the wider coaching landscape (LaVoi and Dutove, 2012; Hamilton and LaVoi, 2020).

As I moved between the research and my role as a coach developer, trainer of coach developers and programme leader I became aware that my own biography – having worked in a national sport, working with regional bodies, sporting leaders, and supporting and working with numerous national bodies – makes me an insider and a person of significant standing within this group. As a result, I am mindful of the need to attempt to remain and "maintain analytical distance" (Sparkes and Smith, 2014, p. 183; Brewer and Sparkes, 2011; Robey and Taylor, 2018). This was a challenge both for the participants and myself, as at times I was privy to a wider array of insight than was conveyed in the data. This was illustrated by the repeated use of comments such as "you know" or "as you would have seen". Standard ethical protocol was kept with participants, who were requested to complete

informed consent (see Appendix 2) and making the participants aware they could withdraw at any point in the study (Sparkes and Smith, 2014).

3.4.2 Procedure

I reviewed the literature and educational research on coach developers, coach educators and mentors, as well as coach learning and education literature, for the creation of my interview guide. This followed three themes within the guide: individual and context; learning and understanding the role; and motivations, expectation and commitment (See Appendix 3). I hoped to explore these while allowing the ability to add extra questions or themes as they arose (Edwards and Holland, 2013; Morris, 2015; HesseBiber, 2017). I also consulted with current coaching scholars, who provided insight on the guide and its interviews. I then asked if two of the participants would be happy to conduct pilot interviews to check that the guide was effective in practice (Cushion, 2014; Purdy, 2014; Lefebvre, Martin, Côté, and Cowburn, 2019). One of the coach developers in the pilot study had greater experience in research than I did, while the other had no research background (like the majority of the participants). Both provided valuable feedback that added to the usefulness of the interview guide and developed my own skills as a researcher. One of those suggests I found useful in future interviews was to keep bring in the participant back to my questions if their reflections wondered. Once these interviews were successfully completed, I conducted the interviews with each participant, and with the success of the pilot interviews, participants were happy for them to feature in this study.

Researching using "interview[s] has become one of the most common ways of producing knowledge in the human and social sciences" as they "are routinely employed in education, sociology, communication, anthropology, psychology, and many other disciplines." (Brinkmann 2018, p. 577). Interviews are well-established as a method within sports coaching (Jones et al., 2004; Purdy, 2014; Brasil et al., 2017; Watts, 2020) and offer "the potential for understanding and gaining a 'rich' insight into a person's perspective" (Purdy, 2014, p. 161). I selected this method to provide a better understanding of what, why and how coach developers interpret their work (Purdy, 2014).

Semi-structured interviews were chosen as they provided greater leeway to explore what is believed to be important by the interviewee, and to allow me to actively participate in developing the knowledge (Brinkmann, 2018). The semi-structured nature of the interviews allowed for "exploratory and descriptive data" (Hesse-Biber, 2017, p. 106) generation. Coach developers' voices take centre stage, with personal in-depth discussion of their biographies, understanding of their experiences, knowledge of learning theory, how they made meaning of and experienced being a coach developer (Brinkmann, 2018).

I had originally planned to interview all participants three times, however because of the overlap between the sections throughout the interviews, it was felt that many of the questions, such as questions about biography and motivation, were answered in two interviews. Overall, the interviews enabled the participants to answer questions in their own way while creating structured opportunities for comparison to be made across the data (Edwards and Holland, 2013; Morris, 2015; HesseBiber, 2017).

In these interviews, I acted as a reflective questioner, creating both reflection on and reflection in practice (Schon, 1983; Schon 1987). Similar to Gilbert and Trudel's (2001) work on coaches, many of the coach developers expressed value in the interview process and wished to continue with this type of connection outside of the research. The opening interview kicked off with a broad question about the participant and their journey as a coach developer, before narrowing down into more challenging or targeted questions over the course of the interviews with the aim of probing deeper into the research question (Edwards and Holland, 2013; Morris, 2015; Brinkmann, 2018). From time to time, I too shared experiences in common with the coach developers over an insight or comment, or to deepen or establish greater rapport.

To achieve safety in interviews, coach developers were asked where they preferred to be for interviews, with the aim of making sure the participant was able to have a comfortable and accessible interview (Morris, 2015; Hesse-Biber, 2017; Watts 2020). The goal was to provide an interview environment that felt "safe enough to talk openly about their experiences and understandings" (Edwards and Holland, 2013, p. 77; Purdy, 2014). I felt, from my own experience and understanding, that the environment where the interviews were situated sometimes led interviewees to hold back sharing personal stories. For example, in the two interviews that I completed in my office I noticed that participants paused and check who was walking past the closed glass door.

There were two interviews held in my work office at Sport Waikato in Hamilton, New Zealand, two in a local coffee shop, and the twenty other interviews were completed over Microsoft Teams face-to-face private video call. Prior to each interview was an informal discussion of up to thirty minutes in which we discussed confidentiality, anonymity and other general themes of the research or coach development. In each interview I recorded handwritten notes (Matiss, 2005; Creswell and Creswell, 2018), with the interviews audio-recorded and then later transcribed.

Once data collection was complete, the interviews ranged from thirty-seven to sixty-two minutes, with close to 20 hours of interview data transcribed verbatim. In addition, 40 hours of field notes and over a hundred hours of observation and reflections were accounted for in the completion of this research,

plus many hundreds of hours in personal experience with both participants and other coach developers prior to this research informing my insights.

In conclusion, my personal biography and current involvement in the field aided in identifying and recruiting a sample for the research. This enabled an effective relationship and a "researcher-participant understanding" (Watts, 2020, p.76; Brasil et al., 2017). Aligned to my ontological and epistemological position and the type of thematic analysis that was chosen, my role of interviewer was to be someone who "embarks upon an interactive and reflective interpretation of how they came to 'see' and transform particular 'sights' into knowledge" (Edwards and Holland, 2013, p. 13; Kvale, 1996, 2007; Watts, 2020). Although the sample is only a small number of total coach developers, I feel that both my understanding of their contexts, and the research, aided in making meaning of their reflections, discussion, interactions, interpretations, and understandings (Gilbert and Trudel, 2001, Crouch and McKenzie, 2006; Lefebvre et al., 2019; Smith and McGannon, 2018, Watts, 2020). However, it was important for me to not assume, or skip over, or take for granted, areas, topics, understandings or knowledge because of my place within this community (Purdy, 2014). This was not always as simple a process as it might seem and did require some reflexive consideration later (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992).

3.4.3 Data analysis

There is not a perfect procedure to analyse data collected from interviews (Coffey and Atkinson, 1996; Smith and Sparkes, 2009; Braun and Clarke, 2019). However, because it did not rely on a pre-existing theoretical framework (Braun and Clarke, 2006, 2013, 2019; Clarke and Braun, 2017; Terry, Hayfield, Braun, and Clarke, 2017; Braun, Clarke, Hayfield, and Terry, 2018; Watts, 2020), and for its flexibility and openness (Lefebvre et al., 2019), the method that I choose for this research was to apply reflexive thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2019). Thematic analysis can be seen as "a method for identifying, analysing and interpreting patterns of meaning ('themes') within qualitative data" (Clarke and Braun, 2017, p. 297). This allowed for this research to have "a method – a tool or technique, unbounded by theoretical commitments – rather than a methodology" (Clarke and Braun, 2017, p. 297). Using this kind of thematic analysis aligns with my paradigm because participant data in interpreted through a set of socially constructed assumptions about the nature of reality. This was especially relevant in this research as it provides the opportunity to highlight one's own training, biography, development and journey in the development of latent and semantic themes analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2019).

The analysis process began throughout the full interview and data gathering process (Braun et al., 2017; Lefebvre et al., 2019). This method and analysis facilitated data being first considered through

a descriptive, semantic process, and then at a latent level. An inductive approach is believed to be useful when researching areas that have been under-researched (Clarke and Braun, 2017), and when applied alongside to a theory-driven deductive analysis, can attain the underpinning meanings (Bourdieu, 1977). This supports and allows me to apply a constructionist framework (Lefebvre et al., 2019), and this method has recently been affirmed by Braun and Clarke (2019) and test-driven in parallel research by Watts (2020). Once interviews were complete, I revisited data by listening to each interview, then going over the interview's transcriptions, my notes both from the interviews and the field. Over the course of this pre-immersion process, some extra things came to light - with notes made (Matiss, 2005; Creswell and Creswell, 2018) which led me to adding aspects that the literature review had not uncovered, such as interviews as a form of intervention (see chapter 4). I followed by immersion in the process involved, transcribing, and multiple listening and readings of transcripts and applying a data-driven coding approach utilizing a constant comparison method (Strauss and Corbin, 1990), with codes created in line with potential themes. All possible thematic categories were checked and rechecked to consider where there was valid data worth putting into the analyses and findings (Sparkes and Smith, 2014).

While completing this project I was wary of Braun and Clarke's (2019) comments on what they considered to be the regular use of confused or poor thematic analysis: assessing others to have a lack of reflexivity that has led them to not locating or differentiating their thematic analysis in a wider landscape. The "themes emerging' from qualitative data with little or no discussion of analytic philosophy and procedure" (Braun and Clarke, 2019, p. 1) is something that they warn against. Instead, they promote 'generating', 'constructing' (Braun et al. 2018) or 'developing' (Braun, Clarke, and Weate,2016) because they argue that themes are not waiting within the data for the researcher to be able to passively see or simply retrieve them. This meant that my role as a practitioner and researcher in this field was key to the creation and understanding of the field as a co-constructor of knowledge.

This study aimed to provide understanding on three areas in coach developers' learning:

1. Reflection on coach developer reality, and the development their own personal meaning.
2. How they understand and recognised social structures (Sparkes and Smith, 2009).
3. How social structures motivate or influence how they learn and what they learn.

Aware of the risks of generating only findings and themes that are a direct reflection of the questions (Braun and Clarke, 2006, 2013), I was able to uncover and explore unexpected themes. Having not committed to a theoretical framework (Braun and Clarke, 2006; Clarke and Braun, 2017; Lefebvre et al., 2019) I created far richer data in the interview and analysis, achieving a far wider exploration, reflection on, reflection in and retrospective reflection on practice (Munby and Russell, 1989; Schon

1983, 1987; Shulman, 1987; Gilbert and Trudel, 2001) and retrospective reflection on coach developers' ongoing practice, such as teaching a class throughout a year, or in this case, developing a coach over time (Court, 1988; Gilbert and Trudel, 2001), as well as exploration of signature pedagogy, which includes 'surface structures, deep structures and implicate structures', (Shulman, 2005, p. 54-55). Interestingly, a fourth area rapidly became clear: interviews as a reflective learning intervention (Martens, 1997; Dewey, 1938, 1963; Kolb, 1984; Schon, 1983, 1987, 1991, Shulman, 1987; Gilbert and Trudel, 1999, 2001; Clarke, 1998; Kruse, 1997) filled with 'confession, empowerment' and the 'discourse of reflection' (Downham and Cushion, 2020) alongside 'discipline, power' in reflection.

3.4.4 Reflexive considerations

Reflexivity and researcher subjectivity is central to reflecting on thematic analysis (Braun et al., 2018; Braun and Clarke, 2019). I am conscious that elements of this research related to a self-reflexive analysis can be open to critical scrutiny. As pointed out by Townsend and Cushion (2020), generally in reflexive texts the emphasis is unsurprisingly placed on the researcher's agency, which leads to criticism for its 'ethnocentric' position (Wacquant, 1989; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). In this endeavour I was wary of the criticisms of thematic analysis, such as conflicting interpretation or inadequate analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2006, 2013; Sparkes and Smith, 2009, 2014; Terry et al., 2017). But I felt that because the thematic analysis allowed a remarkably interactive, creative ability to explore and understand the data (Trainor and Bundon, 2020), it was an ideal fit for the under-explored ecosystems of coach developers, generating a "develop rich, detailed, and nuanced analysis" (Trainor and Bundon, 2020, p. 1). My analysis was undoubtedly driven by my professional and academic interest in coach learning and development, and the exposure to the multitude of critical frameworks that existing research draws upon (e.g Jones, 2006). My personal knowledge, combined with a more abstract analysis, allowed me to explore more than simply what the coach developers had said, and instead attempt to look at, understand and interpret the perception, assumptions and dispositions that have created the coach developers' understanding (Braun and Clarke, 2006; Lefebvre et al., 2019, Watts, 2020). Therefore, I must recognise my epistemological commitments and personal biography and position in the subjective coding and theme creation process as a reflexive qualitative researcher (Lave, 2012; Carless and Douglas, 2013; Sparkes and Smith, 2014; Brinkmann, 2018; Braun and Clark, 2019). Bringing the "undiscussed into discussion" (Bourdieu, 1977, p. 168) can help researchers to consider different 'accepted way' thinking in the learning contexts (Reay, 1998, 2004a, 2004b; Wacquant, 2008; Colley, 2012; Colley and Guéry, 2015; Townsend and Cushion, 2015; Burke et al., 2018). Interestingly, many of the coach developers' experiences and understandings had mirrored my own at different points in my own career. Although their journeys were their own, many of the themes

were aligned to my own experiences as I have moved through my own career as a practitioner. If anything, this process has helped to enhance and make clear what may not have been clear otherwise. I hope that I have been able to effectively merge my researcher and practitioner roles to create a better understanding through my study (Drake and Heath, 2011; Robey and Taylor, 2018; Watts, 2020).

I should say that it was at times a challenge to represent all eleven coach developers and their individual views in this process (Braun and Clarke, 2019). At a pragmatic level, the process of research became more complex with a rapidly changing sporting environment, combined with a major global change due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which created changes for all the coach developers, many of whom dealt with significant changing circumstances in their roles. This, and perhaps due to the reflective nature of the interviews (Schon, 1983, 1987), meant that several participants seemed to change and contradict themselves over the course of the interviews (Hesse-Biber, 2017). Examples of this included one coach developer discussing his disdain for a 'tool' taught in his coach developer training, while in the next interview concluding that he had decided that this was in fact an important tool to both practice and reflection: "the more I think about it…it just kind of covers everything" (Oscar). Another challenge was the economic response to the pandemic, with coach developers losing their roles or having roles reduced or changed over this period. Eight of the eleven coach developers were directly affected by this, alongside changes in my own coach development roles and many others throughout New Zealand. Another feature was the difference between coach developers as to what was articulated or perceived (Creswell and Creswell, 2018), with different understanding of questions, roles and pedagogies. The range of understandings on certain topics is explored in the following chapter. Over the process I was able to generate and construct themes for editing, condensing, and reviewing, to arrive at the following themes prior to the development of an overarching framework seen in the following chapter:

Theme	**Sub-themes**
Role of a coach developer	Ambiguity: • Not sure what to do • Looking for others • 'Thin air' e.g., others aren't there to compare to Contradiction in theoretic: • Pedagogies that contradict intent • Pedagogies that suit political agenda • Pedagogically floating in the wind. "I'll try anything" Impression management: Multi-layer social issues: • Caught in the middle

	• One player in a complex system Vulnerability: • Comfortable being uncomfortable • Penny drop moment • Sink or swim Questioning Motivation Moving up and out: Validation: People who "get it", "work with the willing": Reducing vulnerability Interview as reflective intervention: • Reflection • Ambiguity • Changing practice or commitment to action • "you know" o As they search for what to do o Search for Validation o Checking that this is normal as a coach developer. Exploration of accepted social norms A safe space to be vulnerable and share personal thoughts
Learning to be a coach developer:	Learning mechanisms: • Lifelong learning • Learning on the Job o Wider life o As an athlete o As a coach o As a teacher or other training o As a coach developer o Observing others • Reflection o On action o In action o Future action o Further action • Formal learning o Sport NZ o World Rugby o Others Learning the do's and don'ts: • "You know" Vulnerability: • Encouraged to change

	• Forced to watch • Sink or swim • Aligning to others • Agendas • 10 min presentation or other rite of passage actions • Seeking for the way • Social acceptance Still learning: • Interview as reflective intervention • Do I have already mentioned themes here? Power and discipline Confession Validation People who 'get it' Connecting with others Discipline and power: • Questing for your change Contradiction in theoretic: • Person Pedagogies vs Programme Pedagogies
The Sporting Ecosystems' Impact on Coach Developers	• Connecting with others • Discipline and power • Empowerment, positive environment • Validation • People who "get it", "work with the willing" Impression management Multi-layer social issues: • Stuck in the middle • Programme forced on • Conflicting agendas • Lack of agency Wider concerns in sport Sport system change A wide verity of different influences

3.5 Ethical Considerations

In line with ethical approval requirements for this study by The University of Waikato, confidentiality and anonymity for all participants was paramount in this research. All participants received an information sheet which included assurances of confidentiality and a description of their withdrawal rights. Participants were asked to sign the informed consent prior to data collection. Assurances were made that all data would have any identifying factors removed. Several coach developers would not

have openly shared without this safety and trust in the interviewer. All personal identities have been removed, along with aspects of their work lives that would be personal to them. It was important to remove the risk of their identity being compromised through this research, and as a further precaution, a pseudonym was given to each participant. Coach developers reported that they felt reassured and comfortable to have the data shared in this way. A number also commented that they simply trusted the lead researcher to treat it sensitively. All participants were offered the chance to be provided with their own transcripts. All coach developers expressed interest in the findings of this research on its completion.

3.6 Researcher Critique

As a member of this community, I feel that this benefited my ability to communicate, explore and then analyse the data as I have a foot in both the coach developer and coach developer research camps.

In this research I hold a "shared membership" (Hesse-Biber, 2017, p. 134) as a coach developer. Cushion (2014) believed this to "off-set…feelings of aloofness and distance" (p.178), benefitting the research process (Lefebvre et al., 2019; Watts, 2020). The counter side of this is that although it may have aided certain interviews (Crouch and McKenzie, 2006), there is also a risk that others who were interviewed were suspicious or wary of my role, motivation, or agenda.

There was more than one moment when I felt the impact of my role. Of interest were the times I asked questions that participants either did not know the answer to, hadn't considered, or were surprised by. Because of my role I thought it important to note that these moments placed both myself and the participant at risk of feeling exposed. I aimed to mitigate this with supportive body language and comments or confessing that these questions had also caused me a challenge. I was at times concerned that I had asked questions that may have been too challenging or inadequate (Drake and Heath, 2011; Edwards and Holland, 2013), such as: 'what don't coach developers do?'.

As mentioned earlier, critical consideration when facilitating qualitative interviews in the research of human beings is needed as it is not a completely objective or neutral enquiry. In the sharing of the interview experience, it was important to note that I was an emotionally engaged participant in their sharing (Edward and Holland, 2013; Lefebvre et al., 2019, Watts, 2020). It is fair to say that this method has been criticised, and although interviewees' answers can be characterized as 'real world', it is easy to ignore the positionality of the researcher. (Morris, 2015).

It is therefore important that I am aware of my own 'positionality' and the impact this may have. The "researcher is a product of his or her society and its structures and institutions just as much as the

researched" (Hesse-Biber, 2017, p. 134). It is a case of "what should be or is the relationship between researchers, the researched and the research (Edwards and Holland, 2013, p. 11) in terms of what is necessary. Using semi-structured interviews is a process that involves collaboration (Morris, 2015). My position, therefore, has implications for choosing interviews as a method (Morris, 2015), with interviews guided by myself as the interviewer leading to an unequal exchange (Edwards and Holland, 2013). In other words, even though the interviewees did not need me, the method was selected by me, I approached participants, needed interviewees, and selected the research. In this journey "human interaction and negotiation is seen as the basis for the creation and understanding of social life in interpretative approaches, it is the interaction of the participants in the interview situation – researcher and the researched – that creates knowledge" (Edwards and Holland, 2013, p. 17). Unlike Kvale (1996, 2007), who believes that interviews involve a process of co-construction, I sought to prioritise coach developers' views and personal beliefs in this research. Like Watts's (2020) work on coach educators, coach developers were asked to consider, reflect and think about things that they had not previously considered. Even so, interviews are "not conducted for their own sake" (Brinkmann, 2018, p. 580), with power relations a consent in the "dialogue between equal partners" (Brinkmann, 2018, p. 587), so It is important to recognise that this method of research builds on social practices (Brinkmann, 2018). Like many other researchers, I had an agenda, which was of personal gain both from developing a thesis and gaining professional development. However, I wished to promote and allow coach developers' voices to lead the research, not my own. My standing within the field as an experienced and active member of the communities and ecosystems meant that I could be considered an insider: "insider or practitioner research can be seen through this perspective as phronesis, in so far as it produces new ways of knowing which combine both professional and technical knowledge with academic or analytical knowledge" (Drake and Heath, 2011, p. 18). I understand research is not often completed by practitioners in the field, "yet when practitioners do research, they must, despite starting from a position of knowledge and insight into what is important, take extra special care to rebut attacks for not being sufficiently distant and therefore critical" (Drake and Heath, 2011, p. 19; Robey and Taylor, 2018, Watts, 2020). I have throughout my research sought to consider this and adapt to each group, for example using coach developer-friendly language and culturally relevant terms in interviews, as there was no benefit in using language that was distant or disengaging to participants. I was then solely responsible for the translation of these experiences, so need to remain mindful for the many interpretations of these (Brinkmann, 2018; Smith and McGannon, 2018). My position provided me with a high level of control on the reporting and the dominant position on interpretation (Brinkmann, 2018; Robey and Taylor, 2018; Creswell and Creswell, 2018). I sought to

prevent concern by explaining prior to all interviews that answers were not judged and that I was seeking to understand the wider experience of a coach developer's role and journey (Purdy, 2014).

To summarise, what became evident was that there were many complexities to being a practitioner-researcher who was "researching things in situations that one already knows quite a lot about" (Drake and Heath, 2011, p. 20). I was often left grappling with my own practitioner and research identities. However, overall, I felt that my experience as an insider aided in the interviews (Hesse-Biber's, 2017), while the formality of the process meant I was able to explore what might have been taken for granted (Drake and Heath, 2011), even though participants might have their own views and issues (Hesse-Biber, 2017). As explored more thoroughly in chapter four, overall, it appeared that interviews were a learning event for me, the interviewer, and the interviewees as well (Edwards and Holland, 2013), leading to the development of the unexpected. As Braun and Clarke's reflexive thematic analysis this required careful consideration.

3.7 Judging Qualitative Inquiry

Although it remains a contested area (see, for example Tracy, 2010; Sparkes and Smith, 2014; Smith and McGannon, 2018), qualitative research is a well-established means of research for the difference in ontological and epistemological positions between quantitative and qualitative research (Lincoln and Guba, 1985; Guba and Lincoln, 1989). Qualitative research is judged by its dependability, credibility, confirmability, and transferability, establishing the criteria for 'trustworthiness' of qualitative research and is 'judged' by research (Sparkes and Smith, 2014; Smith and McGannon, 2018). The critique of Guba and Lincoln's (1989) suggests it "paid lip service to ontological relativism but on the other hand they espoused epistemological foundationalism in the form of procedures or method to sort out trustworthy and untrustworthy interpretations of reality" (see, Sparkes and Smith, 2009, p. 493; Watts, 2020). Judgement is still problematic for research that is positioned in a relativist ontological space through a fixed and universal view (Sparkes and Smith, 2014; Smith and McGannon, 2018; Braun and Clarke, 2019). Regardless, this research provides new and valuable additions to this field, as it seeks to uncover how coach developers learn to develop coaches. Aiming for new knowledge of coach developers which can add to the discourse while also adding to what little is already known, I did not use constant markers in this endeavour as it would have come unstuck when trying to understand what are "trustworthy interpretations from untrustworthy ones" (Smith and McGannon, 2018, p. 114; Sparkes and Smith, 2009, 2014; Lincoln, 2010). I have aligned to Smith and McGannon (2018), who challenged whether qualitative research should be judged on being "predetermined, permanent and applied to any form of inquiry regardless of its intents and purposes."

These have “given a world of multiple, created, mind dependent realities, and the impossibility of theory-free knowledge, criteria is not ‘out there’ awaiting discovery but socially constructed” (Smith and McGannon, 2018, p. 114) and would have meant universal criteria without consideration by the researcher “to judge qualitative research” (Watts, 2020, p.93) for its intent and purpose and instead against set criteria (Sparkes and Smith, 2009; Smith and McGannon, 2018). Although both cherry-picking and universal criteria can be problematic (Braun and Clark, 2019; Smith and McGannon, 2018), Sparkes and Smith (2014), suggested using some of these eight criteria: credibility, resonance, sincerity, rich rigor, worth topic, ethics, meaningful coherence, significant contribution (Tracy, 2010). These eight seem to encompass how this research will be viewed for its credibility for it rich and rigor, by those who review and read it, as they are most likely to ask questions such as, sacrificially asking whether it is worthy in its fields or sincere in its self-awareness, or others of these eight. When making their judgement I ask that they also consider the epistemological and ontological positions that underpin it (e.g., Smith and McGannon, 2018).

3.8 Conclusion

In this chapter I have aimed to provide a description of the methodological approach I used for this research as well as some comments about the project itself (Creswell and Creswell, 2018). In this study I have sought to understand how coach developers learn to develop coaches. Instead of seeking a universal truth (Crouch and McKenzie, 2006), I have taken a social constructionist position and used semi-structured interviews to explore how coach developers learned and understood their practice. My own role working in the field, coupled with my position as a researcher have had a clear impact on both my ability to access, uncover and interpret the data and can be seen in the following chapters. In what can be a micro-political environment with many complex and competing factors, coupled with the restrictions caused by the global pandemic and its effects on the sporting landscape, I have been able to grow what is understood about coach developers. I have been allowed to bridge two worlds, that of academics and coach developers, I have demonstrated this by being both a research of coach developers and a coach developer, I hope that I have done this justice. Much like the way coaches learn (Jones et al., 2003, 2004; Chesterfield et al., 2010; Nelson et al., 2013; Watts and Cushion, 2016; Townsend and Cushion, 2017; Stodter and Cushion, 2019a), it is not until academics begin to access and engage in understanding the complexities of coach developers’ learning and the ecosystems they inhabit (Watts, 2020), that they begin to understand. This research has aimed to grow this understanding and continue to develop the under-researched area of coach developers in a way that is both informative and a beginning for insight for later research (Hesse-Biber, 2017). In the next chapter I discuss the results of this study as well as several discussion points.

Chapter 4: Results and Discussion

The purpose of this research is to explore the learning and development of coach developers. Despite growing awareness of the importance of coach developers to coaching systems, there is a lack of research that explores how they learn to develop coaches. As such, there is a need to provide a greater understanding of their work and learning, to enhance the means of supporting their professional development. In doing so, this research adds to the literature by exploring the understanding, beliefs and journeys of a group of coach developers from a range of national and regional sporting organisations.

Specifically, my research questions seek to address how New Zealand sports coach developers learn to develop coaches by paying special attention to three components of the participants' reflections. Starting, firstly, with how the coach developers understand their role and what they do day-to-day within their contexts. Secondly, to discover their beliefs about effective practice and success. Then thirdly, how they learned to become a coach developer and the influences on their practices.

In this section I will present the results of this research and my discussion, building an empirical picture of the work, learning and development of the participants. I layer my discussion with interview data and reflexive observations from my field notes and informal conversations generated through sustained immersion in the practice of coach development (e.g., Brasil et al., 2017; Edwards and Holland, 2013; Kvale, 1996, 2007; Watts, 2020). Furthermore, drawing on the resulting analysis, I will identify some of the many opportunities for future research on coach developers and the questions that remain unanswered. Together, this sample of coach developers allows me to examine and understand more about them and the spaces they operate within, against the backdrop of what the current coach development literature suggests. Although there is regular and significant crossover between themes, this section is structured according to three themes, all of which hold sub-themes, with commentary on their interplay and impact. The combination of these themes and the interplay between them form the basis for a critical analysis of coach developers' learning.

4.1 The Role of a Coach Developer

Similar to earlier research examining coaches' role frames (cf. Gilbert and Trudel, 2001), it was obvious from the coach developers' interviews that learning how to develop coaches was an ambiguous

process without a clearly defined set of skills, attributes or knowledge requirements. In entering the role, it was apparent that there was a lack of consensus or clarity about what coach developers needed to 'know' to 'be' a coach developer. Coach developers learn to maintain personal power through storytelling, disciplining of coaches and the avoidance of vulnerability (Foucault, 1977, 1980, 1995; Denison, 2019; Denison and Kindrachuk, 2020). Aligning with evidence internationally (e.g., ICCE, 2014; Stodter and Cushion, 2019), all the participants in this study struggled to define the boundaries of their role, beyond the obvious suggestion to 'develop coaches', suggesting that there is a level of ambiguity framing how they learn to fulfil their role (cf. Bowes and Jones, 2006).

However, participants' understanding of their roles was not always clear. Beginning with a recruitment process that lacked a critical pedagogical grounding:

> "here's an opportunity I think [you] would be great, 'let's do it' type of thing, and I was like fine, I'll give it a go. And then that was kind of part of the process [of recruitment into the role of being a coach developer]." (Taby, netball)

With a lack of theoretical grounding, questions about success and what coach development looks like in the role, created reflective learning interventions (see section 4.2.3). Instead, coach developers had 'reframed' their roles and what they saw as the requirements of the role. The data throughout this theme suggests a number of contradictions in beliefs and practice (Bruner, 1999), which is understandable given the lack of role clarity expressed by the participants. When asked to define the boundaries of their role, many participants struggled to provide a clear answer which was summed up by John:

> "I don't know what they [coach developers] don't do. Don't know."

This was supported by many of the coach developers with Ronald saying:

> "I don't think there is anything they [coach developers] couldn't do or wouldn't do unless it is outside of their moral and ethical boundaries."

Taby commented:

> "OK, when you ask that question, what does a coach developer do? What are we talking about? Are we talking about an effective coach developer? Are we talking about me as a coach developer? I feel like coach development is not a one size fits all. Every coach developer is different in everything."

Here, Taby alluded to several competing factors that defined her role, including individual beliefs about what constitutes success, understanding the coaches' needs, understanding the organisational

needs and the contexts and purpose of a given interaction. While the wider needs of her sporting bodies, both national and regional, and trying to identify what Sport New Zealand refers to as 'what hat she is wearing' could also be interpreted in Taby's understanding of an effective coach developer. As such, she defines a coach developer's role as not being 'one size fits all', which further reinforces her awareness of the ambiguous nature of the role. In contrast, John described his role as that of a "connector" for "opportunities" between the needs of the coach, the group and sport.

> "I don't know. It's so contextual…I think a coach developer is just, they're just a connector. They connect coaches with opportunities to learn, or just create connects or... I see my role as just connecting people. Meeting their needs enabling them to reach their potential, if they're proactive, and I also see myself as a guardian of the game."

Participants had learned to retain personal power and relevance by using person-centred intentions to build relationships of mutual need that allowed the coach developers to question and challenge coaches. It was not uncommon for methods of disciplining coaches, such as, 'challenging' them to change aspects of their coaching and aligning them to the programmes to be used to discipline coach developers, athletes, or coaching communities, through questioning or challenging them to develop through conforming or the development of new logic. This logic of 'best practice' typically followed the governing bodies principles and was shared by participants in the stories. The sharing of stories with coaches, which placed coach developers as the holders of knowledge and power through sharing their knowledge and validation of what good coaching is viewed as. In other words, participants used anecdotes to reflect a 'hidden curriculum' (Cushion and Jones, 2014), that 'recreate' reflective coaches. Telling coaches stories of practice, reduced the risk of losing personal power, being disciplined, or making themselves vulnerable. This was a key aspect of what they had learned as effective for coach learning and served the coach developers' purpose of reducing their ambiguity as they shared stories from their experiences. Ryan explains it this way:

> "I think instead of telling them, I can tell them a story… it will either help them or it might not."

In conceptualising their role, the participants discursively constructed their practice according to a number of principles. These are outlined in the following section.

4.1.1 Being Comfortable, Being Uncomfortable

A number of participants described being 'comfortable' or 'uncomfortable' as crucial in learning and improving their practice. Kate describes how feeling uncomfortable affected her first impressions of the role:

> " I think in the beginning I remember always feeling judged."

Typically, participants focused on how to achieve positive feedback from coaches, affirmation from or alignment to people in power, as well as support for themselves while they learned. Participants described becoming 'comfortable' with the multitude of people influencing their role.

> "Like he [Sport New Zealand coach developer] would come along, and it give me feedback. My manager at [sporting organisation 1] and then [Coach developer 1] would come along. Give me feedback. [coach developer 2] who was the [sporting organisation 2] manager at the time like most of my early workshops for that [sporting organisation 2] minimum standards so he [Coach developer 2] was always there. Would chat about things after and that would really help going forward for next time so… it's utilizing help and then, I also think I put in place a reflection process." (Dylan, Volleyball, Rugby, Sport New Zealand Trainer).

Although it has been suggested that the role of a coach developer is to 'accelerate' coach learning (ICCE, 2014), this was not how participants described their role focus, nor what led to long term success or upward mobility within the coach development landscape. Many coach developers identified success in their role as spending time with and growing and maintaining relations with those in power. Noticeably, participants who were most intricately connected to those with the most power in their sporting ecosystem, such as Sport New Zealand's Coaching consultants, were those who experienced the least vulnerability and were least affected by the impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic. Regardless of success in the role, experience or qualification, connection to those with power had the largest impact on coach developers in this study and what they spent their time doing. This matches personal observations over my career as a practitioner, where coach developers who experience the least vulnerability and are fastest to rise in coaching system power structures are the coach developers most connected to the powerful. These connections, which often form a relationship of mutual advantage, had led to many coach developers regarding this as a key part of their role. In my role as a practitioner, a major New Zealand sporting bodies coaching leader – who had recently attended the ICCE coach developer training – and supported Sport New Zealand in coach developer training and coach development programme leadership and creation described to me that they no longer develop coaches. Instead, they defined their role as working with those in power. In essence, they believe their

role to be not about the coaches or participant-centred models that their national body promoted, but instead about the growth, development, retention, and maintenance of power with Sport New Zealand's dominant social narratives. In field notes Kate, and other coach developers I connect with as a practitioner described experiencing a complete disconnect between this national bodies coaching systems and the needs of the coaches they work with. Many of those who did not align have not retained roles as coach developers. The Covid-19 pandemic enhanced and accelerated how coach developers experienced and valued this. Dom shared how he viewed the impact on his career:

> "Oh, hundred percent it's been spending time with [Sport New Zealand Coaching consultant], yeah, that [was] by far that would be the best PD [personal development] I've had in my whole career as a coach developer, I think."

Taby described how much she valued support in learning how to deliver Netball New Zealand coach development programs from Kate a trainer of coach developers for Sport New Zealand:

> "Kate has honestly helped me so much, she's amazing. I guess with coach development, it's a very hard skill to learn."

Ryan also described how much difference it made once he was able to align to a powerful role:

> "For me, probably the one guy. Actually, having, when [Sport New Zealand's Sport Development Manager] reached out and said look, please use me, and that we can use a two-pronged [approach], that actually made a massive difference."

A consistent finding in parallel coaching research is that it is a micro-political landscape where coaches need to negotiate different conflicts, powers and develop cooperation (Potrac and Jones, 2009). Much like research by Allanson, Potrac, and Nelson (2019), Kate shared one of her early experiences of how the micro-politics impacted her practice. With coaches providing a bottom-up power that changed and affected her understanding of the role and her practices as a coach developer. While she negotiated how top-down power from national coaching programs held sway of her thoughts and actions as she leads her 'class' (Foucault, 1977, 1980, 1991, 1995; Denison, 2007):

> "In every kind of workshop, you get feedback. So that became, unfortunately, that became my focus for a little because I was so obsessed with reading the feedback because I then wanted to obviously make those improvements. You know, and had to go through that, oh really, I talked too much, you know, you're taking on those kinds of comments and you know at first, they hit you in the heart, but then you grow a harder shell. And you learn to actually, you look at those negatives. I found myself over a couple of years, I went for the negatives rather than going for the compliments all the time. I'd go straight to the negative and go, so

> really I learnt to put my emotions to the side, base it on the facts and actually, reflect on my class that I'd given and actually, yes, I could have done that better and that was really great, it was a good learning for me."

This data is suggestive of a level of vulnerability, particularly related to coaches' perceptions of them. In learning to be 'comfortable being uncomfortable' led to many questioning the systems they were part of or looking at how they could change them and their roles. They either found the systems inadequate and unclear or exposed the participants to conflicts and contradictions which placed additional stress on coach developers who may have different areas of power pushing different messages of what was valid learning and delivery methods. To avoid vulnerability and confusion, much like the Bernsteinian concepts of framing (1975, 1981, 2000) which have since been applied to coach development (Dempsey, Cope, Richardson and Cronin, 2021; Dempsey, Richardson, Cope, and Cronin, 2020; Griffiths, Armour, and Cushion, 2018; Williams and Bush, 2019), Simon suggests that to achieve a sustainable role, coach development policy change is required to frame this process differently:

> "It's a policy issue, I think that countries that want to be successful in [Sport] have sustainable coaching practice and you know that they create policies and now they put minimum bandwidths of salaries in place. They put minimum qualification criteria in place. Right, you know they put those systems and structures so that there's a standard, right? I can't go be an architect without an architectural degree, right? But we can have coaches that are athletes that all of a sudden become national team coaches and they have no background other than the fact that they were an athlete, right? So, you know. We don't have those systems. The systems to support that and in certification, isn't the be all and end all, but I do think it's part of an important piece around organizations having capable competent coaches".

The professionalisation of coaching, had particular implications for coach developers establishing the need to gain professional accreditation and professional support. When asked how he chose what to do and what not to do, Simon further described how unusual it is for policy to provide a secure role in coach development. Elaborating on what one might look like, and how much this challenges those in power and the reproductive nature of the coaching landscape before confessing it has led him to leave his role:

> "But the reality is, you know, those situations [where policy supports the coach developer] are pretty, pretty rare, or again, they would be more academically based if I'm at a university teaching, doing research, still doing some consulting in sport. … There's a much broader value position in that as opposed to just being the coach developer, right? So, it's [being a coach

> developer] a very narrow value position, right? That actually reflects really what we [Sporting Organizations] think about coaching, and it fits nice and neat, right? And then when it doesn't start to fit neat, that some people start to get challenged [and roles] get lost…I look around now. People who work in coaching and I just don't know how they do it."

Ken also challenges how Sport New Zealand defines the role of a coach developer. Sport New Zealand leadership influence's role descriptions for coach developers throughout most of New Zealand's major sporting organizations. This descriptor emphasises coach developers as leading coach education and development workshops and one on one coach observations. Those organisations that follow this model believe that it has a wider impact on improving regional or national coaching practice:

> "So, I would say that [the coach developer] model, that intermittently 'one on one' [with a coach] model, is probably the best for impact, especially if you're skilled in the way you operate with that one person if it is very questions-based and self-led and participation-centred, you can have quite a big impact, [be]cause everyone's needs are so different, so you can go on tangent where they either want to go or need to go. So, whereas the opposite end of the spectrum where you just get a whole, heaps of people in a room and give them a whole heap of content which is not going to hit everyone…., I'm challenging, [that role definition] …it's not a suitable model unless people are willing to pay corporate prices just so I can put bread on the table. So, when you start to think like that, you start challenging [Sport New Zealand's role definition], you question the bang for buck."

Participants commonly described 'questioning' Sport New Zealand's definition or developing different aspects of the role as they strove for promotion or to "elevate" themselves in the sporting system. This was something that many of the participants had achieved in one way or another and was a common aspiration. In this sense, while it was an influential role, coach development was seen as a 'steppingstone' to further progression. When asked how he knows he has been successful, Ken explained his ambition:

> "Working with sports and coach developers rather than coaches, so your influence is wider...and increasing the army of people."

For some participants, coach development was not seen as a viable or stable career:

> "Now being a coach developer in [Athletics] …Like personally, I just I don't see a career there…What I want to be able to do with a career is to do the job, get paid well so I can spend time and get enough money to do the cool shit that I want to do outside of work, right? So, the

next logical step for me, things that allow me to do that, is move into a role above other coach developers."

Ronald has just achieved a promotion that allows him to do that. He has succeeded in doing what many coach developers learned to appreciate, which was to follow personal motivation in learning "what works" for them.

Participants saw no value in the role and received little kudos for their actions leading them to seek out and strive to achieve personal objectives such as Ronald's promotion. This had widespread impact on how they learned and understood the role of a coach developer.

This created a high level of vulnerability and ambiguity for participants that often resulted in a search for validations and cherry-picked learning theory, that produced contradiction in their role descriptions, their own beliefs, or caused them to act in contradiction to the role description, meaning actions were often at odds with the learning programme's intention. This fed into the general level of ambiguity about their role and what learning they required to be effective coach developers. The impacts of personal biography, relationship management, and the effect of power on coach developers' roles is a topic for future investigation.

Out of the eleven participants, all had taken steps to change their role in coach development by 'elevating' themselves by either working with fewer coaches and focusing on leading coach developers and/or aligning themselves and their time to more high achieving coaches. This is worth further discussion and research on the risks that may be associated with coach developers targeting higher profile coaches or coaches of high achieving athletes, and with coach developers looking to gain favour with those who can support their job promotion. Because of the ambiguity and the vulnerability inherent in the role, participants looked to find ways for change or redefine the role. Whether it was finding common ground while being true to themselves - with people who could help them get ahead - or by navigating through the ambiguity by redefining their role to someone who was striving to find and grow a larger "army of people" (Ken), coach developers understood their roles as short term, undervalued, and about personal growth and satisfaction.

4.1.2 Thin Air Example: when others aren't there for comparison

Despite the reliance on peer support networks for generating an understanding of their role (see 2.a above), many participants spoke about the isolation they experienced as the sporting communities that they served looked to them for answers. Many of the coach developers had ascended their regional or national coach development ladder and were solely responsible for the delivery of multiple

coach education programmes, developing coaches, interpreting content, and understanding contextual needs. However, due to the lack of professional development support for the coach developers, there were fewer opportunities for mentoring, guidance, or support in their roles:

> "So, I really had no extra guidance or mentoring in reflections, you know, actually that extra support, there was nothing…we've never been through that live experience before. We've always came, you know, we've always come together into a one or two day coach developer training. But it's not life. It's not with coaches. It's not real scenarios." (Kate, Netball)

Their status as coach developers meant that, for many, they were asked to stand on the 'top' of the coaching system, responsible for the development of the sporting workforce, yet the lack of professional development and peer support left them vulnerable, isolated, and trying to make meaning of an ambiguous landscape. For example, John reflected on his initial entry into his role:

> "Man, if I did it like ten years ago. Holy…, cringe, but, that's life, I guess you just get better at what you do the more you do it. I guess it probably took me [so] long because I didn't have the support." (John, Rugby)

4.1.3 Vulnerable

The Covid-19 pandemic and resulting 'lockdowns' brought with it unprecedented changes across the sport sector, magnifying the vulnerability that coach developers already faced by increasing organisational instability (Grusky, 1960; Soebbing, Wicker and Weimar, 2015). All the participants were affected by the impacts of wider changes in the sporting ecosystems that claimed to highly value them and the coaches they serve. Furthermore, six participants lost or left full-time roles over the course of this research. Ken explained how the vulnerable nature of the role leads to high staff turnover, creating a focus on socialising new coach developers into the role and coach development structures that play lip service when acting on coach developer training in situ:

> [There is] "a big focus on getting a lot of people [Coach Developers trained]. You were there the other day, we got twenty odd people doing it and [Rugby] has a turnover of about twenty odd percent of their staff turnover every year. So out of those twenty-odd people in the room, probably twelve to fifteen of them will be here, still in those same roles [or any role in rugby] next year. And out of those twelve to fifteen how many are actually going to do any [Coach Development]. So, you [Rugby] put all that investment into them but what do they [trained coach developers] actually do?... I'm probably one of those rare specimens [coach developers] that did the [coach developer training] course and [is] still living and breathing it and, creating

> and still heavily engaged in [being a coach developer] investing and doing it, you know. And really, still heavily engaged and invested in doing it [coach development], you know… it [getting qualified as a coach developer] wasn't just the ticket."

As such, it is unsurprising that this theme runs throughout and underpins much of what was learned about how coach developers learn their roles. Reflecting on my own experience entering the coach developer role, of the cohort from my first Sport New Zealand Coach Developer training programme I am one of only two of the 16 attendees who are still involved in coach development. The socialisation of coach developers through events such as, profession development workshops, was something observed by me many times when observing the coach developers in action over this research. Although the high turnover rate was often not spoken about in the interviews as directly affecting participant understanding of their roles, it was talked about in more practical terms, such as this comment:

> "I think having lost a few of those guys [coach developers] to the system [s lack of funding] and to the network [finding different other roles in sport], you know, it becomes more important the next one [coach developer training] we do. Because we are likely to have to include a few more [new coach developers]." (Ryan, Cricket)

After socialisation into the role of a coach developer, participants sought the development of symbolic capital (Bourdieu, 1989) or the value a person gains within a culture from, prestige, honour, and recognition. This directly contributed to and led to the reproduction and production of culturally accepted coach development ideologies and discourses, which were often neither reflective, nor critical (Watt, 2020). In other words, the role was to grow and maintain the power of leading coach developers' success such as Sport New Zealand's coaching consultants or national sporting bodies' coaching leads. Leading coach developers have a vested interest in maintaining and controlling particular bodies of knowledge (Cushion et al., 2017). For example, participants were socialised into a language and set of actions that reinforced their vulnerability. When explaining this, participants commonly described themselves as valuing the learning, growth or development that came from "being stretched", "challenged" or "pushed" "out of their comfort zone". My field notes and wider observations are that coach developers actively avoid vulnerability and seek safety and the safety of social capital. Ronald shares his observations of this:

> "The thing is, we know, I know people who are like that [focus on being stretched] and I am one of them, who up until this point has been all about growth and getting better. I mean it just wrecks you."

4.1.4 Micro-political Literacy, Emotional Labour and Precarious Work

Although 'participant-centred' learning is a commonly accepted discourse within the coach developer community and for the participants in this research (e.g. Rodrigue and Trudel, 2020; Rowley and Lester, 2016; Milistetd et al, 2020), what is shown here is the toll that this takes on the role of a coach developer, who must not only aim to learn and then connect to individual coaches' needs, but also learn how to effectively lead coach development in a range of different social and cultural coaching settings. This area is not well understood, nor has it received enough researched attention. However, research in coaching guides us towards exploring emotional labour (e.g., Cox and Bachkirova, 2020; Darrington-Murphy, 2020; García López, and Kirk, 2021) and the precarious nature of the work (aka, Gilmore, Wagstaff, and Smith, 2018). This suggests that there is a high level of micro-political (Potrac and Jones, 2009; Potrac et al, 2020; Allanson et al, 2019) literacy required by regional and national coach developers to survive and thrive in their work within the coaching communities they serve.

John identifies taking the time to learn about the coaches, their needs and how to create ongoing connections as key to success:

> "So, making sure you're taking the time to respect and cater for their needs, and to know what their needs are, [be]cause quite often you can just rock into a course, and you don't actually know who is in the room, and whatever you're pitching is at the wrong level. I know who I'm dealing with beforehand, and I meet their needs and learn a bit more about them during the course and get some connection with them afterwards, then yeah, I get the sense that that's been successful."

Once working in these coaching communities, participants described learning how to be reactive or "freestyle" and knowing what to look for when "navigating" a room of coaches. This was common among participants.

- "Definitely when people are writing, if I catch them going quiet, but it's a good quiet, because they're thinking. They're deep in thought. They might ask really good questions. They make contact afterwards. They come back (laughs). And they continue, so they take up other opportunities." (Kate, Netball)
- "That's kind of gut feel, I suppose. I suppose you kind of do it a few times until you overstep the mark, and then you kind of [go], OK, I probably shouldn't have." (Oscar, Cricket)
- "I guess, ongoing connection, so like a little measure for me is relationships I build. So, if I've built relationships with someone I've met through a coaching course and they can come up to

me on the side-line and [say] good ah, and shake my hand, or ask me questions or send me an email or reach out to me, I view that as success." (John, Rugby)

For many, the 'outcome' of successful coach development meant bringing a successful, positive learning environment to life for the coaches.

- "Well, I see it, to deliver an awesome experience for kids, an experience where they are engaged, they are having fun, they are learning, and our role is to help coaches be better to be able to do that." (Ken, Rugby)
- "Coaches love it man. That's the feedback I get often. I love it when we talk about this stuff and then you can relate it to something we have seen, and then you can relate it to something in a contextual manner. So, being able to provide proper good stories around that in a good manner is pretty key." (Ronald, Athletics)

Even so, this caused several issues, including contrasting methods of delivery inside sessions, programme goals, and coach developer actions, a focus on entertainment or edutainment (Griffiths et al, 2018) and personally having a good time, and pedagogies that were contradictory, cherry-picked, and most commonly, at odds with the programme's design and the explicit aims of the coach developer training they had received. These points were noted by some of the participants, although many did not recognize these issues.

An example is how John explains looking to his personal connections and their feedback on the experience:

> "I view that [coach connection] as success. Because a) I have potentially just created a connection where they may value how I interact with them, or support them, on or off the field. So that would be a measure of success. Another measure of success would be feedback, we just do like simple feedback forms, or we do a little Post-it Note exercise."

Dylan testifies:

> "You have conversations with people. I guess you know. Also like the number of people who stay behind after a workshop to continue talking and, you know, I guess those kinds of informal measures all give you an indication. Like Oh yeah, that triggers something to these people. Yeah, emails, you get phone calls your people returning to workshops, that kind of thing."

Ryan provides insight into how he attempts to understand a successful session and debates what success could be.

> "It's a difficult situation, because how do you know after your session and people haven't got it that they might get it in weeks' time, or two weeks' time, three months' time? So, do we judge on whether your session has been successful, or not, on hundred percent of the people got it, or ten percent of the people got it after your session. You know, it's a difficult one, and you know I don't know, I'm probably guilty [be]cause I'll keep measuring and question, and I want to leave the session and they have understood it. But I think if they don't, I don't beat myself up about it if there is a few people that don't. [Be]cause, I think to myself and think, 'well, I only got it three months later, you know. If they don't get it now, maybe they will get it three months later, or a week later, or whatever'."

Dylan adds:

> "They enjoyed the interaction. It triggered something and then they, [it] got them thinking, but did it actually change their behaviour?"

The lack of clarity created a precarious working role were the emotional labour led coach developers to seek to grow their power by navigating micro political wins. The development of coach developer power can be viewed as contradicting and conflicting with coach-centred intentions (e.g., Zehntner and McMahon, 2018). The most common contradiction came in the belief held by many coach developers that:

- "We don't tell people what to do" (Adam, Parkour)
- "They [coach developers] certainly don't tell you what you need to do" (Dom, Rugby League)
- "I think what they have got to do is see how they can apply that, so we might challenge them to see how they can apply that tool in their environment, rather than telling them how to do it in their environment… so it wouldn't be up to me to be telling them how to use it in their environment" (Ryan, Cricket)
- "For me, it's not about telling them what to do" (Taby, Netball)
- "So, we're not telling coaches what to do. We are asking them" (Taby, Netball)

Both Taby and Dom went to great lengths to explain how they would avoid creating an environment where coaches who did not align to the beliefs of the coach developer or the programme were "challenged" or "questioned" until they changed, until they "got it" or "adapted" their answers and showed the coach developer that they had "got it". Although coach developers were well intentioned in their efforts to empower coaches, in the use of their power to aid coaches understand "the philosophy", this could be problematic. Instead of seeking to create a self-surveying, competent workforce (e.g. Downham and Cushion, 2020), participants had learned to question coaches with the

intent of creating a reflective learning opportunity for coach learning (Stodter, Cope, and Townsend, 2021).

Participants also described what they viewed as the 'darker' side, that is, top-down programme intentions and personal agendas that contrasted with person-centred design intentions. This involved the practice of questioning used by participants as a form of power over coaches, who were expected to answer as the coach developer wanted in a process akin to disciplining (e.g., Downham and Cushion, 2020) or pushing coaches. This was, in effect, a method of telling the coach what they were expected to answer. Participants saw this as a highly effective model. Dom and Taby provide detailed accounts into the use of this method, which was also present in many other accounts.

Taby shares an example of how this can look in a coaching workshop, while providing an insight into how she has aligned her ideologies to those in power:

> "So, when I've got a coach in front of me who is saying, 'I'm only going to put my strongest team on, every week', I know what the philosophy is that we are trying to teach, which has come from [Netball New Zealand], so it's from top down, but I believe in the philosophy myself. And I've experienced how effective it is, in action. So, when I've got a coach in front of me saying that I'm going to say, 'um, does all your team, are they all on the same page with [this]? Do they only want the strongest team to play? Do they want to be standing on the side-line? What do you think is going to be fun, for them? Is it going to be that they get to pass and catch the ball less often [be]cause there is more or less players on the court? Is it going to be they get to try the positions because you're constantly rotating the players? What's going to be fun for them?' And usually, ninety-nine percent of the time they will say, 'yea, of course, less players on court is better [be]cause they get to pass and catch the ball more often'. You know, they say exactly what I want to say, pretty much. And it just comes back to the philosophy in that situation… [be]cause they're owning it as their own idea."

As Taby navigates the micro political landscape, she provides an example that contrasts with not telling the coach what to do:

> "So, there is a bit of knowledge sharing in terms of the facts and experience from the coach developers to the coaches…So it's validating their experiences or their hard whatever, or whatever that looks like, and then just trying to bring them back on track."

Dom contradicts himself as he explains that coach developers don't tell coaches what to do, before sharing how he would tell them instead how he has done it:

> "They [coach developers] don't tell you. They educate you, but they don't tell you. You make up your own mind afterwards. How well they educate you will determine whether or not you have a different perspective on it. But they certainly don't tell, and off the back of that, they certainly don't enforce their views onto you or impose their views, and in some ways, there is a time and a place to use your own stories as examples. This is how I do it, or this is the best way, they have got to be very careful with their language. And if anything, mate, they don't give up. How, how contradicting is that. They don't tell you, but they don't give up either."

Dom goes on to describe:

> "I've learnt how to, I learnt how to persuade you into thinking a different way."

Participants often understood their role as navigating micro political challenges to reduce their emotional labour and the precarious nature of their work by passing accountability on to the coaches they worked with. "[Be]cause they're owning it as their own idea" (Taby) and "you make up your own mind afterwards" (Dom). To achieve this, participants had learned that imposing their ideas, learning how to increase their power and influence over coaches while they are working with coaches by challenging or questioning and sharing their own stories as "the best way". Although there is limited evidence to suggest that this is an effective method of developing the coach, multi-level research that includes the voices of coaches is required to understand the impact. Ken tells a story about his observation of the effectiveness of the current approaches to the role:

> "New Zealand Rugby came in and goes, "shit, that was the best level two programme I have ever seen. It was like the participants were engaged, it was, you know, participant-centred, it was, you know, that was fun, that was, you know, it was excitement. It was energy, there was coaches coaching coaches, it was off the charts, and then [I] went, and bloody went and saw some of these coaches in action and actually you [they] were as shit as you [they] were when you bloody arrived… that [coaching] workshop which was supposably the best that this guy had ever seen, and he has been around a long time."

Ronald goes further saying:

> I did enjoy it, but I just don't think it's worth it at the moment… [as a] coach developer, like people we have the barriers up man, and they're reluctant to change, and they've already got these preconceived ideas about the people who run coach development within New Zealand. It's hard to change that."

This requires a much wider exploration with research and understanding, building on the work by Zehntner and McMahon (2018). Questioning the training and development elements of coach

development programmes and asking bigger questions of how coaches and coach developers combined to engage coach-centered programme design intentions. The participants gave consistent descriptions of the four needs of their roles. These are to:

- Negotiate the contrast in programme designs.
- Apply what they had formally learned.
- Apply what they had learned that was required when working with coaches.
- How to hold power and avoid vulnerability to coaches using reflection tools adapted into coach disciplining techniques.

A lack of regular development-focused interactions on the job could be described as the difference between what coach developers were taught to do and how they developed their practice, with a marked difference between the two. With coach developers' professional development contexts most often taking place away from coaches and their teams, what was taught and what was required in the field frequently did not match the holistic needs of the coach developer or the coaches they worked with.

4.2 Coach Developer Learning

A number of studies have pointed to the lifelong learning process framing coach developers (e.g. Ciampolini, et al. 2020; Dohme, et al. 2019; Brasil, et al. 2018), with particular attention drawn to problem-based learning (e.g. Jones and Turner 2006) or overcoming issues that arose from their practice, either with or alongside a community of practice (e.g. Stoszkowski and Collins 2014). High value was placed on mentoring (e.g. Sawiuk et al. 2017), reflection (e.g. Knowles et al. 2001, Kuklick et al. 2015) and experiential in-situ practice (e.g. Cronin and Lowes 2016).

A significant amount of coach developers' beliefs about their role were established prior to gaining the role (Stodter and Cushion, 2017). Participants shared that they had not aspired to become a coach developer. Although the coach developers described developing their skills, growing in their knowledge, and changing their practical application, many of them either 'fell into' the role or took the opportunity to work in coach development as it presented itself. Participants had come from coaching backgrounds, having "elevated" themselves in the coaching systems to become coach developers who were entrusted with developing coaches nationally or regionally. Dylan shares his early coaching aspirations:

> "if you had asked me, I would have said I wanted to be the All Black's coach one day."

While Ronald explains how becoming a coach developer provided a career advancement in coaching:

> "[I] was almost shoulder-tapped a little bit from some of those other external to almost say 'hey, come and do this to help you out, come and help us out with this', and then once I got alongside some of the right people, kind of just, the rest kind of happened…I am almost being forced into a role there at the moment [Athletics New Zealand] in regard to my role here as a coach developer, here at [coach education institution] that is ultimately driven by my boss." Ronald later explains, "Man, it was simply just a next step forward career-wise."

While Kate explains why she was invited to take the role:

> "I guess I was this coach in the room that just loved…I was just so in love with that space [coaching], and I guess that's why she had invited me to take up the role."

Learning the role of a coach developer, participants were dependent on personal biography and the ability to navigate power dynamics and relationships with those in their career and social settings.

The ambiguity framing the coach developers' role (see section 4.1) led to a process of socialisation into the prevailing culture of coach development, inclusive of sets of norms, values and a particular language associated with the practice. Simon, a national bodies coach developer and someone who has held a number of roles globally in coach development, explained:

> "I don't think I ever formally learned to develop coaches… I don't think that the intent in my career or my practice was to have ever learned to develop coaches."

This had two unsurprising outcomes that had a direct effect on coach developers. Firstly, developing and learning on the job through a process of trial and error was common with coach developers, who highly prized time on the job to experience delivering and discovering what worked for them in the role. The high value placed on in context trial and error learning provided two noticeable insights. One, reminiscent of research on multi-layer coach development programmes (Stodter and Cushion, 2019; Culver et al, 2019) found that coach developer training was not providing effective development of what coach developers believe to be required to meet their relational, social or contexts needs. Two, much like research by Cushion, Stodter and Clarke (2021), participants produced a dominant discourse of linear learning which was unproblematic and out of context and used mechanistic processes where coaches were positioned as experiential learners, who instead focus on 'what worked'. Critical thinking, innovation and creativity was replaced by self-surveillance that supported the construction of coach docility (Foucault, 1977; Cushion et al, 2021). Research by Cushion, Stodter and Clarke (2021) show reproductive power relations developed between the holders of knowledge (coach developers) and recipients of knowledge (participant coaches). These findings match my field notes from

participants in action, my experience with the coach developers in the field, and participants' reflections. As they sought to grow 'comfortable' and avoid vulnerability, participants presented themselves and their roles as those who were knowledgeable, facilitating knowledge to flow between coaches who were the recipients of the knowledge.

Dylan provides an example as he reflects on how he negotiates this in coaching workshops:

> "You're needing, you're kind of navigating through that where the people at the group wanna take things, but sometimes they miss something that's really important and you've got to in step, that [what the coaches "missed"] step back into that. No, no, I'm the expert and this is something I think you really need to understand and really need to know. So that is what I mean by that positive and negative reinforcement, but it's a constant kind of judging of like, where is the group at. Right? Is this landing? Yep, cool, let's move on. Or no, it's not. Let's [take] a different track or not. [or telling coaches] I think we really need to like spend a little bit more time getting, getting deeper on this."

Much like Cushion, Stodter and Clarke (2021), Dom describes how the creation of self-surveillance, and the creation of docility makes coaches who have been 'persuaded' into thinking differently from how he knows he has learned to develop coaches:

> "You can pick it up in the coaching course, yeah. But then when they start thinking and talking differently then start talking a different language. You kind of think Oh yeah, cool. I've got something here. I've learnt how to, I learnt how to persuade you into thinking, a different way. Um, so yeah. The results. The results tell. And I guess too from when they do let you know about the results. Just the fact that they're coming back to you. That, that's another thing as well. You know that it's …that they report it. Trust that relationship that networking that coach developers should be really good at. "

Many of the participants began their role as coach developers with little or no training in how to develop coaches. Their lack of experience in coach development meant that early experiences came from informal learning environments this process often began with their experiences of receiving coach education, and informed their personal beliefs of what would 'work' in their sporting context (i.e. their practice theories). As such, the coach developers commonly described a need for continual learning - often through a process of trial and error:

> "Maybe that's why it took 10 years to develop something. I think my approach is one of that kind of 'we are all in this together. I'm a practitioner and I'm still learning'. I end up learning different kinds of things." (Adam, interview)

> "I would describe myself as an unfinished product for sure. I would describe myself as, for me the more I get into the role the more I realise there is so much subjectivity and so much nuance to it, so I think I'm always striving to do better in it knowing that there is probably, you know, like there is no, when I say unfinished product, I don't think there is a finished product." (Dylan, interview)

All the participants had received some form of formal learning or professional development as a coach developer after taking on their job. The levels of professional development available for the participants differed according to their role and institutional context. However, a number of participants completed training in the form of the Sport New Zealand Coach Developer Trainer Programme (discussed in chapter 2), while others had been part of sport-specific programmes such as the World Rugby Coach Educator course, or regional coach developer training delivered through Regional Sports Organisations. While different in scope and content, together these programmes introduced ideas, practices and norms associated with the role of a coach developer – similar to a process of socialisation - under the watchful eye of trainers such as myself who are in turn socialised by the powerful few, such as Sport New Zealand coach development staff. Despite the multitude of actors contributing to the landscape of coach development in New Zealand, Sport New Zealand occupy a powerful position in shaping and disseminating a shared language of coach development. The national trainer programme, for example, includes a number of artifacts (Vygotsky, 1978) of learning such as to act as theoretical tools and sensitising concepts for coach developers. These include, for example, the LEARNS and REVIEW models, 'levels of perspective', De Bono's 'six hats' and the importance of 'shared mental models'. For example, Dom described attending the Sport New Zealand Coach Developer Program as having a powerful impact on his practice:

> "I kind of took on a different persona. Before I had the lightbulb moment, I felt as though I had to be the expert, so my personality was a little bit different… I knew how to develop after I've been through coach developer [training]."

However, once coaches left these programmes, they returned to their contexts and had to navigate what was expected from the 'top down' while continuing to meet what they perceived their coaches' needs to be. As such, the coach developers were inserted into complex networks of power involving various individuals and organisations responsible for establishing the culture of coach development. Despite the provision of formal training programmes however, the coach developers were forced to rely on experience to refine and shape their practice. For example, Kate's emphasised that the process of learning 'your own way' through practice was critical:

> "It's like getting your learner's licence, then you've just got to go in there and do the hours. Just drive, drive, drive, and that's what I felt like I was doing. I was out there just delivering all the time and that's really important in terms of learning."

In similar research on coach learning (e.g. Young and Collin, 2004; Cronin and Lowes, 2016; Cushion, 2020; Kuklick and Kasales, 2020), participants emphasised the crucial role of experience in learning their roles, which led many coach developers to express a level of personal vulnerability in 'doing' their role. For example:

> "I'm talking to coaches who have been doing it for a hell of a lot longer than I have, who am I to tell them how to coach? You know. I just remember absolutely bricking it. [I] probably had that feeling, not as strong, but that really nervous feeling for the first couple of years that I was in that job. But it gave me so many runs on the board. Like I reckon on average, across the six years, I probably ran one workshop a week for six years. You know, so that is fifty-two times six so that's up over three hundred workshops, that's just my loose calculations; it might be bit more than that, I'm not sure. So, it gave me so many different rehearsals to work out what I think worked for that role that suited my personality and, so it was [a] pretty good time for me to just get lots of reps in that role." (Dylan)

As Ronald explains, coach developers were responsible for the delivery of coach development while they were learning their craft on the job. When asked about the impact of what they had learned in the past that had influenced them as a coach developer, on the job learning was highly prized, especially early in their careers. Dylan simplistically explains this process:

> "A lot of it is, it was learning on the job. To be perfectly honest."

While Taby agrees:

> "I learn a lot…on the job."

Ryne suggests he did this without support and has settled on his own approach through on the job application:

> "Did it myself a different way, and I think it's [affective] …., I've kind of settled."

Adam agrees, adding he has found learning on the job as a coach also help him learn 'what worked' as a coach developer:

> "Practical opportunities to test and train alongside other coaches… it's been coaching development."

Although in reflection, many participants highly valued the learning that they had on the job this process often was neither planned, nor simplistic to recreate. John himself describes his early learning:

> "I guess for me the learning, like, was informal, mainly informal in the early days."

While Simon credits the informal learning, from spending time with a wide variety of coaches with providing him with a necessary understanding of "how coaches operate":

> "So, I think having those conversations early on across different disciplines with different coaches of different nationalities, gave me a really good depth and breadth of, of understanding of how coaches operate along a continuum."

It was noticeable in both my conversations with coach developers and interviews that coach developers often glorified and valued these "reps". However, Dylan sheds light on the challenges and vulnerability (for more see 4.1.3) that arose in learning from doing:

> "that was I guess my baptism of fire into working with coaches…I was just nervous, man was I nervous, like holy shit, like I was just packing myself… It was just a lot of repetition of delivering workshops. That was the best learning I ever had, [be]cause I was chucked in the deep end and I just do it and reflect on it, and do it again and reflect on it… So, it's a shitload repetition."

It was interesting to note that although many participants claimed to value this learning and credit it with improving their practice. Participants sort to 'elevate' themselves into positions of power that did not include significate delivery of face-to-face coach development (See section 4).

The combination navigating an ambiguous and complex role only added to the need for trial and error, this created a reliance on personal biography (Ciampolini, et al. 2020; Dohme, et al. 2019; Brasil, et al. 2018) and the preferences they developed through their personal filters (e.g. Stodter and Cushion, 2017). Three trends emerged among participants. The first was "staying true" to themselves, and how they wanted to represent themselves within the confines in the role (e.g., friendly, welcoming, inclusive, etc). This was intrinsically linked to the second, which was focusing on what they believed or wanted to do in their role (run workshops, meet one-on-one, etc). The third was a common consideration as to what was best for themselves, for example those they trusted to help them get results, and who they associated with their personal growth. Dylan explains how he has valued social learning through both informal and formal learning as a coach developer in the communities of practice (Trudel, and Gilbert, 2004; Côté, 2006; Culver, and Trudel, 2008; Stoszkowski and Collins, 2014) around him over his career:

> "I think just key people along the way to be honest. Like, just key mentors or key people I learnt from."

Dom provides a more specific example:

> "having input from people like [Sport New Zealand Coaching consultant] and observes that I've asked can you look at this."

The participants often reflected on how these connections had enabled them to succeed and motivated them to learn from these people how to be a coach developer.

> "So that's probably been a big thing, and that's been a big relationship with yourself and [Regional Coaching Advisor] and Sport Waikato and [Regional Coach Developer upskilling], has been pretty powerful for me. Then other relationships you get, you know what I mean, like [Rugby Coach Developer] been really big for me, he's been really big." (John)

4.2.1 Contrasting and Cherry-picking Pedagogies

While the participants had access to a number of formal training programmes that exposed them to the theories and content required for the role, participants reported limited training or support in the 'how to' of coach development, with a number of participants searching for 'effective' and 'successful' ideas from their peers:

> "I draw from people who have shown me cool stuff…Honestly, it's been through other people who I deem to be good at what they do… and a lot of it's just through pulling bits out from other people. See what they do well and then going, 'Could I use that, how could I use it, and what is it going to look like in my practice?" (Ronald, interview)

The level of ambiguity inherent in the role led to many participants seeking out and looking to others for critical learning and new ideas. This often included a search for and cherry-picking of ideas, adaption of others' methods or looking to more powerful others to validate their own practices leading to coach developers, arguably, being socialised into a way of acting that was reproductive and docile (Downham and Cushion, 2020). This overreliance on informal learning through connecting with peers was a consistent finding, affirmed here by John:

> "Connecting myself with other people...I've been open to far more, so I've seen different learning styles or different facilitation skills, and I guess through my experience and age I've just been confident to give it a crack and try it and change it."

This was expressed by all participants as a key to their informal learning process. Similar to research in the broader coach learning literature (e.g. Irwin et al, 2004; Nash and Sproule, 2012; Wright et al, 2007) I found that such a reliance on informal learning can create an uncritical tradition (e.g., Cushion, 2020), which can provide a fertile landscape for the reproduction of accepted practice (Cushion et al., 2018; Piggott, 2012; Stodter and Cushion, 2019) reflecting the embedded assumptions of the cultural context (i.e, Light, 2008; Cushion, 2020). The power relations created by these norms of teaching and the disciplinary assumptions that create "signature pedagogies" (Shulman, 2005), underpin what counts as knowledge and how this becomes known (i.e., Stodter, and Cushion, 2019). Through experience, the participants began to expand their repertoires based on those they admired and the response of those around them. However, it might be suggested that the effects of an uncritical tradition meant that the participants drew on a range of beliefs about learning that were not necessarily clear and explicit, for example:

> "I think we are trying to create experience where the learning can occur." (Adam, interview)

The language used here represents a particular set of beliefs about learning similar to the acquisition metaphor proposed by Sfard (1998). The acquisition metaphor portrays learning as the acquisition and accumulation of knowledge (Sfard, 1998). In contrast Dylan shared contradictory beliefs about learning, as exemplified here:

> "Probably the biggest shift in thinking was: I went from thinking that I was the organizer of the content of the learning to flipping that to go: I need to give these people in the room what they need or what they want from this experience…I guess [their learning,] it's around questions that they're asking if you're doing activities, it's how well do they putting it into action.

In the above Dylan provides examples of cherry picked and contrasting pedagogies as he searches to bring to life a 'coach centred' philosophy. First, conflating knowledge with learning, assimilating learning under an acquisition metaphor (Sfard, 1998). When claiming to organize "the content of the learning". Before presenting the constructionist view that, "The people in the room will give you, you know, the beacons".

> Some of the things that have been talking about, it's just reading body language. Or you know, if you're doing a think, pair, share or some way where you're giving the group a chance to interact and make meaning of the knowledge yourself. If you're jumping around the groups and listening to the conversations, you can get an idea of, yep, cool, they're getting this. Let's move on, or actually, I think we need to spend a bit more time on this… The people in the

> room will give you, you know, the beacons. I suppose it's positive reinforcement and negative reinforcement.

Dylan goes on to present strong behaviourist beliefs such as “they need to be able to execute at the moment, so that you've got to give them lots of repetitions in the ability to do that training”.

> Like you're reading them and you're going, yeah, sometimes you; I think the challenge is you're taking a step back from always having to be the person with the knowledge. It's a bit like the role of the coach, right? Like, you want to empower athletes and you want them to make decisions, and you know they need to be able to execute in the moment, so that you've got to give them lots of repetitions in the ability to do that training. But at the same time, you're still there as an expert as well, and sometimes you need to jump back into that role of, like, no, this is actually what I think you need to know, and I think it's that. That's similar in the coach developer space where you're needing, you kind of navigating through that, where the people at the group wanna take things, but sometimes they miss something that's really important and you've got to step back into that: ‘No, no, I'm the expert and this is something I think you really need to understand and really need to know’. So, that's what I mean by that positive and negative reinforcement, but it's a constant kind of judging of, like, where is the group at. Right? Is this landing? Yep, cool, let's move on. Or no, it's not. Let’s [take] a different track or not. I think we really need to, like, spend a little bit more time getting, getting deeper on this. Yeah, I don’t know if that makes sense.”

A common discourse underpinning many of the coach development programmes that the participants delivered was the need to be ‘coach-centered’, reflecting a view of learning underpinned by a constructivist view of learning. While participants’ answers about learning ranged across a wide range of topics, a behaviourist view was prevalent among coach developers who described favouring and acting at odds with programme designs. Much like recent research, coach developers seek to see coaches acting out the learning at a workshop, then working with them on how they will bring these to life in their context (Stodter and Cushion, 2017, 2019a, 2019b). Ken pushed for a behaviourist viewpoint as he could see results and measure impact simplistically and quickly:

> “if I look through the behaviourist’s lens… ‘[be]cause it might have been a learning experience, but you're looking at what learning actually is and how we are going to define it, but I'm having to find it. To go back to my comment earlier, I'm all about action you know, like seeing [learning]. Like here, we can read stuff and all that which is learning. Like, I'm learning stuff. But I just want to see an action that says [they understand]. [Like] your coaches want

> from their athletes, right? Your calls, you can know your, you know all the lineout calls but can't do it on Saturday. Mates, what's the point?"

The only consensus as to what participants had learned regarding the desired behaviours coaches or coach developers should demonstrate was that the increasing number of questions they used was desirable. Questioning approaches are often synonymous with 'athlete centred' coaching in contemporary coaching discourse (cf. Nelson et al, 2013), and in this instance, permeating the work of coach developers. However, the assertion that questioning is good and explicit instruction is bad has recently come under scrutiny in coaching (e.g., Cope and Cushion, 2020).

In contrast, others favoured measures of 'success'. Here is a sample of the contrasting ideas:

> "So, do we judge on where your session has been successful or not on hundred percent of the people got it, or ten percent of the people got it, after your session? You know, it's a difficult one and, you know, I don't know, I'm probably guilty [be]cause I'll keep measuring and question and I want to leave the session and they have understood it. But I think if they don't, I don't beat myself up about it, if there is a few people that don't. [Be]cause I think to myself, well, I only got it three months later. If they don't get it now, maybe they will get it three months later, or a week later, or whatever." (Ryan, interview)

Kate refers to the coach developer as a confidence builder, facilitator, connector, coach support, and so much more:

> "So, a coach developer who is trying to help the coaches grow their confidence offer new knowledge, or you, you know I guess, I think of our LEARNS model, but then one thing I love doing is pulling the knowledge that's in the room. Because I think that has so much goodness in it [be]cause you're building other people up as well. So, when you've got an experienced coach and asking them to share and so what happened when you did this? So doing that is really important too. So, it's quite crafty, we talk about coach developers as facilitators, but I think of us as connectors as well; and glue, and just, support structure. Yeah, I tend to look at it, there is lots of more layers that we're not talking about."

Questioning, getting them to commit and convincing them it was their idea was emphasized by Taby:

> "So, I'm not embarrassing people in front of everyone, I'm not calling them out, I'm not telling them what to do, I'm asking questions."

John points to the need to give coaches direction through sharing:

> "Giving coaches direction through observing others in action, giving them different ways to coach, being honest and personalizing it from their experience. I think the coaches need to grow their knowledge because people talk about there is all these, you can go on to YouTube, find them, you can look up anywhere, all these drills and skills. I think being there and observing someone doing it in your environment or a similar environment is quite powerful and that can then enable them to go away or give them the foundation or a starting block to start coaching. So, I think, giving coaches more technical and tactical and ways of coaching is a positive impact, that I have on them. But, at the same time within that, giving them stuff around the art of coaching. And the other impact I think is constantly showing them that it's really hard and it's all right, and that I'm here providing this learning opportunity. I'm still learning, so constantly sharing with them my learning experiences around failing, failings, things I could do better, things I struggle with I think have a big impact on them there, because it's true, like there's so much I could do better being a coach. And I think the other part would be drawing on their experience."

While Dylan explains:

> "If a coach wants to get better at coaching, they need to coach."

The above data shows the range of contrasting understanding of what the coach developers understood as effective in the development of coaches.

The level of ambiguity present in most of our interactions was never clearer than participants' repeated use of "you know?" in our interviews. This seemingly innocuous comment was most common when participants expressed their understanding of their role and practice. While this may seem like an unlikely theme to have noted, and was not one that I would have foreseen, it was so common in the transcription, that in one of Simon's interviews, it appears 173 times in the 59 minutes and 40 second conversation between Simon and I. Although this is a higher number than many others, 'you know?' was commonly expressed across all participants. When I asked participants to elaborate or explain further on a "you know", coach developers often became uncertain or ambiguous, or vulnerable, inferring that as a coach developer I should know what they were referring to, or they connected their commentary to a shared experience that we had both been a part of. Dylan provided an example:

> "You know. There is different roles play[ed] there around workshop, facilitator role and I guess there's, you know. And I guess there's a couple of different segments of that as well. You know, I guess like, you know, um I guess, you know."

While Simon suggests I should know about his context when referring to the micro-politics of his work context:

> "Like you know, who's got the bigger egg in the Hen house?"

At first, I put this down to my own location as a practitioner in the field as the reason, but on closer examination there were many factors at play, with ambiguous, vulnerable, and isolated participants searching for agency, power, connection, safety, and validation in their responses. Dom provided an example of this:

> "But it's not that I'm still right, but 'they [coaches] didn't prove me wrong' kind of thing. I hope that doesn't sound too arrogant. But you kind of know what I mean, eh?"

What became increasingly clear throughout the research was that the coach developers occupied a tenuous position in that they are both powerful and vulnerable members within the sporting ecosystem.

With the risk of losing their job and the precarious nature of their work (e.g., Gilmore et al, 2018), many of the coach developers were focused on finding new roles over the course of this research. Participants spoke about "doing what is right" for me or "staying true" to themselves choosing to instead cherry pick which aspects of their roles suited them. Ken summed up his beliefs on how he felt about certain elements of his role:

> "I'm like 'fuck that, mate'. I'm not just gonna sit there for like an hour and a half and observe a coach take a session."

This point was not lost on Ryan as he debated whether to attend a professional development opportunity with Sport New Zealand that he felt was not worth attending or putting himself in a vulnerable position by not being seen to 'do the right thing':

> "[Be]cause some of the stuff we were talking about in workshops, I remember thinking, 'well, I actually don't really need that'. Or a title would come up on a workshop and I would think, 'well, do I need that at this stage? No'."

Ronald expands on the issue of how relevant the training is, adding that he believes it needs to be within his current needs to expand on his personal learning:

> "It's pitched at the right level for me as well, and again, off-handed, but it's making sure that its new or, I don't want to use the word useful but, it needs to be new enough but relatable enough: the stuff that we are going through. It can't be this brand-new topic that I have heard

nothing about before. It needs to be some link, as I said before about how I can incorporate to what I'm already doing."

4.2.2 Isolation and Learning Interventions

The role of a coach developer can be described as isolated, lacking in training and support. Reflections on two important points became evident. The first is a limited understanding of, or training in, the pedagogies that underpin the programmes they are either part of, or lead. Instead, participants having not had sufficient development in this area unwittingly and unsurprisingly used cherry-picked pedagogies that can be at odds with each other or the coach developer programmes' intent. Leading to a general lack of expectation or clarity beyond the vagueness of being learner centred and achieving competencies, two antithetical positions. Dylan provides an example of this sharing his changing understanding:

> "Probably the biggest shift in thinking was, I went from thinking that I was the organizer of the content of the learning to flipping that to go, I need to give these people in the room what they need or what they want from this experience."

While Kate describes how because of being isolated, she was forced to learn on the job, much like parallel research in coaching in which Lyle (2018) describes coaches as theoretically innocent:

> [I was] "thrown in the deep end of coach developer, straight away swim."

While Dylan provides depth into how isolation and personal dependence developed his beliefs and confidence in what he understood as 'what worked'. By providing him with a high volume or "lots of reps" or what he described as "rehearsals to work out what I[he] think[s] worked":

> "So, it was pretty much 'chucked in the deep end' around having to run workshops and work with coaches, and I hadn't. I still had a relatively little, I did a little bit of that in [Regional sporting trust role] but not a lot, so I remember the first workshop I ran that was like a Kiwis minimum standards workshop. So, it's pretty much the easiest workshop to run basically, and I was fucking bricking it… I was absolutely bricking it. I was so nervous…. Like, who am I to tell them how to coach. And I just remember absolutely bricking it. And probably had that feeling, not as strong, but that really nervous feeling for the first couple of years that I was in that job. But it gave me so much runs on the board….So, it gave me so many different rehearsals to work out what I think worked for that role that suited my personality, and so it [was a] pretty good time for me to just get lots of reps in that role…. I guess like, the more you do things, the

> more confident you get, right? so it probably took a good year, I reckon. Maybe even longer for me to get into that space where I felt really confident in my ability to facilitate those sessions; I would still get nervous."

Learning from the coaches in their ecosystem how to understand people and 'reading the situation' was seen by participants as instrumental in learning how to develop coaches. Participants' lifetimes of experience, both in and out of the sporting system, coupled with the learning they had 'on the job', had taught these coach developers what they believed to be effective. For example, the quote below from Simon is illustrative of his approach to coach development:

> "It's more you know, how I learned to understand, maybe what people need. And, oh, by the way, they just happen to be a coach. So I think there's probably two levels of that one I've learned in a sense, to spend enough time around people to build their relationship to maybe understand what it is that they need. And then I've learned about the challenges of coaching and high-performance coaching and what that might mean for that person based on where they are at a point in their particular career or time."

John has a similar insight as he describes intuition, 'feel for the game' (Bourdieu, 1990), trial and error, learning from mistakes or uncomfortable situations:

> "I was just thrown in the deep end. The learning for me was the challenge of standing in front of people presenting, which I thought was like educating coaches, you know what I mean. So, standing in front of people presenting and then knowing, and sort of feeling or sensing inside that I wasn't doing it right, I guess, standing up there and not being able to answer everyone's questions."

Much like John, the other participants in this study matched many of the anecdotes I had heard from my own involvement in sport. Describing being isolated and dependant on their own experiences while searching for understanding, of how to successfully learn to effectively meet coach's needs.

> "Especially when, [be]cause I know that some other people won't like them either, so I struggle with like, running stuff like that because I personally, I'm like, people don't want to do that. I just want to get to the point, you know, but I do know that they are important in certain environments and, they can have their place, but I feel like sometimes people just add them in just … for the sake of it." (Taby, interview)

Ken provides this insight into how he disregards Sport New Zealand and World Rugby's training when working one-on-one with coaches. Instead of observing the coach, providing feedback and creating reflective questions as trained, instead coaching and co coaching parts of sessions, modelling and

demonstrating his personal beliefs on what the coach should be doing in their context to meet the athlete's needs:

> "I used to go, 'I'll take it. I'll take a part of your training tonight as well, if you're happy for me [to] and it depending on the relationship'. So, a lot of them said, 'Yeah, sounds good. What do you wanna take?' Just to show another way of delivering it in, you know, sometimes jump in there with them, and do it and that would be criticized under the current model... [I've] really summed it up in 20 or 30 minutes."

The above is an example of how isolation has led to Ken to develop his own methods based on what he feels is right. Whereas Dylan reflects that the isolated nature of the role promotes a need for coach developers' personal reflections and the ability to reflect, as critical to their learning:

> "I just think, just to reiterate that reflection piece is really important."

Secondly, participants confusion in what is considered valid to learn or to apply left them seeking out the opinions of those they admired, while searching for coach feedback.

> "So, if you and [Kate] said, I did a great job, but the coaches were like [bad job] you know, then, like I guess I trust you guys, probably [I would] not [do as you said]… [be]cause at the end of the day we're here for the coaches and no one else. So, they're the main priority. That's who I would draw most of my feedback from." (Taby, Netball)

Dom goes further, describing his experiences of developing his knowledge through intermittent interactions with an academic mentor. Dom had no formal academic understanding of the pedagogies involved and describes being "bamboozled":

> "Sometimes I hate talking to him, because he just, mate, he fries my brain, but it's good for me. But putting yourself in those positions where you're uncomfortable but having the confidence to put yourself in those positions to start with, I mean sometimes I walk out of a conversation with [AUT professor] just bamboozled and he knows it too, mate. One time we were talking about something, and I'm sure he read it on my face, and he goes, 'I'll give you a couple of days to think about that', and we walked off. We walked our separate ways, and I was thinking, 'oh you smart bugger'."

Like many participants Dom describes the impact of the receiving training through a coach developer program on their understanding of coach development:

> "The one that I guess is more memorable is the coach developer, the Sporting [New Zealand] the Coach Developer course, the light switch. The game changer where you realize that you

work: coach developing your coaching. I guess that was the turning point for me in terms of 'Oh my gosh, I've been doing this wrong for so long'."

Although, participants suggest that these training opportunities are impactful on their learning. Existing research (e.g. Stodter and Cushion 2017) suggests that coaches' learning processes are complex, involving the continuous filtering and application of knowledge. This process is heavily influenced by biography and the culture of the sport in which they are situated. These findings were matched by the participants in this study who described their personal biographies. Such as Kate who describes how her personal biography has taught her to filter and understand her work:

> "Nurturing as a mum, passion as a player, so the love of the game as well. Coaching I guess from being a mum, but coaching, and I think what I personally have loved and I'm quite proud of [my work] …I think this has a big impact." (Kate, Netball)

Or Oscar's background in teaching which provides a filter he applies to coach development:

> "I regularly use my background [in] education. [I] Suppose my education training and then work as a teacher, as an educator essentially so [I] utilized that a lot. (Oscar, Cricket)

While Simon sights his wider sporting experiences:

> "It kind of comes back to the question of how I learn and evolve my practice, and I think it's through a number of experiences, through eighteen years of sport, not just in coaching, but then also, managing coaches." (Simon, Coach Developer and Coaching Consultant)

Participants consistently described their personal and professional connections, different organisational needs, experiences throughout their lives, and different interpretations of how these affected them and those around them as they developed their own "flavour". Taby describes how she understands the impact of this:

> "You've got your own flavour, you've got your own personality, this [is] not 'a one size fits all'."

Dom shares an experience that covers many of the above themes, such as personal biographies, connection, experiences, and importantly, his interpretation:

> "When you watch somebody and think woo, I wouldn't have done it like that…. yea and even like there was one, one particular example when I was delivering with [Regional Sporting Trust (RST)] and we, we had a, we had invited an external coach developer in, from another code, from a specific code. It wasn't from an RST, and he got to mental models when we were talking about coach developer and he went way off, he started drifting and I thought, O mate you've

> lost them, and what he did next I learnt a lot from. He goes, 'actually I'm going to stop that right here. I'm going to put my hand up and think and tell, and I'm going to be honest and tell you I think I have gone off track, so we are going to cut the workshop here. I'll let you guys take break for ten or fifteen minutes so I can regather myself and get back on track.' And I thought wow that's the biggest piece of vulnerability I have ever seen! Ever, in a coach developer! And I learnt from that. I learnt that you can do it. You admit, you know what, I've gone off track here. Yea, so yea, learning off others… she'll [Regional Coaching Advisor] remember that [be]cause we both looked at each other and go, O my gosh he just did that."

While much like recent research by Stodter, Cope, and Townsend, (2021) Dylan credits the reflective conversations he has had throughout his time being a coach and coach developer:

> "I think also having people come along and help me. To reflect and to learn and to get a different set of eyes on it." (Dylan, Volleyball, Rugby, and Sport New Zealand trainer and ICCE online presenter)

As mentioned earlier, the lack of learning opportunities and value placed on learning interventions, led to the blurring of my role as a member of the coach developer community. It quickly became apparent that coach developers were using the interviews as reflective learning interventions that the lack of support left them craving. Ronald explains:

> "how often do … coach developers actually get to delve into themselves? You're constantly asking others and prompting others to do this. When very really, do we get an opportunity? [To] Go that deep ourself?... I have been looking forward to these…I really enjoyed talking about myself." (Ronald, Athletics and Wintec)

While Dylan sort to revisit many of the questions:

> "it's good to get to look back over it [be]cause there's been someone's [questions] where I stopped and gone shit." (Dylan, Volleyball, Rugby, and Sport New Zealand trainer and ICCE online presenter)

To summarise, due to the complex and often informal learning process framing the role, this research created opportunities for coach developers to use these interviews as an opportunity to reflect on their own learning and development. As Ken explained:

> "(This interview was) … a good reminder actually as I don't think I've had that opportunity to get deep like that."

It also created a tension between questions that reinforced my position in the field as a practicing coach developer while at the same time situating me as an outsider attempting to draw out their thoughts on experiences we had often shared, or in which I was seen to have a shared understanding. The 'diffusion of power' (Townsend and Cushion, 2020) varied both according to the sport in which they were situated and the surrounding influences of power, and my professional relationship or role within their sporting experience that were formed throughout the sporting ecosystems that we inhabit.

4.3 The Sporting Ecosystems' Impact on Coach Developers' Learning

Each of the participants was situated in their own sporting ecosystems or fields (Bourdieu, 1989; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992) consisting of their national and regional sporting bodies, coaches, athletes and other administrative sporting roles. Participants and their organisations were also connected to people from other sports, education, regional bodies, and in most cases, Sport New Zealand. Although this had a different impact on each coach developer, it was seen as a critical part of their learning, adding to their personal biographies, knowledge and providing an example of how to develop coaches with similar New Zealand communities that may have encouraged them to attempt something differently in their own context. Ken shares the "big influences" others in his ecosystem have had.

> "that [Sport New Zealand, coach developer group] had a big influences [on me], so guys like [Sport New Zealand consultant 2], and guys like yourself, Kate, the crew [of coach developers] that we had in there and then I've been fortunate enough to work with [Sport new Zealand coaching consultant 1, Sport New Zealand consultant 3]… [Regional sporting Body], it had guys like [Rugby Coach developer 1, Rugby coach developer 2, and John], there was about seven or eight of us and we would connect every month or so until Covid came along. So, yea that was another game changer."

For some, their ecosystem enabled their development and the growth of their professional opportunities for others it was constraining. Ronald explains why he felt the need to grow his ecosystem and the effect of his sports coach development culture:

> "I just need a completely different environment. Like I look back, I look at it now and it's the same dude running it. It's the same two or three, people who [I] would be going to for help and upskilling you know there's still the same dramas down the [Sports ground] with old dudes doing their thing and you know not doing it any way different."

The ecosystems that coach developers inhabited were critical to their learning and development, creating examples and development opportunities that grow the personal biographies and informed participants' practice. The personal connections within their ecosystem either inhibited or allowed coach developers to learn how to progress their career aspirations, encouraged participants to work with the willing and taught them how to negotiate the wider sporting landscape.

4.3.1 "Working with the willing"

Although all the coach developers had received training and development opportunities that were either formal or informal in nature, it was common for participants to share how little support, aid, or development they had in the context of their role. Instead, they considered they were left to fend for themselves and under scrutiny from those above them, below them, and often those in comparative roles (e.g. Avner et al., 2017; Downham & Cushion, 2020; Mills & Denison, 2018; Denison et al., 2017). Participants often described seeking assurances, guidance, or receiving warnings against a course of action, or recommendations that they adopt certain delivery styles and coach development principles. These types of interaction left participants vulnerable and stuck between different competing power structures which could provide their own forms of discipline or support. Navigating these conflicts proved to be one of the most difficult aspects of a coach developers' actions. Taby provides an example of this when recounting a story about a workshop:

> "I could have just scrapped the whole thing because I forgot the letter, but having you there, because I was looking to you for guidance. If you had said to me, I'm not sure you should do that, I probably would have listened to you, because I was kind of a newer coach developer there".

Later Taby reflected:

> "I guess like part of it was feedback from Kate as the trainer, and part of it was. Also, you know you learn from your audience, so the coaches who would turn up to the workshops."

The data from the participants also indicated a disconnect between what they perceived coaches needed and the learning outcomes associated with the coach development programmes they delivered. For example, John explains the conflict between his beliefs and the global sporting qualification he leads.

> "Tough one, so when you do world rugby stuff there's a level of compliance there. So, you have to do three practical sessions and the coaches have to be observed and give feedback

and time to prepare and plan. So, the compliance stuff is there because there is competencies that [you] need to meet. And they are quiet, they are some of them book related, so they do have to do their book essentially and they do have to do their reporting and handling of their book work etc [to pass] … I guess the big change is everything is interactive, everything is, senses so they get to experience it, touch it, feel it, talk about it, think, pair, share [with other coaches], so there is a lot of talk amongst themselves to contextualise things. [We] Probably group them a bit better, so if you're an experienced coach you're with the experienced coaches as opposed to having that one experienced coach in the group just dominating things."

The coach developers tended to work with a wide range of coaches, and the variety of different needs within each space provided an uncertain terrain for many coach developers' work and, in turn, 'what' they learned as the following data illustrates:

> "[I] always have an outcome, but never a set way of getting there: have a rough sketch of it, but mostly it's what's going to stimulate the room and what I can recall as, you know, sometimes you use your own examples, if the crowd is getting it. And you try, 'OK, so what can I pull from my past that is authentic and genuine', [be]cause they will see straight through it if it's made up, and how can I sort of start getting them to think in different ways here. So, I would say that I'm a bit of a freestyler, but to me it is really important to make sure that you're giving them what they want, not what you think they want." (Dom, Rugby League)

> "I think being too contextualised, knowing your learners, and even being within … [Regional sporting body] we were operating, where I worked, I would deliver things slightly different and that, not intentionally, but in different parts. Like, you go to …[Sports Club 1] and they are up for a good time so you can bloody yar char who and whatever and have few games and stuff and then you go to … [Sports Club 2] and they're a bit stauncher and they won't get up and they won't get up and do role plays but you go to … [Sports Club 3] and they will do heaps of role plays and then you go to … [Sports Club 4] and there a little bit, o shit, they'll sit there and then you go to bloody … [Sports Club 5] and they're into it, you know, it's just, I guess that is the art, ah? It's the skill of working with different people, understanding them." (Ken, rugby, netball and Sport New Zealand Trainer)

Due to the variety of coaches that they worked with, the participants tended to describe varying measures of 'success' in their coach development activities. For example, when asked "how do you judge if it's [Coach development workshops are] going well?" (James, Lead Researcher) John replies:

> "That [success] varies, mate, depending on their experience. Varies, it varies I think when you go to a rural area: the farmers are a lot harder to connect with and get up and active than some other spots." (John, Rugby)

Although many participants tended to operate on their own, the impact of top-down power from SGB's (Sports Governing Bodies) cannot be neglected in their learning. Participants were often encouraged to do things that did not align with their personal motivation or understanding of the needs of the coaches by governing bodies wanting measurable outcomes from coach development. Such as, producing an increase in the number of qualified coaches or coaches delivering on a national philosophy. This led to many participants learning who to work with – a practice commonly known as "work[ing] with the willing". Kate described how competency was viewed as leading to the selection of "willing" coaches as a common practice. Practice left many participants vulnerable, searching for the discovery of the" willing" to keep up with their governing bodies expectations.

I have experienced Sport New Zealand staff openly promoting the practice of 'working with the willing'. While many regional and national bodies also follow this practice as they look to promote the effectiveness of their programs. Participants shared having been encouraged by managers, in their trainings and the development of their role to work with the willing. The common nature of language about 'working with the willing' meant its regular inclusion in my field notes and was incorporated into the day-to-day language and viewed as accessing 'easy wins' or 'low hanging fruit' that could 'tell your story'. Taby explains how she values coaches that are willing to follow her lead, demonstrating an openness to learning:

> "Luckily, I deal a lot with new coaches who are willing to just, willing to soak in everything. So, that is quite lucky for me. But sometimes I'll come across someone who is just there because they need to tick the box, and that's challenging because they are just not buying into anything. They are just literally there with the wrong attitude."

"Working with the willing" is a form of aligning the coaches that a coach developer works with the organisation's aims: by targeting coaches, or groups of coaches, who are willing to change, seeking change, or interested in similar learning outcomes as the coach developer and the programmes they lead. By cherry-picking their audience, coach developers had learned to negotiate the micro politics in their sporting ecosystem and reduce ambiguity of how to align programme outcomes. Identifying their role as working with the willing was often used to reduce vulnerability and the precarious nature of the work. 'Working with the willing' enabled coach developers to demonstrate how they supported coaches who were enthusiastic to do what the coach developer and their organisation wanted while acting in accordance with the wider cultural norm led by Sport New Zealand.

However, this was not always straightforward. Taby explained how some coaches she worked with did not support the learning outcomes of the coach education programme she leads:

> "The body language is telling you they really do not want to be here...I mean it is hard because it's a Netball New Zealand program. So technically people have to buy into this, but we don't say that because we're trying to get them to buy into it."

Taby continues explaining how she over comes this:

> "Can you really tell me what, the kids would enjoy more? And unless you are really naïve [you will agree]… I'm like but again it's not really about you we want more players so if the kids are having more fun being, why wouldn't we play this program?"

John felt that for the coaches he worked with, the coach education programmes he delivered were not always relevant or appropriate, and it was a case of measuring the number of qualified coaches rather than the facilitation of their development:

> "I get a sense, well not even sense it, I quite often get told that we have, we need to get these guys signed off. You know, and I don't know if that process is right. So, what one person perceives as success, is actually not my perception of success. Does that make sense? So, World Rugby would just see fifty level two accredited coaches, where really I've properly only got two that are level two competent… We have to do X amount of level ones or twos to keep people coming through, that kind of, that grinds my gears a little bit. So, it's like, I would run, I would put fifty coaches though a level two coaching course, and I get people from World Rugby asking me have I signed them off yet? And [how] right is this, they are not level two competent yet? You know what I mean, they're… Are you saying I just have to run these courses and tick them off? [Be]cause you just want more numbers coming through having completed the course? Or do you want genuinely level two coaches having completing the course? Which is an ongoing process, you know."

Here, John highlighted that a key part of his role as a coach developer was to ensure a 'pipeline' of coaches completing the Sports' Governing Body (SGB) coach education awards. This puts the emphasis of the role and the coach development ecosystem on the recruitment and training of new coaches and developing coaches so that they can be fast-tracked into roles. Critically this moves the coach developer role away from the coach's need and shifts it into a qualified deliverer of decontextualised course content.

Nevertheless, the participants acknowledged the need to 'give them what they need'. In practice, this reduces vulnerability by encouraging the coaches, and participants, to work toward learning-centred pedagogies alone, making sense of and owning their own learning on how to do this. Kate describes how pressure to follow the session plans of national coach development program, took a personal toll early in her career as a coach developer:

> "To feel like it's got to be perfect, you know, like it was just this heavy burden. And I didn't want people to go through that. You know that was something I suffered I guess in silence, that I don't share with anybody."

Participants use working with the willing as a means of negotiating the wider sporting landscape, simplifying their roles and avoiding volatile moments within the wider ecosystem.

4.3.2 The Ecosystem is Large, Complex and Volatile

The sporting ecosystems' effect on coach developers' learning is significant. As has already been discussed earlier in Chapter 2, to understand coach developer learning we need to understand the broader impact of the culture in which they are situated (Hodkinson, Biesta, and James, 2007; Cushion et al., 2018; Nelson et al, 2014; Stodter, and Cushion, 2019a). Ryan and Simon demonstrate how none of the participants' learning or ecosystems are the same.

> "I'd find workshops that Manchester United or Chelsea or whatever were running for community coaches and I'd organise for them to go, and I'd go to them most of the time. So there is that then I got a job out here with Canterbury, so that was running cricket." (Ryan, Cricket)

> "Sport experience and that crosses the globe in multiple international support systems across Scotland or England, the Netherlands and the United States and now New Zealand. I've formal background is being trained as a sport or exercise physiologist and also a strength and conditioning coach and strength scientists. And I've held multiple roles and sport and exercise Physiology and strength conditioning and strength science at the Olympic and Paralympic level, particularly in winter sport, then through 5 Winter Olympic Games and preparing athletes, in teams to five winter Paralympic Games, and have coached and supported a number of successful multi metal campaigns both at a team and individual level and then let's see. I've been actively involved in coach education from being a national coaching director to being the director of a Sport education Department… then I've also been on high performance

> Director in Sport and then in New Zealand, I played a role as high performance coaching consultant working across winter in Paralympic sport." (Simon)

The effect of the wider ecosystems that participants occupied not only acted as a teacher for coach developers such as Ryan, but also created vulnerability and ambiguity. To address these issues, participants report being given a level of autonomy to create resources and/or inform policies around coach development and then deliver these to coaches. Although these were commonly designed with support from others from within their sport ecosystem, coach developers often played the role of subject matter expert. Nonetheless, due to the lack of professional training and the ambiguous nature of the role, coach developers relied on their own existing beliefs about good practice, coach learning and what they thought was expected of them to develop successful programmes. Because these beliefs were in part formed in conjunction with their personal ecosystem (e.g., Bourdieu concept of habitus. Bourdieu, 1977, 1990, 1998; Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992) which exposes coach developers' personal understanding of good practice, coach learning and what is expected of them to their own ecosystem. It also exposes a coach developer's position and their social connections within the wider sports ecosystem as having a critical impact in coach developer learning. The combination of dependence on their ecosystems, the reproduction of practice and docile coach developers [Foucault, 1977, 1980, 1991, 1995; Denison, 2007] led to the creation and recreation of cherry-picked models that supported the agendas of the powerful, leaving the participants vulnerable to their support system, while power and influence regularly trumped pedagogies or evidence-based work. Kate shares how she was able to break free from her national body's control over her practice, with support from her wider ecosystem:

> The experiences I "have had with you and [Regional coach developer] …, just around, you know, that blank piece of paper and just the permission for, it's OK [to let coaches needs guide your session]. That changed a lot of things for us [Regional Sporting Body] and our coach developer world you know, and I honestly can say there was a big separation between Netball New Zealand [who expected coach developers to follow provided session plans] and us."

Simon discussed his work attempting to develop and design an evidence-based programme and the push back he has experienced from sporting organisations, the professional risk he has taken, and his fears for people in coaching and coach development:

> "It was building the infrastructure around coach certification and, and how do we, you know… how do you get coaches competent at coaching? You're talking about [the establishment of coach development] systems and structures, and this is, you know, it's an interview, and look, I'm happy for this to be reflected back in publications. But I've looked around [the sporting

> world] now…. people who work in coaching [and coach development], and I just don't know how they do it."

Commonly, participants reflected on the competing aspect of coach development, and how different personal, political, institutional, and cultural agendas lead to lack of clarity for coach developers, which in turn impacted on the outcomes for the coaches on these courses. Simon made the following point:

> "I don't think coach development is helping them unpack their campaign [reflecting on a coach's pinnacle event], and so I actually think it's a system. I think we fucked it up as a system. To be fair, I think we haven't been clear on what we're trying to accomplish, right?... I just don't think we're clear as a system."

Ryan described his experience of the conflicting ecosystems and how he was focused to pick and choose as his time commitments could only allow him to focus on limited needs, rather than his own development:

> "A lot of the time they [training opportunities] seemed to clash with things that I had on, or at that time, a lot of the time I was under pressure to get, to change our development course, to change our level one into a development course. So, I had, I had to develop, so, like I said, it took eight months of solid work, and I found that I just didn't have a lot of time to put into these Zoom calls, and I didn't. I wouldn't have attended that many."

This was a common comment among participants who reflected on the restricted attention and time they could give to their own development. The ecosystems that participants occupied, with competing agendas, needs, and demands for attention, taught coach developers to focus on their personal beliefs, to follow those in powerful roles, and how to negotiate these within systems that provided limited reward. The constraints of participants' ecosystems, combined with wider systematic lip service to the value of coach developers, influenced how they understood their roles and their daily actions. For example, Ken expressed that "you don't normally get paid that well in sport", because coach development is fraught with ambiguity that can lead to large scale vulnerability to the changing landscapes in sport, this can result in participants, including the two most experienced participants, Simon and Ryan, no longer holding national coach developer roles while others sought to 'elevate' themselves, their influence and power within the ecosystem through personal connection to those in power in their contexts. To properly understand the impact of a sporting ecosystem, this requires further longitudinal study on the pressures and policies that affect the sporting ecosystem as a whole.

4.4 Discussion/Summary

In this chapter I have outlined three key themes related to the learning and development of coach developers. These are the ways in which they conceptualised their role, key mechanisms for learning to 'be' a coach developer, and the impact of the broader ecosystem on their work and learning. In considering the research questions guiding this thesis (see chapter 1), the data and subsequent analysis has highlighted a number of issues for discussion.

I seek to provide a clear and consistent understanding of the role of a coach developer and contextual micro political needs is required. While further discussion is needed on the findings of this research on how to reduce the vulnerability, emotional toll, and lack of role security of coach developers. Participants experienced a lack of role security which undermined the retention and growth of this work force. Coach developer learning, happened through a process of socialisation which was inconsistent, cherry-picked, dependant on others, lacking pedagogical grounding and strongly influenced by personal motivation. Although Sport New Zealand and many sports have programmes aimed to grow this work force, it is worth discussion around what an effective coach developer learning programme could include. Such as developing the wider need for security within the wider ecosystem. Future research is required to demonstrate the value of these roles to sporting organisations; however, this has not stopped many organisations from defining their coaching force and their development as a key strategy in their successful delivery to sporting participants. I hope that this research can guide and support these discussions as this work shows: how coach developers learn, how they learn and understand their roles, and the impact of the wider sporting ecosystem.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

The learning and development of coach developers has been under-researched and under-represented in existing sports coaching literature (Stodter and Cushion, 2019a). The purpose of this research was to understand the learning and development of a sample of coach developers from a cross-section of sporting codes based in New Zealand. The analysis and subsequent discussion outlined how these participants learned to develop coaches, what and who had taught them, as well as significant and enduring influence on their practice. Furthermore, coach developers also shared how they had come to understand their roles, while articulating their beliefs on effective coach development. The research also provides an insight into the influence of the wider sporting ecosystem and the role this plays in the socialisation of coach developers and the production of the coach development systems that they are part of (Townsend and Cushion, 2020).

5.1 Learning to 'be' a Coach Developer

Of primary interest to this thesis is the learning and development of coach developers. In seeking to address the research questions, the analysis highlighted a learning trajectory characterised by personal vulnerability and a level of ambiguity as to 'what' the role of coach developer encompassed. The analysis highlights that, for the participants, their entry into the role of coach development and subsequent elevation to positions of considerable influence in their respective sporting institution was not linear and problematic. Commonly, participants were left with few examples or mentors to follow, and as the air grew thinner the higher they ascended so did their uncertainty and risk. This rendered coach developers personally vulnerable and at risk from broader political or economic shifts in their sporting ecosystems, which was evident with the changes experienced during the COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent lockdown.

To succeed in this environment the participants described learning to adapt to top-drown pressures, emphasising the need to 'be comfortable being uncomfortable", and to learn 'on the job' through a process of trial and error. At a personal level, these coach developers experienced a high personal vulnerability by being "thrown in the deep end", learning how to negotiate and operate as a coach developer. In articulating their role, participants described the practices and beliefs comprising coach development. Learning was dependent on cherry picked ideas from their peers, followed by the 'reps' gathered through experience and learning to read and respond to the environment. The impact of formal training programmes such as Sport New Zealand's coach developer programme seems negligible. The trial-and-error process involved in growing their "reps" to discover what may or may

not ‘work’, happened while experiencing personal vulnerability as they redefined and negotiated different perspectives on the practices comprising effective coach development to survive in their role. Identifying, watching, and spending time with experienced coach developers was seen as accelerating learning that helped to provide a platform for a successful career. Coach developers who had learned to cope with their vulnerability by “elevating” themselves in the systems, gained more power and responsibility. Ultimately, this led to participants questioning the systems and the methods used for coach developer training and learning support, and coach development.

5.1.1 The Sporting Ecosystems’ Impact on Coach Developers’ Learning

In focusing on the participants’ learning and development, we necessarily situate them in the broader sporting culture in which they were immersed. The sporting ecosystems’ impact on coach developers’ learning was significant, often characterised by volatility and a level of role precarity. Participants celebrated bringing their own personal experiences into their roles, explaining how they had learned from the ecosystems in which they operated and had developed a level of cultural literacy, competence and respect believing that coach developers were therefore well-placed with an understanding of ‘what coaches need’. However, what was missing for many was a level of support, mentorship, and training as they learned to deliver coach development activities.

In the absence of any formal training and education, coach developers placed a high value on the time they spent on the job learning from their social surroundings what was or was not viewed as effective coach development in their systems. Success was conceptualised by participants according to how senior coach developers, that is, those who held power or influence in their personal networks, viewed their work. Second, participants touched on their ability to gain engagement from the coaches they worked with through one-on-one interactions, observing training sessions, reflective conversations, and ultimately the level of change they could observe as being indicative of success.

However, the institutions that the coach developers were situated within also had powerful influences on ‘how’ they were expected to deliver the broad range of activities associated with coach development. For example, the participants described having to deliver formal coach education programmes that were not always aligned to their beliefs about effective coaching or coach learning. The volatile and unclear nature of the role left many coach developers uncertain and personally exposed to changes or personal agendas within their wider ecosystem, where the systems and structures undermined the coaches and coach developers they were intended to support.

5.1.2 The Impact of Vulnerability and Power

A key finding was the way the coach developers managed the impressions of those they perceived to have influence and power in coach development. The diffusion of power throughout the sporting landscape left coach developers exposed and disciplined from a wide range of powerful groups, while also experiencing vulnerability to wider system pressure and the influences of those in power. They were also vulnerable to the coaches they developed, whose approval, connection and wants are sought after by coach developers, while attempting to change or improve the coaches based on their own principles and those underpinning the programmes they run. Leading to the creation of contrasting and cherry-picked pedagogical methods that coach developers used as they sought to connect with and gain the support and buy in of the coaches they worked with. Many coach developers had learned to avoid putting themselves into vulnerable positions and instead sought to avoid this by simply "working with the willing" - those who wanted to learn from them what the programmes offered and avoiding those that did not outwardly 'engage'. This data highlights that coach developers developed a shared sense of how to perform their role based on cultural socialisation and internalisation of top-down expectations and accepted practices. For instance, authenticity was commonly used to describe the traits of an effective coach developer, where participants learned to share with coaches the stories of their own experiences as a learning 'moment'.

5.1.3 Personal Motivation's Impact on Learning

Power differentials had a big influence on the training and development accessed by the coach developers. These findings had close links to adult learning literature as coach developers used their autonomy, cherry-picking what they felt was effective, while reproducing and transmitting accepted ideals. They were commonly motivated by what was on 'offer' that met their learning needs and by whom it was delivered. This affected coach developer learning as well as providing a guide into why their attention was focused on a particular way of developing coaches, creating coach developers who have a limited understanding of learning theory and the 'how to' facilitate coach learning. Accelerating the temptation for coach developers to cherry-pick pedagogies that were often at odds with one another in their search for what was effective. In this research, coach developers provided three trends, a) staying true to themselves and who they were as a person, b) focusing on their own wants or beliefs, and c) actioning how they wanted to bring their coach developer role to life. In action this meant finding those who would support their aspirations and who would support them towards what each coach developer considered was right for them. Frequently, these motivations lead to coach developers looking to "elevate" themselves as they sought promotion and personal gain (Hall, Cope,

Townsend, & Nicholls, 2020), whether that involved being true to themselves alongside, finding people who could help them get ahead or to help navigate through the ambiguity of redefining their coach developer's role, or instead, whether it meant striving to find and grow a larger "army of people" (Ken) who supported and promoted their messages as they developed coaches.

5.1.3 Isolation, Ambiguity and Learning Interventions

Coach developers were often isolated and were left with limited and ambiguous understandings and limited support. Coach developer isolation and ambiguity caused them to choose what they felt would work best with those coaches in that context. This created confusion, made them personally vulnerable, and created a need for them to learn to become "comfortable being uncomfortable". Decontextualised learning programs left coach developers to make meaning for themselves, a process that often depended on how it connected to their personal biography and the ability to personally reflect on, contextualise and be able to try to reapply learning. The outcomes were mixed and require more research to understand. The lack of learning support meant that the interviews conducted in this research also formed learning interventions through the reflective questioning of participants understanding of their roles and beliefs about learning.

5.1.4 Contrasting and Cherry-picked Pedagogies

As coach developers uncovered what they believed was and was not effective, they attempted to use a range of differing approaches based on personal experience, the input of those around them and the coaches they worked with, informing what they viewed as effective. These approaches incorporated a wide range of philosophic backgrounds. Nevertheless, many coach developers agreed that questioning coaches and learning what they needed was a key aspect of effective coach development. Below is a list highlighting a range of other answers that were given, including beliefs that a coach developer's role was to help coaches by:

- Creating experiences where learning can occur.
- Learning from doing, in and out of workshops.
- Changing coach behaviours.
- Organising coaching content.
- Giving coaches what they want.
- Giving coaches what they need.
- Asking coaches to make meaning of knowledge.

- Teaching coaches so they are “getting it”.
- Ideas for future learning to create a scaffold from which coaches can build their coaching.
- Confidence building.
- Facilitating learning.
- Connecting coaches.
- Supporting coaches.
- Convincing coaches to commit to an action.

Although this is not a comprehensive list of answers that participants gave, it captures the essence of the answers that were given. This wide range of responses led participants to question the systems they were part of and reflect on how at times they had been misdirected or learned and applied an ineffective method of coach development. This is supported by Lyle (2002) who argued “coach educators are in an impossible position unless they are operating within an appropriate framework of knowledge and skills” (p. 26). The isolated, ambiguous, and vulnerable nature of their roles led to many coach developers reflecting on this journey, using the research interviews as a learning intervention that supported their own growth, reflection and learning as to how they learned to develop coaches.

5.2 Researcher Reflections

In reflecting on this research, I am struck by the general lack of clarity around how coach developers understand and perform their roles. Maybe this is understandable given the lack of agreement in the literature about what quality coaching is (Gilbert and Trudel, 2004) and the corresponding lack of research into coach developers (Watts, 2020) and what coach developers do outside of their training (ICCE, 2014; Stodter and Cushion, 2019). It is worth, therefore questioning the impact of the multiple actors influencing coach development practice in New Zealand, particularly in terms of influencing the learning and development of coach developers.

Although this may provide concerns or a negative perspective on coach developers, it can be viewed as the opposite. Instead of a negative perception, the positive spin is that coach developers are a curious and inquisitive workforce with considerable influence in their spheres of work who just need corresponding training and development and recognition of the arbitrary and phantom nature of what it is to be ‘good’. The participants in this research demonstrated a will to openly reflect, grow, and search for personal development. For these reasons I hold much hope, both as a researcher and practitioner for the future of coach developers. In completing this research, I have extended my own

perspective and understanding of my role by becoming increasingly aware and critical of the impact of my own biography and ecosystems, while seeking to adapt creative means to avoid reproducing existing methods or the creation of docile coaches.

Although the analysis raises critical questions for the current models of coach developer training, my hope is that this research builds on the small but growing critical research in this field (e.g. Callary and Gearity, 2020a), adding depth and understanding to how coach developers learn to develop coaches. A number of critical questions remain however. One of the key findings of ambiguity comes from a lack of research in how coach developers influence coaching practices, and ultimately participants' experience of coaching. While the delivery of quality coaching programmes is, arguably, underpinned by coach developer's effectiveness, little is known about what experiences, resources and training are required to develop expertise as a coach developer. While this research has also highlighted a need for a better understanding of how coach developers understand success (Stodter and Cushion, 2019a; Dohme et al, 2019), and a lack of knowledge in what successful coach developers do, a broader question remains in both coaching and coach developer research on what effective coach development is.

This research has uncovered how participants understood the way New Zealand's coach developers learned to develop coaches and the core themes that drove their learning. It also revealed how these coach developers understood and learned to perform these roles. It gathered insight into the nature of being, becoming and growing in the coach development landscape and what coach developers revealed about their perspectives on the sporting ecosystems they inhabit. This work has gone some way to uncovering the complex, diverse and volatile landscapes in which coach developers operate. However, more research is required to gain a greater understanding of coach developers, the impact of their roles and how this interacts with the wider sporting systems. As this research examined eleven coach developers, it cannot claim, nor does it wish to have provided, a complete overview of all coach developers. Instead, the aim is to create an understanding that could "assist people in their struggles to understand the society and culture of which they are a part" (Burke et al.,2018, p. 6). Although the research results cannot reduce the ambiguity, vulnerability, or isolation that coach developers face, I hope that this research can provide a basis for increased support and understanding of the important role that coach developers play in sporting ecosystems, which it may have done temporarily for some participants. Finally, I hope that this research enhanced understanding, providing a voice in the literature for coach developers, and illuminated the need for continued study and critical reflection to enhance practice.

Reference List

Abraham, A. & Collins D. (1998) *Examining and Extending Research in Coach Development*. Quest 50(1): 59-79.

Abraham, A., Collins, D., Morgan, G., & Muir, B. (2009). Developing expert coaches requires expert coach development: Replacing serendipity with orchestration. *Aportaciones teoricas y practicas para el baloncesto del futuro*, 183-206.

Abraham, A., Morgan, G., North, J., Muir, B., Duffy, P., Allison, W., Cale, A., & Hodgson, R. (2013). Task analysis of coach developers: applications to the FA Youth coach educator role. In H. Chaudet, L. Pellegrin, & N. Bonnardel (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 11th international conference on naturalistic decision making* (NDN 2013), Marseille, France, 21-24 May 2013 (pp.21-24).

Abukari, A., & Abubakar, A. B. K. (2018). Editorial: Using research to inform practice: the teacher as a practitioner researcher. *Journal for Researching Education Practice and Theory* (JREPT), 1(2), 1-5.

Allanson, A. (2014). Understanding Coach Educators' Experiences of Everyday Practice: A Narrative Biographical Study. *Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis*. University of Hull, UK.

Allanson, A., Potrac, P., and Nelson, L. (2019). The career experiences of football association coach educators: lessons in micropolitical literacy and action, *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, doi: 10.1080/2159676X.2019.1690563

Alvesson, M. and Sköldberg, K. (2009) *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative Research*, 2nd edn, England, London: Sage.

Armour, K. (2010). The learning coach…the learning approach. In J. Lyle & C.J. Cushion (Eds.), *Sports Coaching: Professionalisation and Practice* (pp. 153-164). China: Elsevier.

Atkinson, M. (2012). *Key concepts in sport and exercise research methods*. London: England Sage.

Avner, Z., Jones, L. and Denison, J. (2014) 'Poststructuralism', in L. Nelson, P. Potrac and R. Groom (eds.) *Research Methods in Sports Coaching*, pp. 42–51, London, England: Routledge.

Avner, Z., Markula, P., & Denison, J. (2017). Understanding effective coaching: A Foucauldian reading of current coach education frameworks. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 4(1), 101–109. doi:10.1123/iscj.2016-0108

Barker E. & Bailey J. (2015) There's more to coaching than the context: A Bourdieusian account of an embodied athlete. *Sports Coaching Review,* 4 (1), 41-57.

Blackett, A. D., Evans, A., Piggott, D. (2017). "Why 'the best way of learning to coach the game is playing the game': conceptualising 'fast-tracked' high-performance coaching pathways." *Sport, Education and Society* **22**(6): 744-758.

Ben-Peretz, M., Kleeman, S., Reichenberg, R., & Shimoni, S. (2010). Educators of educators: their goals, perceptions and practices. *Professional Development in Education*, 36(1-2), 111-129.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3, 2. 77-101.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2013). *Successful qualitative research: a practical guide for beginners*. London: Sage.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2019): Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, doi:10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806

Braun, V., Clarke, V., Terry, G., & Hayfield, N. (2018). Thematic Analysis. In P. Liamputtong (Ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Health and Social Sciences* (pp. 843–860). Singapore: Springer.

Braun, V., Clarke, V., Hayfield, N., & Terry, G. (2019). Thematic analysis. *Handbook of research methods in health social sciences*, 843-860.

Braun, V., Clarke, V., & Weate, P. (2016). Using Thematic Analysis in Sport and Exercise Research. In B. Smith and A. Sparkes (Eds.). *International Handbook on Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise* (pp. 191–205). London: Routledge.

Brasil, V. Z., Ramos V., Milistetd, M., Culver, D. M., and do Nascimento, J. V. (2017). The learning pathways of Brazilian surf coach developers. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, doi.org/10.1177/1747954117739717

Brasil, V. Z., Ramos, V., Milistetd, M., Culver, D. M., & do Nascimento, J. V. (2018). The learning pathways of Brazilian surf coach developers. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 13(3), 349-361.

Brinkmann, S. (2018). The Interview. In Denzin, N. K., and Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, (5th ed.) (pp. 576-599). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Brody, D., & Hadar, L., (2011). "I speak prose and I now know it." Personal development trajectories among teacher educators in a professional development community. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 27, 1223-1234.

Brookfield, S.D. (2009) *The Power of Critical Theory for Adult Learning and Teaching*, England, Berkshire: Open University Press.

Bruner, J., (1999). Folk pedagogies. In B. Leach & B. Moon (Eds.), *Learners and Pedagogy* (pp. 4-20). London: The Open University

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

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

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical reason: On the theory of action*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P. (1999). *The weight of the world – social suffering in contemporary society*. Cambridge. Polity Press.

Bourdieu, P., & Wacquant, L. J. D. (Eds.) (1992). *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Brewer, J. D., & Sparkes, A. C. (2011). Young people living with parental bereavement: Insights from an ethnographic study of a UK childhood bereavement service. *Social Science & Medicine*, 72(2), 283-290

Burke, C., Thatcher, J., Ingram, N., and Abrahams, J. (2018). Introduction: the development of Bourdieu's intellectual heritage in UK sociology. In J. Thatcher, N. Ingram, C. Burke, and J. Abrahams (Eds.), Bourdieu: the next generation*. The development of Bourdieu's intellectual heritage in contemporary UK society* (p. 1-7). London: England Routledge.

Burr, V. (1995). *An introduction to social constructionism*. London: England, Routledge.

Bush, A.J., and Silk, M.L., (2012) Politics, power & the podium: coaching for Paralympic performance. *Reflective practice*, 13, 471–482.

Callary, B., Werthner, P., & Trudel, P. (2011). Shaping the way five women coaches develop: Their primary and secondary socialization. *Journal of Coaching Education*, 4(3), 76-96.

Callary, B., Culver, D., Werthner, P. and Bales, J. (2014) 'An overview of seven national high performance coach education programmes', *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 1: 152 – 164.

Callary, B., Rathwell, S. and Young, B.W. (2015) 'Masters swimmers' experiences with coaches: What they want, what they need, what they get', *SAGE Open*, 5: 1–14.

Callary, B., Rathwell, S. and Young, B.W. (2017) 'Coaches' report of andragogical approaches with Masters Athletes', *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 4: 177–190.

Callary, B., Rathwell, S. and Young, B.W. (2018) 'Coach education and learning sources for coaches of Masters Swim Athletes', *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 5: 47–59.

Callary, B., & Gearity, B. (2020) a. *Coach education and development in sport : Instructional strategies*. Routledge: America.

Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.). (2020) b. Introduction. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.). (2020) c. Using Project-Based Learning for the Graduate Student-Coach Learning Strength and Conditioning. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Callary, B. (Ed.), Young, W, B. (2020). What's Good for the Goose is Good for the Gander. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Carless, D., and Douglas, K. (2013). "In the boat" but "selling myself short": stories, narratives, and identity development in elite sport. *The Sport Psychologist*, 27, p. 27-39.

Cassidy, T., Potrac, P., & McKenzie, A. (2006). Evaluating and reflecting upon a coach education initiative: The CoDe of rugby. *The Sport Psychologist*, *20*(2), 145-161.

Cassidy, T., Jones, R. and Potrac, P. (2009) *Understanding Sports Coaching: The Social, Cultural and Pedagogical Foundations of Coaching Practice*, 2nd edn, London: Routledge.

Chesterfield, G., Potrac, P., & Jones, R. (2010). "'Studentship' and 'impression management' in an advanced soccer coach education award." *Sport, Education and Society 15*(3), 299-314.

Christensen, M, K. (2014). Exploring biographical learning in elite soccer coaching. *Sport, Education & Society*, 19, 204-222.

Christians, C. G. (2000).N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (Vol. 2, 3rd ed., pp. 139–164). Thousand Oaks, America, California: Sage Ethics and politics in qualitative research. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (Vol. 2, 3rd ed., pp. 139–164). Thousand Oaks, America, California: Sage

Ciampolini, V., Tozetto, A. V., Milan, F. J., Camiré, M., & Milistetd, M. (2020). Lifelong learning pathway of a coach developer operating in a national sport federation. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 1747954120912384.

Clarke, A. (1998). Born of incidents but thematic in nature: Knowledge construction in practicum settings. *Canadian Journal of Education/Revue canadienne de l'education*, 47-62.

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2014). Thematic analysis. In T. Teo (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of critical psychology* (pp. 1947–1952). New York: Springer.

Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(2), 297-298.

Coe, R. (2012). The nature of educational research: Exploring the different understandings of educational research. In J. Arthur, M. Waring, R. Coe, and L. Hedges (Eds.), *Research methods and methodologies in education* (pp. 5-14). London: England Sage.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2003). Learning and unlearning: the education of teacher educators. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 19(1), 5-28.

Cochran-Smith, M., Grudnoff, L., Orland-Barak, L., & Smith, K. (2020). *Educating Teacher Educators: International Perspectives*. The New Educator, 16(1), 5-24.

Coffey, A., & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data*. London: Sage.

Colley, H. (2012). Not learning in the workplace: Austerity and the shattering of illusio in public service work. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 24, 317–337.

Colley, H., & Guéry, F. (2015). Understanding new hybrid professions: Bourdieu, illusio and the case of public service interpreters. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 45(1), 113-131.

Collins, D., Burke, V., Martindale, A. et al. The Illusion of Competency Versus the Desirability of Expertise: Seeking a Common Standard for Support Professions in Sport. *Sports Med* 45, 1–7 (2015).

Consterdine, A., Newton, J., & Piggin, S. (2014). “Time to take the stage”: A contextual study of a high performance coach. *Sports Coaching Review*, 2(2), 1-12

Cope, E., & Cushion, C. (2020). A move towards reconceptualising direct instruction in sport coaching pedagogy. *Profession*, 18, 19.

Cope, E., Cushion, C. J., Harvey, S., & Partington, M. (2021). Investigating the impact of a Freirean informed coach education programme. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *26*(1), 65-78.

Côté, J. (2006). The development of coaching knowledge. *International journal of sports science & coaching*, 1(3), 217-222.

Côté, J. and Gilbert, W. (2009) ‘An integrative definition of coaching effectiveness and expertise’, *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 4: 307–23.

Coulter, T., Gilchrist, M., & Mallett, C. with Carey A (2016) ABRAHAM MASLOW Hierarchy of coach and athlete needs. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Court, D. (1988). “Reflection-in-action”: Some definitional problems. *Reflection in teacher education*, 143-146.

Cox, E. (2006). An adult learning approach to coaching. *Evidence based coaching handbook*, 193-217

Cox, E. (2015). Coaching and adult learning: Theory and practice. *New Directions for Adult and Continuing Education, 2015*(148), 27-38.

Cox, E., & Bachkirova, T. (2020). Coaching with emotion: How coaches deal with difficult emotional situations. *Coaching Researched: A Coaching Psychology Reader*, 167-181.

Creswell, J. W., and Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approaches*. (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: America Sage.

Crocket, H. (2018). Grappling with ambiguity and contradiction: an examination of the role of reflexivity in coach education research. *Sports Coaching Review*, 7(1), 82-99.

Cronin, C. and Lowes, J., 2016. Embedding experiential learning in HE sport coaching courses: an action research study. *Journal of hospitality, leisure, sport & tourism education*, 18 (1), 1–8. doi:10.1016/j.jhlste.2016.02.001

Crotty, M. (1998). *The foundations of social research: meaning and perspective in the research process*. Thousand Oaks, CA: America Sage.

Crotty, M. (2003). *The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process*. London: England, Sage.

Crouch, M., and McKenzie, H. (2006). The logic of small samples in interview-based qualitative research. *Social science information*, 45(4), p. 483-499.

Crudgington, B. (2020) Authentic E-Learning. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge.

Culver, D., Holder, D., Rynne, S. B. (2020) Travel-Based Learning. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Culver, C., Kraft, E., Duatre, T. (2020) Social Learning in Communities and Networks as a Strategy for Ongoing Coach Development. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Culver, D. M., Werthner, P., & Trudel, P. (2019). Coach Developers as 'Facilitators of Learning'in a Large-Scale Coach Education Programme: One Actor in a Complex System. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, *6*(3), 296-306.

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

Culver, D., & Trudel, P. (2006). Cultivating coaches' communities of practice: Developing the potential for learning through interactions. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *The sports coach as educator: Re-conceptualising sports coaching* (pp. 97–112). London, UK: Routledge.

Cushion, C. & Nelson, L. (2013) 'Coach education and learning: Developing the field', in P. Potrac, W. Gilbert and J. Denison (eds) *Routledge handbook of sports coaching*, London: Routledge, 359 – 374.

Cushion, C. (2014). Ethnography. In L. Nelson, R. Groom and P. Potrac (Eds.), *Research methods in sports coaching* (pp. 171-180). London: Routledge.

Cushion, C. with Townsend, R. (2016) JEAN LAVE Learning in coaching as social praxis. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Cushion, C. J., Griffiths, M., & Armour, K. (2017). Professional coach educators in-situ: a social analysis of practice, *Sport, Education and Society*, doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2017.1411795

Cushion, C. (2020) Teaching Within a Social Constructionist and Critical Framework. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Cushion, C., Armour, K., & Jones, R. (2003). Coach Education and Continuing Professional Development: *Experience and Learning to Coach*. *Quest, 55*(3), 215-230.

Cushion, C.J., Ford, P. and Williams, A.M. (2012) 'Coach behaviour and practice structures in youth soccer: Implicitions for talent development', *Journal of Sport Sciences*, 30: 1631–41.

Cushion, C., & Jones, R. (2014). A Bourdieusian analysis of cultural reproduction: Socialisation and the "hidden curriculum" in professional football. *Sport, Education and Society, 19*(3), 276-298.

Cushion, C., Stodter, A., & Nicola J. Clarke (2021) 'It's an experiential thing': the discursive construction of learning in high-performance coach education, *Sport, Education and Society*, DOI: 10.1080/13573322.2021.1924143

Darrington-Murphy, C. (2020). *The Effects of Emotional Labour Coach Education Interventions on Performance Football Coaches' Awareness of Their Own Emotions.*

Day, D., & Newton, J. (2016) JOHN DEWEY Experience, inquiry, democracy, and community in coaching. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (1985) *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*, America, New York: Plenum.

Demers, G., Woodburn, A., & Savard, C. (2006). The development of an undergraduate competency-based coach education program. *The Sport Psychologist*, 20(2), 162–173.

Dempsey, N., Richardson, D., Cope, E., & Cronin, C. (2020). Creating and disseminating coach education policy: a case of formal coach education in grassroots football. *Sport, Education and Society*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2020.1802711

Denison, J. (2007) 'Social theory for coaches: A Foucauldian reading of one athlete's poor performance', *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 2: 369–83.

Denison, J., Mills, J., & Konoval, T. (2017). Sports' disciplinary legacy and the challenge of "coaching differently". *Sport, Education and Society*, 22(6), 772–783. doi:10.1080/13573322.2015.1061986

Denison, J. (2019). What It Really Means To 'Think Outside The Box': Why Foucault Matters For Coach Development. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, *6*(3), 354-358.

Denison, J., Kindrachuk, N. (2020) Warming Up to Race. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Dempsey, N., Cope, E., Richardson, D. J., Littlewood, M. A., & Cronin, C. J. (2021). Less may be more: how do coach developers reproduce "learner-centred" policy in practice? *Sports Coaching Review*, 1-22.

Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Denzin, N. K. (2017). Critical qualitative inquiry. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 23, p. 8–16.

Denzin, N. K., and Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) (2008). *The Landscape of Qualitative Research*. (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: America, Sage.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2011). Introduction: The Discipline and Practice of Qualitative Research, In Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*, (4th ed.) (pp. 1-20). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Denzin, N. K., and Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.) (2018). *The SAGE handbook of qualitative research* (5th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: America, Sage.

Dewey, J. (1938). *Unity of science as a social problem*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dewey, J. (1958) *Experience and Education*, America, New York: The Macmillan Company.

Dewey, J. (1963). *Liberalism and social action* (Vol. 74). New York: Capricorn books.

Dohme, L. C., Rankin-Wright, A. J., & Lara-Bercial, S. (2019). Beyond Knowledge Transfer: The Role of Coach Developers as Motivators for Lifelong Learning. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, *6*(3), 317-328.

Douglas, S., Vidic, Smith, M., & Stran, M. (2016). Developing coaching expertise: life histories of expert collegiate wheelchair and standing basketball coaches. *Palestra*, 30(1), 31-42.

Douglus, S. (2020) Better Coaching, Better Athletes. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Dowling Naess, F. J. (1996). Life events and curriculum change: the life history of a Norwegian educator. *European Physical Education Review*, 2(1), p. 41-53.

Downham, L., & Cushion, C. (2020). Reflection in a High-Performance Sport Coach Education Program: A Foucauldian Analysis of Coach Developers. *International Sport Coaching Journal, 1(aop)*, 1-13.

Drake, P., & Heath, L. (2011). *Practitioner research at doctoral level: developing coherent research methodologies.* London: Routledge

Driska, A. P., Nalepa, J. (2020) Self-Paced Online Learning to Develop Novice, Entry-Level, and Volunteer Coaches. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Duarte, T. & Culver, D. (2014). Becoming a coach in developmental adaptive sailing: A lifelong learning perspective. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 26, 441-456.

Eade, A. and Reid, B. (2015) 'The role of the coach developer in supporting and guiding coach learning: A commentary', *International* Sport *Coaching Journal*, 2: 350–51.

Edwards, R. and Holland, J. (2013). *What is qualitative interviewing*? London: England Bloomsbury.

Eraut, M. (1994*) Developing Professional Knowledge and Competence*, England, London: Falmer Press.

Ellis, N., & Loughland, T. (2016). The Challenges of Practitioner Research: A Comparative Study of Singapore and NSW. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 41(2). http://dx.doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2016v41n2.8

Etherington, K. (2004). *Becoming a reflexive researcher*. London: England, Jessica-Kingsley.

Fendler, L. (2003). Teacher reflection in a hall of mirrors: Historical influences and political reverberations. *Educational Researcher*, 32(3), 16–25.

Filstead, W. J. (1979). Qualitative methods: A needed perspective in evaluation research. In T. D. Cook and C. S. Reichardt (Eds.), *Qualitative and quantitative methods in evaluation research* (p. 33–48). Beverly Hills, CA: America, Sage.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2006) 'Five misunderstandings about case-study research', *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12: 219–45.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Penguin.

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge; selected interviews and other writings* 1972-77. Harvester Press.

Foucault, M. (1991). *Questions of method*. In G. Burchell, C. Gordon, & P. Miller (Eds.), *The Foucault effect. Studies in governmentality* (pp. 73–86). The University of Chicago Press.

Foucault, M. (1995). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Random House.

García López, L. M., & Kirk, D. (2021). Coaches' perceptions of sport education: A response to precarity through a pedagogy of affect. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy,* 1-15.

Gearity, B. T., & Mills, J. P. (2013). Discipline and punish in the weight room. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1(2), 124-134.

Gearity, B., Metzger, L. H., Wong, D. S., Butryn, T. (2020) Understanding and Acting Upon White Privilege in Coaching And Coach Education. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Gilbert, W., & Trudel, P. (1999). Framing the construction of coaching knowledge in experiential learning theory. *Sociology of Sport Online*, 2(1), 2009.

Gilbert, W. D., and Trudel, P. (2001). Learning to coach through experience: Reflection in model youth sport coaches. *Journal of teaching in physical education*, 21(1), 16-34.

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

Gill, D. (2011). Beyond the qualitative-quantitative dichotomy: notes from a non-qualitative researcher. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 3, p. 305-312.

Gilmore, S., Wagstaff, C., & Smith, J. (2018). Sports psychology in the English Premier League: 'It feels precarious and is precarious'. *Work, Employment and Society*, 32(2), 426-435.

Griffiths, M., Armour, K., & Cushion, C. (2018). "Trying to get our message across": Successes and challenges in an evidence-based professional development programme for sport coaches. *Sport, Education and Society,23*(3), 283-295.

Groom, R., Cushion, C., & Nelson, L. (2011). The delivery of video-based performance analysis by England youth soccer coaches: towards a grounded theory. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 23, 16-32.

Groom, R., Nelson, L., Potrac, P. (Eds.), with Coles, A. (2016) BURRHUS FREDERIC SKINNER Environmental reinforcement in coaching. Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Grusky, O. (1960). Administrative succession in formal organizations. *Social Forces*, 39, 105–115. doi:10.2307/2574148

Gordon, S. P., & Brobeck S. R. (2010). "Coaching the Mentor: Facilitating Reflection and Change." *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning* 18(4): 427-447.

Gould, D., Dieffenbach, K., & Moffett, A., (2002). Psychological characteristics and their development in Olympic champions. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 14(3), 72-204.

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1989). *Fourth generation evaluation*. California: Sage

Habermas, J. (1975) *Legitimation* Crisis, America, Boston: Beacon Press.

Hall, J., Cope, E., Townsend, R. C., & Nicholls, A. R. (2020). Investigating the alignment between coaches' ideological beliefs and academy philosophy in professional youth football. *Sport, Education and Society*, 1-16.

Hamilton, M. G., & LaVoi, N. M. (2020). Coaches Who Care: Moral Exemplars in Collegiate Athletics. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 32(1), 81-103.

Hesse-Biber, S. N. (2017). *The practice of qualitative research* (3rd ed). Thousand Oaks, CA: America, Sage.

Hodkinson, P., Biesta, G., & James, D. (2007). Understanding learning cultures, *Educational Review*, 59(4), p. 415-427. https://doi.org/10.1080/00131910701619316

Hodkinson, P., Biesta, G., & James, D. (2008). Understanding learning culturally: Overcoming the dualism between social and individual views of learning. *Vocations and Learning, 1*(1), 27–47. https://doi-org.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/10.1007/s12186-007-9001-y

Hogg, J.M. (1995) Mental Skills for Swim Coaches, Edmonton: *Sport Excel Pub*.

Horgan, P., & Daly, P. (2015). The role of the coach developer in supporting and guiding coach learning: A commentary. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, *2*(3), 354-356.

ICCE. (2014) *International coach developer framework: Version 1.1* . Online. Available HTTP:<www.icce.ws/_assets/files/documents/PC_ICDF_Booklet_Amended%20Sept%2014.pdf> (accessed 3 March 2020).

Irwin, G., Hanton, S. and Kerwin, D.G. (2004) 'Reflective practice and the origins of elite coaching knowledge', *Reflective Practice*, 5: 425–42.

Jones, L., Denison, J., & Gearity, B. (2016) ROBIN USHER A post-structuralist reading of learning in coaching. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Jones, Robyn (2006). "Dilemmas, Maintaining "Face," and Paranoia: An Average Coaching Life." *Qualitative Inquiry* 12(5) 1012-1021.

Jones, R. L., & Turner, P. (2006). Teaching coaches to coach holistically: Can Problem-Based Learning (PBL) help*? Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 11(2), 181–202

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

Jones, R. L., Armour, K. M., and Potrac, P. (2004). *Sports coaching cultures: from practice to theory*. London: Routledge.

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

Jones, R. L., Bailey, J., & Thompson, A. (2013). Ambiguity, noticing and orchestration: Further thoughts on managing the complex coaching context. P. Potrac, W. Gilbert & J. Denison (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Sports Coaching* (pp. 271- 283), London, England: Routledge.

Jones, R. L., Thomas, G. L., Tuim Viotto Filho, I. A., Felix, T. S. P., & Edwards, C. (2016) YRJÖ ENGESTRÖM Coaching and activity theory. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

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

Knowles, M.S., Holton, E.F., III and Swanson, R.A. (2012) *The Adult Learner*, 7th edn, New York: Routledge.

Kuklick, C. R., Kasales, M. (2020). Reflective Practice to Enhance Coach Development and Practice. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge.

Kolb, D. (1984). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*. Prentice Hall.

Kolb, D.A. (2015) *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*, 2nd edn, Upper Saddle River: Pearson Education.

Konoval, T., Denison, J., & Mills, J. (2019) The cyclical relationship between physiology and discipline: one endurance running coach's experiences problematizing disciplinary practices, *Sports Coaching Review*, 8:2, 124-148, DOI: 10.1080/21640629.2018.1487632

Kruse, S. D. (1997). Reflective Activity in Practice: Vignettes of Teachers' Deliberative Work. *Journal of research and development in education,* 31(1), 46-60.

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

Kvale, S. (2006). Dominance through interviews and dialogues. *Qualitative inquiry*, 12(3), 480-500.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. New York, America: Cambridge University Press.

Lave, J. (2012). Changing practice. *Mind, Culture, and Activity*, 19, p. 156–171.

LaVoi, N. M. (2020) Sport Coach Development. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

LaVoi, N. M., & Dutove, J. K. (2012). Barriers and supports for female coaches: An ecological model. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1(1), 17-37.

Leeder, T., & Cushion, C. (2019). The reproduction of 'coaching culture': a Bourdieusian analysis of a formalised coach mentoring programme. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1-23.

Lefebvre, J. S., Martin, L. J., Côté, J., and Cowburn, I. (2019). Investigating the process through which National Hockey League Player Development Coaches 'develop' athletes: An exploratory qualitative analysis, *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, doi: 10.1080/10413200.2019.1688893

Lemyre, F., Trudel, P., & Durand-Bush, N. (2007). How youth-sport coaches learn to coach. *The sport psychologist*, *21*(2), 191-209.

Letts, W. (2013). Reflective practice. In R. Churchill, P. Ferguson, S. Godinho, N.F. Johnson, A. Keddie, W. Letts, & M. Vick (Eds.), *Teaching. Making a Difference* (2nd ed.) (pp. 460-487). Milton, Qld: John Wiley and Sons Australia.

Light, R., (2008). Complex learning theory – its epistemology and its assumptions about learning: implicitions for physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 27, 21-37.

Lincoln, Y. (2010). 'What a long strange trip it's been'; twenty-five years of qualitative and new paradigm research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16, p. 3-9.

Lincoln, G. S. C. Y. S. (2017). Deploying qualitative methods for critical social purposes. In *Qualitative inquiry and social justice* (pp. 53-72). Routledge.

Lincoln, Y., & Guba, E. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverley Hills, CA: Sage.

Lincoln, Y. S. and Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences. In N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed.) (p. 163-188). London: England, Sage.

Lyle, J.W.B. (1999). The coaching process: Principles and practice. In N. Cross & J. Lyle (Eds.), *The coaching process: Principles and practice for sport* (pp. 1-24). Oxford, England: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Lyle, J. and Cushion, C.J. (2017) *Sport Coaching Concepts: A Framework for Coaching Practice* ,2nd edn, London, England: Routledge.

Lyle, J. (2018). *The transferability of sport coaching research: A critical commentary*. Quest, *70*(4), 419-437.

Lyle, J. (2018). *The transferability of sport coaching research: a critical commentary*. Quest, doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2018.1453846

MacLellan, J., Callary, B. and Young, B. (2018) 'Same coach, different approach? How Masters and youth athletes perceive learning opportunities in training', *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 13: 167–78.

MacPhail, A., Ulvik, M., Guberman, A., Czerniawski, G. Oolbekkink-Marchand, H., & Bain, Y. (2019). The professional development of higher education-based teacher educators: needs and realities *Professional Development in Education,* (45)5, 848-861.

Mallett, C. J., and Tinning, R. (2014). Philosophy of knowledge. In L. Nelson, R. Groom, and P. Potrac (Eds.). *Research Methods in Sports Coaching* (pp. 9-17). London: England Routledge.

Markula, P. and Silk, M. (2011) *Qualitative Research for Physical Culture*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marvasti, A. B. (2004). *Qualitative research in sociology: an introduction*. London: Sage.

Martens, R. (1997). *Successful coaching* (2. izd.). Illinois, Champaign: Human Kinetics.

Matiss, I. A. (2005). *Co-creating life histories.* Journal of Baltic Studies, 36(1), 83-97.

McDonald, B., & Burke, M. (2019). Coaching pedagogy and athlete autonomy with Japanese university rowers. *Sport in Society*, 1-17.

McDonald, B. (2005). *Hegemony, Habitus and Identity in Japanese University Men's Rowing* (Doctoral dissertation, Victoria University).

McMahon, J., & Smith, B. (2016) IVOR GOODSON Narrative coach learning and pedagogy. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

McQuade, S., & Nash, C. (2015). The role of the coach developer in supporting and guiding coach learning. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 2(3), 339-346.

Mezirow, J. (1991) *Transformative Dimensions of Adult Learning*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mezirow, J. (1997) 'Transformation theory out of context', *Adult Education Quarterly*, 48: 60–2.

Mezirow, J. (1998) 'On critical reflection', *Adult Education Quarterly*, 48: 185–98.

Milistetd, M., Trudel, P., Mesquita, I. and Nascimento, J. (2014) 'Coaching and coach education in Brazil ' , *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 1: 165 – 172.

Milistetd, M., Peniza, L., Trudel, P., & Paquette, K. (2018). Nurturing high-performance sport coaches' learning and development using a narrative-collaborative coaching approach. *LASE Journal of Sport Science*, *9*(1), 6-38.

Milistetd, M., Salles, W N., Trudel, P., Paquette, K. (2020) Making Direct Teaching more Learner-Centered in University-Based Coach Education Courses. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Mills, C. W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. *New York: Oxford UP*, 17.

Mills, J., & Denison, J. (2018). How power moves: A Foucauldian analysis of (in)effective coaching. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 53(3), 296–312. doi:10.1177/1012690216654719

Mordal-Moen, K., & Green, K. (2014). Neither shaking nor stirring: A case study of reflexivity in Norwegian physical education teacher education. *Sport, Education and Society*, 19(4), 415-434.

Morgan, K., Jones, R.L., Gilbourne, D., & Llewellyn, D. (2013). Innovative approaches in coach education pedagogy. In P. Potrac, W. Gilbert & J. Denison (Eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Sports Coaching* (pp. 486-496), England, London: Routledge.

Morris, A. (2015). *A practical guide to in-depth interviewing*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Munby, H., & Russell, T. (1989). Educating the reflective teacher: An essay review of two books by Donald Schon. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 21(1), 71-80.

Nash, C. (2016) DONALD SCHÖN Learning, reflection, and coaching practice. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Nash, C. and Sproule, J. (2012) 'Coaches perceptions of their coach education experiences', *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 1: 33–52.

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

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

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

Nelson, L., Cushion, C.J., Potrac, P., & Groom, R. (2014). Carl Rogers, learning and educational practice: critical considerations and applications in sports coaching. *Sport, Education and Society*, 19(5), 513-531.

Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). (2016). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). (2016) b. Towards a theoretical connoisseurship of learning in sports coaching. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. with Marshall, P. (2016) HERBERT BLUMER Coaching and learning as symbolic interaction. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Nelson, L., Potrac, P., & Groom, R. with Maskrey, C. (2016) PAULO FREIRE Problem-posing coach education. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Nelson, L., Potrac, P. (Eds.)., & Groom, R., (2016). Recognizing the dimensions and tensions of learning in coaching. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Nippon Sport Science University. (2017) *Facilitation Skills Handbook*, Liverpool: International Council of Coaching Excellence.

North, J., (2010). Using 'coach developers' to facilitate coach learning and development: Qualitative evidence from the UK. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 5(2), pp.239-256.

Pyett, P. M. (2003). Validation of qualitative research in the "real world". *Qualitative Health Research*, 13(8), 1170-1179.

Phelan, S., & Griffiths, M. (2019). Reconceptualising professional learning through knowing-in-practice: A case study of a coaches high performance centre. *Sports Coaching Review*, 8(2), 103-123.

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

Piggott, D. (2015). The Open Society and coach education: A philosophical agenda for policy reform and future sociological research. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy, 20*(3), 283-298.

Ponterotto, J. G. (2005). Qualitative research in counseling psychology: a primer on research paradigms and philosophy of science. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 52(2), p.126–136.

Potrac, P. & Jones, R. (2009). *Power, Conflict, and Cooperation: Toward a Micropolitics of Coaching,* 61(2), 223-236. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2009.10483612

Potrac, P. Jones, R. & Armour, K (2002). "'It's All About Getting Respect': The Coaching Behaviors of an Expert English Soccer Coach." *Sport, Education and Society* 7(2) 183-202.

Potrac, P., Jones, R. L., and Nelson, L. (2014). Interpretivism. In L. Nelson, R. Groom, and P. Potrac (Eds.). *Research Methods in Sports Coaching*, (pp. 31-41). London: England Routledge.

Potrac, P., Nelson, L., and Groom, R. with Greenough, K (2016) LEV VYGOTSKY Learning through social interaction in coaching. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Potrac, P., Nichola, A. J., Hall, E. T. (2020) Critically Understanding and Engaging with the (Micro)Political Dimensions of Coaches' Work in an Advanced Undergraduate Coaching Course. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge.

Prawat, R.S. and Floden, R.E. (1994) 'Philosophical perspectives on constructivist views of learning', *Educational Psychologis*t, 29: 37–48.

Purdy, L. (2014). Interviews. In L. Nelson, R. Groom, and P. Potrac (Eds.), *Research methods in sports coaching* (pp. 161–170). London: Routledge.

Purdy, L., Potrac, P., & Paulauskas, R. (2016) NEL NODDINGS Caring, moral learning and coaching. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Reade, I., Rodgers, W., & Spriggs, K. (2008). New Ideas for High Performance Coaches: A Case Study of Knowledge Transfer in Sport Science. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, *3*(3), 335–354. https://doi.org/10.1260/174795408786238533

Reay, D. (1998). Cultural reproduction: mothers' involvement in their children's primary schooling. In M. Grenfell, & D. James, (with D. Reay, P. Hodkinson, & D. Robbins). *Bourdieu and education – Acts of practical theory* (pp. 55-71). London: Falmer Press.

Reay, D. (2004a). 'It's all becoming a habitus': beyond the habitual use of habitus in educational research. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 25(4), 431-444.

Reay, D. (2004b). Education and cultural capital: the implications of changing trends in education policies. *Cultural Trends*, 13(2), 73-86.

Ritzer, G. (1996). McDonaldization of Society, rev. ed. Thousand Oaks. *Cal.: Pine Forge Press*.

Robbins, D. (2007). Sociology as reflexive science: on Bourdieu's project. *Theory, Culture, and Society*, 24(5), p. 77-98.

Robey, D., & Taylor, W. (2018). Engaged participant observation: An integrative approach to qualitative field research for practitioner-scholars. *Engaged Management ReView*, 2(1), doi.org/10.28953/2375-8643.1028

Rodrigue, F., Trudel. P. (2020) A "Personal Learning Coach" for High-Performance Coaches. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Rowley, C. with Lester, C. (2016) CARL ROGERS Person-centred learning in coaching. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Russell, K. L. (2020) Differentiated Instruction Through Engaged Lecturing for Coach Development. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge.

Rynne, S. (2014). "Fast track" and "traditional path" coaches: Affordances, agency and social capital. *Sport, Education and Society*, *19*(3), 299-313.

Rynne, S. B., Rossi, T., Giles, A. R., Currey, C. (2020) Becoming an Agent of Change. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Savin-Baden, M. (2003). *Facilitating problem-based learning*. McGraw-Hill Education (UK).

Segwaba, J., Vardhan, D. and Du ff y, P. (2014) 'Coaching in South Africa', *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 1: 33 – 41.

Schön, D.A. (1983) *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*, New York: Basic Books Inc.

Schön, D.A. (1987*) Educating the Reflective Practitioner: Toward a New Design for Teaching and Learning in the Professions*, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Schön, D. A. (Ed.). (1991). *The reflective turn: Case studies in and on educational practice*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Schuh, K.L. and Barab, S.A. (2007) 'Philosophical perspectives', in J.M. Spector, M.D. Merrill, J. van Merrienboer and M.P. Driscoll (eds.) *Handbook of Research Educational Communications and Technology*, pp. 69–82, America, New York: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates and Taylor Francis Group.

Shulman, L. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform*. Harvard educational review*, 57(1), 1-23.

Shulman, L.S. (2005). Signature pedagogies in the professions. *Daedalus*, 134(3), 52-59.

Smith, B. (2013). Disability, sport and men's narratives of health: a qualitative study. *Health Psychology*, 32(1), p. 110–119.

Smith, B., and McGannon, K. R. (2018). Developing rigor in qualitative research: Problems and opportunities within sport and exercise psychology. *International review of sport and exercise psychology*, 11(1), p. 101-121.

Smith, B. & Sparkes, A. C. (2009). Narrative analysis and sport and exercise psychology: understanding lives in diverse ways. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 10, 279-288.

Smith, B. and Sparkes, A.C. (2016). *Routledge Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise*. London, Routledge.

Soebbing, B. P., Wicker, P., & Weimar, D. (2015). The impact of leadership changes on expectations of organizational performance. *Journal of Sport Management*, 29(5), 485-497.

Sparkes, A. C., and Smith, B. (2014). *Qualitative research methods in sport, exercise and health: From process to product*. London: England Routledge.

Sparkes, A., & Smith, B. (2009). Men, spinal cord injury, memories, and the narrative performance of pain. *Disability & Society* 23(7), 679–90.

Sport New Zealand. (2021) https://sportnz.org.nz/resources/balance-is-better-philosophy/ (accessed 5/6/2021)

Sport New Zealand. (2020) https://sportnz.org.nz/about-us/our-publications/our-strategies/sport-new-zealand-2020-2032-strategic-direction/ (accessed 26 March 2020)

Sport New Zealand. (2019) https://sportnz.org.nz/managing-sport/search-for-a-resource/guides/people-who-develop-coaches (accessed 26 March 2020)

Stenhouse, L. (1985). What counts as research. In J. Ruddock, & D. Hopkins (eds.), *Research as a Basis for Teaching* (pp. 8-19). London: Heimeman.

Stephenson, B., & Jowett, S. (2009). Factors that influence the development of English youth soccer coaches. *International Journal of Coaching Science*, 3(1), 3-16.

Stodter, A., & Cushion, C. (2017). What works in coach learning, how, and for whom? A grounded process of soccer coaches' professional learning. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 9*(3), 321-338.

Stodter, A., & Cushion, C. J. (2019A). Layers of Learning in Coach Developers' Practice-Theories, Preparation and Delivery. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, *6*(3), 307-316.

Stodter, A., & Cushion, C. J. (2019b). Evidencing the impact of coaches' learning: Changes in coaching knowledge and practice over time. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 37(18), 2086–2093. https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2019.1621045

Stodter, A., Cope, E., & Townsend, R. C. (2021). Reflective conversations as a basis for sport coaches' learning: a theory-informed pedagogic design for educating reflective practitioners. *Professional Development in Education*, 1-16.

Stokes, P. (2019). The House Always Wins: Why Philosophy Isn't Optional. *Why Philosophy?*, 15.

Stoszkowski, J., & Collins, D. (2017). Nirvana or never-never land: does heutagogy have a place in coach development? *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 4, 353-358.

Stoszkowski, J., & Collins, D. (2014). Communities of practice, social learning and networks: Exploiting the social side of coach development. *Sport, education and society*, 19(6), 773-788.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1990). Basics of qualitative research. *Grounded theory procedure and techniques*. London: Sage.

Swennen, A., & Bates, T., (2010). The professional development of teacher educators. *Professional Development in Education*, 36(1-2), 1-7.

Taylor, W. G. with Collins, L. (2016) JACK MEZIROW Transformative coach and athlete learning. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Terry, G., Hayfield, N., Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis.In C. Willig & W. S. Rogers (Eds.) *The Sage handbook of qualitative research in psychology* (2nd ed.) (pp.17-37). London: Sage.

Thompson, M., Pasquini, E. (2020) Team-Based Learning as an Instructional Strategy for Undergraduate Coach Education. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Thomas, G., Morgan, K., & Harris. K. (2016) ALBERT BANDURA Observational learning in coaching. Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.) *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Tillema, H. H., Van der Westhuizen G. J. (2015). Knowledge building through conversation. K. Smith (Eds.). *Mentoring for learning: "Climbing the mountain"* (pp. 1-19). Rotterdam, Holland: Springer.

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: eight 'big tent' criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16, 837-851.

Trainor, L. R., & Bundon, A. (2020). Developing the craft: reflexive accounts of doing reflexive thematic analysis. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 1-22.

Trudel, P., & Gilbert, W. D. (2004). Communities of practice as an approach to foster ice hockey coach development. In *Safety in ice hockey: Fourth volume*. ASTM International.

Trudel, P., Culver, D. and Werthner, P. (2013) 'Looking at coach development from the coach-learner' s perspective: Consideration for coach development administrators', in P. Potrac, W. Gilbert and J. Denison (eds), *Routledge handbook of sports coaching*, London: Routledge, 375 – 387.

Trudel, P., Culver, D., and Richard, JP. (2016) Peter Jarvis: Lifelong Coach Learning. *Learning in Sport Coaching: Theory and Application,* (pp. 202-214) Nelson, L., Groom, R. and Potrac, P. London, England: Routledge

Turner, D., Nelson, L., & Potrac, P. (2012). "The Journey Is the Destination: Reconsidering the Expert Sports Coach." *Quest* 64(4): 313-325.

Toner, J., & Moran, A. with Gale, L. (2016) JEAN PIAGET Learning and the stages of athlete development. In Nelson, L., Groom, R., & Potrac, P. (Eds.). *Learning in sports coaching: Theory and application*. America, New York: Routledge.

Townsend, Robert C., & Cushion, Christopher. (2017). Elite Cricket Coach Education: A Bourdieusian Analysis. *Sport, Education and Society, 22*(4), 528-546.

Townsend, R., Cushion, C., & Smith, B. (2018). A social relational analysis of an impairment-specific mode of disability coach education. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health, 10*(3), 346-361.

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

Van Mullen, P.V., & Dahlin, S. (2017). Five perspectives on pursuing mastery in coaching. *International Sport Coaching Journal*, 4, 246-253.

Vella, S. A., Crowe, T. P., & Oades, L. G. (2013). Increasing the effectiveness of formal coach education: Evidence of a parallel process. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 8(2), 417–430. https://doi-org.ezproxy.waikato.ac.nz/10.1260/1747-9541.8.2.417

Walters, S., Roger, A., Oldham, A. R. H. (2020) A Competency-Based Approach to Coach Learning. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Watts, D. W., & Cushion, C. J. (2016). Coaching journeys: longitudinal experiences from professional football in Great Britain. *Sports Coaching Review*, 6(1), 76-93.

Watts, Darren (2020): *Exploring professional coach educators in the United Kingdom: experiences, roles and realities*. Loughborough University. Thesis. https://doi.org/10.26174/thesis.lboro.12675839.v1

Watts, D., Cushion, C., & Cale, L. (2021). Exploring professional coach educators' journeys and perceptions and understandings of learning. *Sport, Education and Society*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2021.1887115

Wacquant, L. (1989). Towards a reflexive sociology. A workshop with Pierre Bourdieu. *Sociological Theory*, 7, 26- 63.

Wacquant, L. (2008). Pierre Bourdieu. In R. Stones (Ed.) *Key Contemporary Thinkers* (pp. 261-277). New York: Macmillan.

Weaver, S., Lynch, A. K. (2020) Stronger Together. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Williams, S. P., & Bush, A. J. (2019). Connecting knowledge (s) to practice: a Bernsteinian theorisation of a collaborative coach learning community project. *Sport, Education and Society*, *24*(4), 375-389.

Woodburn, A. (2020) Experiential Learning for Undergraduate Student-Coaches. In Callary, B. (Ed.), Gearity, B. (Ed.), *Coach Education and Development in Sport*. London: England, Routledge

Wright, T., Trudel, P. and Culver, D. (2007) 'Learning how to coach: The different learning situations reported by youth ice hockey coaches', *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*, 12: 127–44.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). *Mind in society: Development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Young, R.A. and Collin, A. (2004) 'Introduction: Constructivism and social constructionism in the career field', *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64: 373–88.

Zehntner, C., & J. McMahon (2018). "Power and knowledge in a coach mentoring program." *Sports Coaching Review* 8(1): 62-82.

https://community.ukcoaching.org/spaces/48/coach-developers/blogs/general/17096/the-coach-developer-as-a-fl%C3%A2neur-and-the-funnel-of-observation

A move towards reconceptualising direct instruction in sport coaching pedagogy | impact.chartered.college http://impact.chartered.college/article/a-move-towards-reconceptualising-direct-instruction-sport-coaching-pedagogy/

Appendix 1: Participant Information

Participant Information

Participant Information Sheet

How do New Zealand sport coach developers learn to develop coaches?

Who is doing the research?

James Davidson

What is the purpose of the research?

The purpose of the research is to understand how coach developers understand their role and in what ways coach developers learn to perform their role.

What will I be asked to do?

You will be asked about your experiences in your development into a coach developer and your practise and learning as a coach developer, relevant information about your previous learning and development opportunities. Participants will participate in a semi-structured interview, lasting approximately 90 minutes, in which they will answer questions related – but not limited to – their learning and development and perceptions of how they learned to develop coaches. These interviews will be audio recorded.

Furthermore, I may observe you developing a coach or coaches if agreed and make notes and observations of the routine of the course. The focus of these observations will be on the structure and content of the course.

Once I take part, can I change my mind?

Yes. After you have read this information and asked any questions you may have, we will ask you to complete an Informed Consent Form. You can withdraw at any time and you will not be asked to explain your reasons for withdrawing. You may ask any further questions about the research at any time. You will have the opportunity to correct any personal information given to the researcher, and you do not need to answer any particular question(s) that you do not wish to. Finally, you do not need to engage in any particular activity that you do not wish to.

How long will it take?

The demand on your time will be minimal, as the research will primarily occur during the times you agree on or while you are working with coaches. The interviews are likely to last no more than 90 minutes each.

What personal information will be required from me?

Some personal information may be asked regarding your coach development. All information will be kept strictly confidential and shall not be kept for longer than is necessary.

Are there any risks in participating?

The research poses no risk to the participants.

Will my taking part in this study be kept confidential?

All data obtained will be kept strictly confidential and will only be available for the researcher. You will be assigned a pseudonym to protect your identity. Under the data protection act, interview, audio data will be saved onto a password protected file. Your name will not appear in the research unless you want to be identified.

I have some more questions; who should I contact?

Please contact James Davidson at James.davidsoncoaching@gmail.com

What will happen to the research?

The research will be used to prepare my thesis and maybe reported for publication. In so doing, I will talk to you about the publication, and ask you if you are happy to be included and how you would like to be represented in the publication.

What if I am not happy with how the research was conducted?

If you are not happy with how the research was conducted, please contact James Davidson at James.davidsoncoaching@gmail.com or the University ethics committee, humanethics@waikato.ac.nz.

Appendix 2: Informed Consent

How do New Zealand sport coach developers learn to develop coaches? Informed Consent

(to be completed after Participant Information Sheet has been read)

The purpose and details of the research have been explained to me. I understand that all procedures have been approved by the University Human Research Ethics Committee.	Yes ☐	No ☐
I have read and understood the information sheet and this consent form.	Yes ☐	No ☐
I have had an opportunity to ask questions about my participation.	Yes ☐	No ☐
I understand that I am under no obligation to take part.	Yes ☐	No ☐
I understand that I have the right to withdraw from this study at any stage up to three weeks post transcription being sent to me, and that I will not be required to explain my reasons for withdrawing.	Yes ☐	No ☐
I understand that all the information I provide will be treated in strict confidence.	Yes ☐	No ☐
I agree to participate in the project.	Yes ☐	No ☐

Your name

Your signature

Signature of investigator

Date

Appendix 3: Interview Guide

How Do Coach Developers Learn to Develop Coaches?

Interview Guide

Research Questions

1. **How do New Zealand's sports coach developers learn to develop coaches**
2. **How coach developers understand their role?**
3. **In what ways coach developer learn to perform their roles?**

Key themes (Biography, culture, education, development and action)

Individual and contextual information

Coach developer demographics - for the research it will be necessary to have a decent understanding of the demographics of the coach developer in order to infer what factors moderate the translation and application of knowledge.

1. Tell us a little about yourself.
2. How long have you been in your role?
3. How would you describe yourself as a coach developer? Your style/approach.
4. Tell us about your development as a coach and coach developer, who or what has had the most impact on you? Why?
5. Who are the groups that you primarily work the most with? What are you trying to achieve with those groups?
6. How do you differentiate between coaching athlete and developing coaches?
7. Tell me about your role?
8. How do you differentiate between how do adults learn to coach?
9. What challenges do you face in your current context?

10. How have you learned your role?
11. What and who impacts your understanding of your role?
12. Can you describe what a coach developer does or doesn't do?
    a. What told you that?
13. How do you judge success as a coach developer?

Learning

1. What past learning have you had that has impacted you as a coach developer?
2. Tell us about your experience of this learning?
3. Can you describe any changes that occurred in your knowledge and practice as a result?
4. Was there anything that you chose not to engage with, disagreed with, or felt was not relevant previously?
5. How impactful have learning and development opportunities been? Why? Can you give any examples?
6. Describe a time when you have been exposed to 'new' knowledge, ideas or insights and then led change based on that learning.
7. How do you know you have learned to develop coaches?
8. What informs your understanding of coach development?
9. How do you grow, learn and develop?
10. What is the most impactful aspects on your actions when developing coaches?
11. How would your dream coach developer setting look like?
    a. How close are you to achieving it if so/not so then what is enabling or stopping that?

Motivations, Expectations and Commitment

1. What is your motivation for engaging in coach development?

2. What are your expectations as a coach developer?

3. What are you expected to do?

4. Considering your current roles and responsibilities how much of a priority is coach developer work, and Why?

5. How much time can you commit to your own develop? What other pressures might impact on your development?

6. What support do you think will be most valuable for you?

7. What does an environment that is committed to coach developers look like?

8. What motivates what you do in your role?

9. How would you prioritise, your needs, the coaches needs and your organisations need? why?

Other business

1. Do you have any questions for us? Do you have anything you would like to add?

Appendix 4: Ethics Approval

The University of Waikato
Private Bag 3105
Hamilton, New Zealand, 3240
0800 WAIKATO (924 528)

HECS Human Ethics Committee
Brett Langley
Telephone +64 77 838 4060
Hecs-ethics@waikato.ac.nz

THE UNIVERSITY OF WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato

17/7/2020

James Davidson

Robert Townsend

Re: HECS Ethics Approval of Application HREC(HECS)2020#18 "How do New Zealand sport coach developers learn to develop coaches?"

Dear James:

Thank you for submitting your amended application HREC(HECS)2020#18for ethical approval.

We are pleased to provide formal approval for your project, including the following activities:

1. Multiple semi-structured interviews with up to 15 coach developers based in the Waikato region of New Zealand.
2. Collection of field notes and observations of various coach development opportunities including taught, educational sessions and 1-1 sessions.

Please contact the committee by email (hecs-ethics@waikato.ac.nz) if you wish to make changes to your project as it unfolds, quoting your application number with your future correspondence. Any minor changes or additions to the approved research activities can be handled outside the monthly application cycle.

We wish you all the best with your research.

Kind regards,

Brett Langley, PhD

Chairperson

HECS Human Ethics Committee

University of Waikato