

Coaches' dispositions and non-formal learning situations: An analysis of the 'Coach Talent Programme'.

Thomas M. Leeder*, Victoria E. Warburton and Lee C. Beaumont

School of Education and Lifelong Learning, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, UK.

** Corresponding author.*

Word Count: 8426 (including notes, reference list, and table)

Funding details:

This work was supported by Active Norfolk under Grant R205006.

*Thomas M. Leeder is affiliated to the School of Education and Lifelong Learning, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom. Email: tom.leeder@uea.ac.uk.

Victoria E. Warburton is affiliated to the School of Education and Lifelong Learning, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom. Email: v.warburton@uea.ac.uk.

Lee. C. Beaumont is affiliated to the School of Education and Lifelong Learning, University of East Anglia, Norwich Research Park, Norwich, NR4 7TJ, United Kingdom. Email: lee.beaumont@uea.ac.uk.

Abstract

Research which identifies and describes the learning situations coaches engage with often overlooks how coaches' dispositions and the 'learning cultures' they occupy influences their opportunities for learning, limiting our understanding of what 'works' and for 'whom'. Seven coaches from five sports were interviewed regarding their experiences of 'The Coach Talent Programme' (CTP); a non-formal learning situation consisting of cross-sport CPD workshops delivered by a UK County Sports Partnership. Data were analysed thematically, integrating Pierre Bourdieu's sociology alongside Phil Hodgkinson's theory of 'learning cultures'. Three themes were developed: (1) social interaction and cross-sport learning; (2) workshop content and online learning; and (3) tutor capital and the coaching field. The findings demonstrate how coaches' 'learning' within non-formal situations varies significantly due to embodied dispositions, capital, and the social fields coaches are positioned within. Sports organisations would benefit from recognising the influence of these factors to develop transformative non-formal environments for coach learning.

Keywords: Continuing professional development, non-formal, coach learning, coach education, dispositions

1 **Introduction and background**

2 Understanding how best to facilitate and support coach learning has been a persistent area
3 of interest for policy makers, coach educators and coaching scholars alike (Purdy 2018).
4 The complexity of coaching has made it difficult to capture the everyday realities of
5 practice in a relevant and meaningful manner when attempting to educate and develop
6 coaching practitioners (Jones 2007). Nevertheless, the need to modernise and
7 professionalise sports coaching through government led initiatives, such as the
8 introduction of the UK Coaching Certificate¹, has been a significant factor behind the
9 increased scholarly work into the fields of coach education, coach learning, and coach
10 development (Piggott 2015; Taylor and Garratt 2010). It has been established that the
11 process of learning to coach is idiosyncratic, where a blending of multiple learning
12 situations contributes to an individual's personal development (Lyle and Cushion 2017).
13 Building upon the work of Coombs and Ahmed (1974), the learning situations coaches
14 experience have traditionally been conceptualised as either formal, non-formal, or
15 informal, with an explicit focus on formal and informal situations evident within the
16 literature (Cushion et al. 2010; Nelson, Cushion, and Potrac 2006).

17 Traditional formal learning situations take the shape of certified courses delivered
18 by sport governing bodies (SGBs). These courses have tended to involve the coaching
19 process being deconstructed into a set of sequential and standardised components, with
20 the 'educational' element argued to be more akin to a process of training or indoctrination
21 whilst having a limited impact on coach learning (Cushion et al. 2010). Due to the
22 restricted time a coach will devote to engaging with formal situations, informal sources
23 such as practical coaching experience, interactions with other coaches, as well as previous
24 athletic careers are seen to be more influential on coach learning (Cushion et al. 2010;
25 Stoszowski and Collins 2016). Sandwiched between formal and informal learning

1 situations, non-formal learning situations refer to educational provision delivered by
2 SGBs outside of their formal coach education pathways. Non-formal learning situations
3 commonly refer to optional coaching workshops, interventions, or conferences on
4 designated content or themes. These situations are considered a form of continuing
5 professional development (CPD), where content is delivered to a select group of
6 individuals through condensed formats after initial certification (Cushion et al. 2010;
7 Nelson et al. 2006). It would seem at present the current evidence base is indecisive on
8 how to successfully implement meaningful non-formal CPD provision to enhance
9 practitioner learning (Griffiths, Armour, and Cushion 2016; Makopoulou 2017).

10 Much of the literature investigating how coaches learn to coach has centred on
11 describing and categorising the situations or experiences coaches encounter throughout
12 their career pathways (see Stodter and Cushion 2017). This mere identification of the
13 learning situations coaches engage with offers little in enhancing our understanding of
14 what works, why, and for whom in similar scenarios (Stodter and Cushion 2017). Such
15 descriptive accounts simplify learning by presenting it as a staged and linear process,
16 neglecting the significant influence of the social and cultural context of the ‘learning
17 situation’. Furthermore, the process of learning to coach has tended to be viewed through
18 the traditional metaphors of acquisition and participation (Cushion et al. 2010; Sfard
19 1998). These metaphors emphasise either the individual or social aspects of learning,
20 overlooking the role of power, culture, and the on-going re-construction of dispositions
21 through the life course (Hager and Hodkinson 2009). To overcome this, one avenue which
22 may enhance our understanding of the nuances of coach learning within non-formal
23 learning situations is through exploring coaches’ dispositions and the learning cultures
24 they are embedded within, helping to account for the complex interactions between the
25 learner and the learning context (Hodkinson, Biesta, and James 2008). According to the

1 sociologist Pierre Bourdieu (1977, 82/83), each individual possesses a habitus,
2 understood as ‘a system of lasting, transposable dispositions which, integrating past
3 experiences, functions at every moment as a matrix or perceptions, appreciations, and
4 actions’. A disposition can be considered as an attitude or preference towards practice,
5 reflecting a lived trajectory through variable social contexts (Bourdieu 1998). Individual
6 dispositions shape and are re-shaped by cultural factors, with the term learning cultures
7 adopted as a ‘way to understand a learning site as a practice constituted by the actions,
8 dispositions and interpretations of the participants’ (Hodkinson, Biesta, and James 2007,
9 419).

10 Consequently, through investigating an individual’s dispositions towards both
11 learning and coaching, alongside the different learning cultures they engage with,
12 learning to coach can be appreciated as complex and multi-dimensional and part of a
13 wider process of ‘becoming’ (Hodkinson et al. 2008). In adopting the metaphor of
14 learning as ‘becoming’, learning can be seen as an active process, where individual
15 dispositions are either reaffirmed or transformed. Indeed, an individual’s habitus can be
16 considered an open set of dispositions which are subjected to and developed by new
17 experiences throughout the life course (Bourdieu and Chartier 2015; Bourdieu and
18 Wacquant 1992). Learning is therefore a holistic, social, and embodied process, with the
19 learner connected to their surrounding environment in an evolving way (Hager 2008).
20 Within the sports coaching literature, research has previously highlighted how cumulative
21 coaching experience becomes embodied over time, influencing coaches’ dispositions
22 towards practice and their subsequent coaching behaviours (e.g. Cushion and Jones 2014;
23 Light and Evans 2013). However, little research has explicitly explored how individual
24 dispositions and learning cultures influence coach learning and coaches’ engagement
25 with afforded learning opportunities, specifically within non-formal situations.

1 An exception to this is research by Griffiths and Armour (2013), who have
2 conceptualised two broad dispositions coaches' possess towards learning; intentionality
3 (being open-minded, inquisitive, awareness of support) and reciprocity (importance of
4 co-operation with others and accommodation of alternative views). Moreover, the
5 influence of such dispositions upon coach learning within high performance workplace
6 environments has been detailed further by Phelan and Griffiths (2018), who identify
7 personal dispositions as a mediating factor that will impact upon a coach's role perception
8 and intentionality towards learning opportunities. Although Griffiths and Armour (2013)
9 have begun to explore how coaches' dispositions towards learning may potentially impact
10 (or not) their engagement within formal learning situations i.e. certified coach education
11 courses, our understanding of how individual dispositions and learning cultures might
12 influence coaches' experiences of non-formal learning situations (e.g. CPD workshops)
13 remains less clear. Non-formal learning situations have been cited within the literature as
14 one of the lowest preferred sources of knowledge for coaches across varying domains
15 (see Stoszowski and Collins 2016). Yet, the reasons for this low preference often fail to
16 be adequately stated, whilst the influence of factors such as habitus, positions, and
17 learning cultures remains an unknown quantity. Whilst some research has investigated
18 sports coaches' experiences of CPD workshops, this work has tended to come from the
19 perspective of singular sports, i.e. basketball (see Falcão, Bloom, and Bennie 2017) and
20 football (see Jacobs, Knoppers, Diekstra, and Skland 2015). These studies focus on
21 coaches' perceptions towards such workshops rather than providing evidence of
22 dispositional changes to learning and the factors which significantly influence this
23 process. Therefore, although insightful, these studies fail to acknowledge the reasons how
24 and why coaches' learning within the same non-formal situation or workshop might

1 differ. To overcome this, critical exploration of coaches' experiences, dispositions and
2 learning cultures could prove productive.

3 It would seem meaningful empirical research on the impact non-formal
4 approaches have towards coach learning is limited at present (Cushion et al. 2010;
5 Winchester, Culver, and Camiré 2013). Therefore, the aim of this research was to explore
6 how coaches' dispositions impacted upon their engagement with a cross-sport CPD
7 programme delivered by a County Sports Partnership² in the UK, entitled the 'Coach
8 Talent Programme' (CTP). In building upon the work of Griffiths and Armour (2013) on
9 volunteer sports coaches' dispositions towards formal learning situations, this research
10 sought to examine the individual differences of coach learning by examining coaches'
11 habitus, capital, and position within learning cultures as mediating factors towards
12 analysing how non-formal learning situations are experienced. Thus, this research
13 contributes to the field of coach learning by enhancing our understanding of how both
14 agentic (dispositions, capital) and structural (learning cultures) factors influence coaches'
15 engagement (or not) with learning opportunities within non-formal learning situations.
16 Thus, practitioners and SGBs will possess a more coherent understanding of what works,
17 why, and for whom when looking to re-design meaningful non-formal CPD workshops
18 to enhance coach learning (Stodter and Cushion 2017).

19 **Methodology**

20 ***Context***

21 The Coach Talent Programme was coordinated and delivered by a County Sports
22 Partnership in the Eastern region of England. The CTP aimed to provide coaches
23 operating within the first selective environment³ of their sport an opportunity to
24 access CPD opportunities at a local level in a cross-sport environment. Coaches were
25 specifically identified by the County Sports Partnership and invited to attend the CTP

1 workshops. Since the programme's inception, coaches have been provided with one
2 workshop every three months delivered during weekday mornings. Each workshop has
3 lasted approximately three hours, with on average 15-20 coaches in attendance. The
4 workshops were held at accessible and convenient locations for the CTP members, such
5 as a local sports centre and university. Each workshop had a designated theme (i.e. sport
6 psychology, talent identification) and were delivered by a guest tutor who was often a
7 practitioner working within the 'elite sport coaching context' (Trudel and Gilbert 2006,
8 522). Although classroom based, the workshops' format was generally interactive
9 involving group discussions, whilst providing coaches with the opportunity for questions
10 and answers with the tutor about their experiences and learning.

11 In addition, the CTP developed an online platform to provide coaches with access
12 to a website where they could further interact and share ideas. This online platform took
13 the shape of a forum which allowed coaches to upload reflections regarding coaching
14 related issues, whilst also being able to comment on other coaches' posts. The CTP is
15 driven by two main aims: (1) to develop a culture of continuous self-learning and cross-
16 sport learning; and (2) to create a perceived change in coaches' performance or results.
17 Due to being delivered to a sub-group of cross-sport coaches outside of formal or certified
18 frameworks (i.e. in the form of short, irregular CPD workshops), the CTP was viewed as
19 a non-formal learning situation for the attending coaches (Coombs and Ahmed 1974;
20 Nelson et al. 2006).

21 ***Procedure and sampling***

22 This research was positioned within the interpretivist paradigm, adopting a relativist
23 ontology with the view that social reality is subjective and multifaceted, along with a
24 subjectivist epistemology, assuming the knower and the known are co-constructed
25 together (Creswell 2013; Sparkes and Smith 2014). The County Sports Partnership

1 provided the research team with contact details of all coaches who were recognised as
2 members of the CTP. A convenience-based sampling approach was employed, meaning
3 any coach within the CTP who agreed to take part in the research was recruited (Sparkes
4 and Smith 2014). In total, seven coaches from five sports who had been coaching on
5 average for 19.7 years (range 6 to 30 years) were involved in the research. Coaches varied
6 between both full and part-time coaching roles, however all stated they were participating
7 in paid coaching employment at the time of contact. Variation occurred in how long the
8 coaches suggested they had been attending the CTP's workshops, with the average time
9 being 3.7 years (Table 1).

10 Following ethical approval from the authors' institution, the seven coaches took
11 part in semi-structured interviews, conducted either face-to-face at a convenient location
12 for the participant (n = 4) or over the telephone (n = 3). Interviews lasted on average for
13 41 minutes and were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim by the lead author. A
14 combination of both face-to-face and telephone interviews provided a flexible and
15 productive way to gain insight into coaches' learning experiences, helping to develop
16 detailed description (Smith and Sparkes 2016). Specifically, individual semi-structured
17 interviews were conducted using a pre-planned interview guide to help facilitate focused
18 but open-ended questions (Smith and Sparkes 2016). The interview guide helped direct
19 the interaction between the researcher and the coaches, whilst the semi-structured nature
20 helped to steer the interviews in evolving directions as the conversations progressed
21 (Sparkes and Smith 2014). Primarily, the interviews were structured around four main
22 areas: (1) coaches' demographic and background information; (2) coaches' general
23 learning and experiences/perceptions of the CTP; (3) impact of the CTP's workshop
24 content and format; and (4) suggested improvements and overall review.

25

1 [Table 1 near here]

2

3 ***Data analysis***

4 Thematic analysis is a method which helps to organise and describe data through a
5 thorough process of analysis and interpretation (Sparkes and Smith 2014). Due to its
6 capacity to produce nuanced, robust, and interpretative analysis, this research employed
7 a thematic analysis procedure that followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase model.
8 Thematic analysis should be seen as an interactive analytical process, influenced by
9 theoretical assumptions, disciplinary knowledge, and the content of the data itself (Braun,
10 Clarke, and Weate 2016). Initially, the lead author familiarised himself with the interview
11 transcripts by thoroughly reading and re-reading all data items, becoming immersed with
12 the data's principle content. The data were then coded both inductively and deductively
13 to identify passages of interest, with the codes collated and organised into 'higher-level'
14 candidate patterns and themes (Braun and Clarke 2006). The flexibility and adaptability
15 of thematic analysis enabled social interpretations of the data to occur, with Bourdieusian
16 concepts and the work of Hodgkinson supporting the coding process and representing the
17 deductive element of the analytical process (Sparkes and Smith 2014). Developed themes
18 highlighted noteworthy aspects of the data and were relevant to the research questions,
19 with each theme reviewed, refined, and named appropriately (Braun et al. 2016). Finally,
20 the write up phase occurred, viewed as an integral analytical step, influenced significantly
21 by the researcher's position and demonstrates a combination of analytical narrative and
22 illustrative data extracts (Braun and Clarke 2006). A key element of qualitative research
23 are the subjective and unique experiences of the participants under study, however the
24 subjectivities of the researcher cannot be overlooked, as these will influence how research
25 is both conducted and analysed (Sparkes & Smith, 2014). Therefore, it is acknowledged
26 that the thematic analysis process, intertwined with the theoretical perspectives of both

1 Bourdieu and Hodkinson, was not benign but instead influenced by the dispositional
2 preferences and habitus of the lead author.

3 **Results and Discussion**

4 The aim of this research was to explore how coaches' dispositions impacted upon their
5 engagement with a cross-sport CPD programme delivered by a County Sports Partnership
6 in the UK, entitled the 'Coach Talent Programme' (CTP). Through the thematic analysis
7 procedure, three themes were developed: (1) social interaction and cross-sport learning;
8 (2) workshop content and online learning; and (3) tutor capital and the coaching field.
9 The social theory of Pierre Bourdieu and its more recent application by Phil Hodkinson
10 and colleagues on 'learning cultures' are used as analytical tools to assist in understanding
11 the influence of dispositions on the embodied process of learning to coach.

12 ***Social interaction and cross-sport learning***

13 In understanding learning as a cultural endeavour, the phrase learning cultures is used to
14 describe 'the social practices through which people learn' (Hodkinson et al. 2008, 34).
15 Both Joseph and Mick explain how the CTP facilitated group discussions and
16 collaborative interaction via the use of group-based social practices.

17 Very often we get given a subject matter and split off into groups of 4 or 5,
18 we'll all have some input on this, scribbling up onto a chart or whatever. That
19 is useful, a quick exchange of ideas then a round up within the room (Joseph,
20 fencing).

21 Some will have tasks involved, so working in groups on task-based
22 activities, which is good. One which was very good was really interactive, you
23 could try out some things... it's always good to break off into groups and then

1 you get more of a chance to talk in your groups and start discussions on a cross-
2 sport basis (Mick, table tennis).

3 Learning cultures which permit social practices such peer discussions and interactions
4 with other coaches are deemed invaluable by coaches to help share experiences and ideas
5 they can implement in their practice (Bertram, Culver, and Gilbert 2017; Nelson,
6 Cushion, and Potrac 2013). Stanley (table tennis) highlights this when explaining his
7 motives for attending the workshops: ‘making contacts with other coaches...so becoming
8 part of a network and sharing experiences’. This sentiment was echoed by Mick (table
9 tennis) in suggesting: ‘the most beneficial things to me are firstly, picking up bits and
10 ideas from experienced speakers and the second one is spending time with coaches from
11 other sports’. These extracts highlight the importance of collaboration and social
12 interaction between coaches within non-formal coach development workshops. This
13 perception is echoed within the literature, where facilitating the exchange of new ideas
14 and practices is deemed pivotal for effective CPD provision (Armour and Yelling 2004).
15 The importance of collaboration was identified by Andy (table tennis) and Sidney
16 (triathlon) through demonstrating the learning disposition of reciprocity, which captures
17 the ‘importance of cooperation and mutual exchange between individual and context’
18 (Griffiths and Armour 2013, 684).

19 I think you always pick up something. You also learn from all the issues all the
20 other coaches face and quite often they are the same for whatever sport you do.
21 I think they’re great (Andy, table tennis).

22 You can't you can't put a value on it. Even if you were there just for 10 minutes
23 listening to one question, or open floor discussions, it's very valuable. Because
24 even if you do know everything, which I don't think anyone does, you will still

1 come away with even a five minute discussion that you'd think, "Oh, do you
2 know what? That actually did hit home on me" (Sidney, triathlon).

3 It would appear the learning culture and associated social practices of the CTP workshops,
4 in conjunction with coaches' preference and dispositions towards dialogic collaboration,
5 mediated social interaction amongst the attending cross-sport coaches. In addition to
6 coaches demonstrating the disposition of reciprocity within their habitus, alternative
7 dispositions were identified which influenced how coaches took advantage of the learning
8 opportunities available to them within the workshops. It has been suggested by Griffiths
9 and Armour (2013) that being inquisitive and open-minded can be characterised as an
10 intentionality learning disposition, which influences how coaches perceive and attain
11 value towards available learning opportunities. Consequently, through being open-
12 minded and showing curiosity towards learning from cross-sport coaches, the disposition
13 of intentionality impacted upon some coaches' perceptions of the value the CTP had on
14 their development.

15 I wanted to go into it and just be very open. Shut my mouth and listen, and absorb
16 as much as I can from other people's experience. I certainly like to try to go in
17 there with a very open mind. It's like going to school, isn't it? You're in a
18 classroom... Everyone's got their own unique thing to bring so I think that it's
19 important to come to the workshops open (Sidney, triathlon).

20 I'm interested in learning and that's what I go for because I just consider myself
21 so open to learn. Although I've probably got more experience than most
22 people, there is always something to learn. Certainly, my experience in coaching
23 is it doesn't stand still. Continuously developing and changing the way you do
24 things because nothing works the same with everybody (Claire, tennis).

1 I try to keep an open mind. I suppose there are times when you go “hmm”. But
2 experience tells you to hear it out. We all like to be right, but experience tells
3 you that sometimes you’re wrong. You might come out and say, “told you so”
4 but at least you’ve heard it through (Joseph, fencing).

5 I like to hear from coaches. I think coaching generally is something that needs to
6 be expanded. People tend to be quite narrow-minded in what they do. It's useful
7 to learn from other coaches in other sports to see where I can use something from
8 another sport into my sport (Jesse, hockey).

9 In drawing upon Hodkinson and colleagues’ (2008) cultural theory of learning, we can
10 begin to see that the connection between the learning culture of the CTP workshops and
11 coaches’ reciprocity and intentionality dispositions enabled social interaction and group
12 collaboration practices to be perceived as meaningful learning endeavours (Griffiths and
13 Armour 2013; Hodkinson et al. 2008). These findings help illuminate the importance of
14 individual dispositions developed through the life course in shaping coaches’ engagement
15 within non-formal learning situations. Coaches’ horizons for learning and embodied
16 dispositions allowed them to ‘see’ what learning possibilities were afforded to them
17 within the CTP’s learning culture (Barker-Ruchti, Barker, Rynne, and Lee 2016).
18 Learning cultures offer different opportunities to learn for those within them.
19 Accordingly, the learning culture of the CTP provided cross-sport coaches with learning
20 prospects their primary sports’ culture might not be able to provide (Hodkinson et al.
21 2008; Nash, Sproule, and Horton 2016). This aspect was expressed in greater depth by
22 Claire and Jesse.

23 I think you just always pick up something and people who don't go because they
24 feel “that's not my sport, what have I got to learn from cycling, or rowing or

1 whatever”, I think that's very narrow-minded... I'm quite happy to go along
2 and I want to pick up things from other sports they find that they've done well,
3 things that they find really useful within their programme, their coaching
4 journey... (Claire, tennis).

5 It's like everything else that's new. “Oh, I don't know what it is, so I don't want to
6 go.” Maybe it's getting the message across about what these things are. It's not
7 just focusing on that particular sport, of that session, it's looking at the bigger
8 coaching aspect. I think it also comes down to coaches having a very blinkered
9 outlook sometimes. “Oh, it's not my sport, I don't want to know anything about
10 it.” That's a problem... from a coaching point of view, you should get those
11 blinkers off and look across other sports (Jesse, hockey).

12 These findings echo recent literature which has established coaches are open to embracing
13 experiences from individuals outside of their sport's milieu, potentially overcoming
14 issues with their primary sport's educational provision (Nash et al. 2016). All sports have
15 their own entrenched cultures which subsequently mediate learning and knowledge,
16 endorsing certain practices and behaviours within SGB coach education and CPD
17 provision (Barker-Ruchti et al. 2016; Townsend and Cushion 2015). Fields can be viewed
18 as social arenas of shared activity (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992), with institutions such
19 as SGBs examples of social fields coaches are positioned within. Learning cultures as
20 social practices within SGB fields work in accordance to normalising expectations,
21 governing what ‘good’ learning might entail for individuals such as sports coaches
22 (Hodkinson et al. 2007). Bourdieu (1990, 68) refers to these normalising beliefs as doxa,
23 defined as ‘the immediate adherence that is established in practice between a habitus and
24 the field to which it is attuned, the pre-verbal taking-for-granted of the world that flows
25 from practical sense’.

1 Coaches operate within multiple learning cultures and fields of practice.
2 Therefore, the learning cultures of CTP participants' primary sport and their associated
3 SGB social fields might influence coaches' dispositions towards other professional
4 development opportunities and what they perceive 'good' learning to entail. Sidney
5 (triathlon) supports this view:

6 Within our sports we get very blinkered... to put away the knowledge of the sport
7 and look at the formats of coaching, there's no other CPD stuff for you to be able
8 to do that' (Sidney, triathlon)

9 Moreover, Stanley (table tennis) believed the cross-sport environment and learning
10 culture of the CTP workshops provided greater freedom for coaches to really express their
11 perspectives on coaching:

12 I think people are scared to say what they are doing in case they are doing
13 something wrong... so, if it is from other sports there is a bit more freedom to say,
14 I do this, I do that (Stanley, table tennis).

15 Coaches will have experienced and engaged with their own sport's 'learning culture',
16 which in turn may have prevented or constrained their ability to learn from cross-sport
17 coaches through the promoted doxa of that SGB's field. Therefore, non-formal learning
18 situations such as the CTP which draws in cross-sport coaches, might provide an arena to
19 challenge the orthodoxy which prevails within particular sporting sub-cultures and fields
20 (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992). As such, non-formal learning situations in this manner
21 provide a medium to exchange ideas, re-working coaches' dispositions and permitting
22 meaningful coach learning to occur. Through engagement with the CTP's learning culture
23 and associated social practices, new possibilities for learning from cross-sport coaches
24 became available for the attending coaches.

1 ***Workshop content and online learning***

2 It has been acknowledged that for CPD to have a significant impact on participant
3 learning, the educational content needs to be perceived as relevant by learners and
4 recognise the nuances of practice (Nelson et al. 2013). In adopting the Bourdieusian
5 concept of habitus, described as ‘systems of durable, transposable dispositions’ (Bourdieu
6 1990, 53), it is possible to understand how exposure to cultures and fields within
7 education, training and employment contexts may alter an individual’s dispositions
8 (towards learning or coaching) and consequently impact upon their future practice (Costa
9 and Murphy 2015). For coaches such as Joseph (fencing), the perceived relevancy in
10 terms of the CTP workshops’ themes and content enabled adjustments and developments
11 to occur to his current dispositions towards coaching practice.

12 To a greater or lesser degree, they are relevant. Very often they are
13 thought provoking... you come away thinking “I never really thought about
14 that”... You’ll go away and be mulling over things for days afterwards until
15 it all sinks in... Very often you’ve got ideas, but you get a slightly different
16 slant on the ideas, so it develops them a lot. I think that’s the important bit. It’s
17 not totally new, but it gives you a new perspective (Joseph, fencing).

18 Mick (table tennis) expands upon this notion and provides an example of how
19 dispositional changes within his habitus has enabled him to “perform acts of practical
20 knowledge” with regards to his current and future coaching practice (Bourdieu 2000,
21 138).

22 There are certainly a couple of things I do differently... I mentioned the
23 psychology one before. We now sit down with each player and when we are doing
24 goal-setting, we use some of those ideas to see how they react to them basically.

1 But yeah from that point of view we have. But certainly, as always with these
2 courses some of the bits won't be overly relevant to what I do but I can still learn
3 from that as a coach (Mick, table tennis).

4 Habitus helps to express how the individual is social, presenting learning as an embodied
5 process exemplified through the metaphor of 'becoming'. Here, a coach's habitus and
6 subsequent dispositions towards learning and coaching might be 'confirmed, developed,
7 challenged or changed' through interaction with learning cultures (Hodkinson et al. 2008,
8 39). Using Bourdieu's conceptual tools enables a more nuanced understanding of how
9 coaches' habitus along with the learning culture of non-formal learning situations, may
10 influence the process of learning to coach through dispositional changes (Bourdieu 1990;
11 Griffiths and Armour 2013). As Hodkinson et al. (2007, 425) signify 'Bourdieu himself
12 was quite clear that the dispositions which make up a person's habitus can and do change.
13 We would argue that learning is one major mechanism what can bring about such
14 change'. However, in the case of Stanley (table tennis), his existing dispositions towards
15 coaching within his habitus were merely confirmed as opposed to being significantly
16 developed.

17 Interviewer: So, would you say you have gained new knowledge from being part
18 of the programme or has it been reaffirming what you already know from other
19 sources?

20 Stanley: Maybe 10-20% new knowledge.

21 Interviewer: So, the rest has been just topping up?

22 Stanley: Yeah, it's just been about reaffirming some of the things... At times, the
23 topics are stuff that you know, but it just reminds you more of it. Just awareness

1 really. It sews the seed to probably go away and investigate that area a bit more.

2 In terms of coaching development, not really.

3 From Stanley's perspective, although his existing dispositions and beliefs towards
4 practice which form his habitus seem to be reaffirmed, he still experienced a form of
5 'learning' through engagement and participation within the CTP's non-formal workshops
6 and subsequent learning culture. Nonetheless, if dispositions remain unchallenged or
7 stagnant, individuals may struggle to articulate what they learnt from attending non-
8 formal educational provision, despite perceiving them to be of value. Andy (table tennis)
9 highlights this by suggesting: 'I think they are really useful, but if you ask me "what did
10 you take from them?" Then it's hard to pinpoint'. Although Bourdieu argues dispositions
11 are embodied and largely tacit, there is a recognition that individuals possess a degree of
12 agentic reflection in which they can consider new material. This is explained by
13 Hodkinson et al. (2008, 40) who propose 'learning is more than the subconscious
14 transformation of our dispositions. We learn not only by doing but also by reflecting upon
15 what we do and by consciously monitoring our actions'. Through reflecting upon their
16 underlying beliefs and the espoused workshop content, Joseph and Mick provide
17 evidence of dispositional changes towards their coaching, whilst Stanley did not. Thus,
18 despite the fact coaches may engage with the same learning cultures, there is no guarantee
19 their dispositions towards learning or a phenomenon (such as coaching) will develop in
20 the same way.

21 When coaches engage with learning situations several individual factors impact
22 upon whether new knowledge is either adopted, modified, or rejected (see Stodter and
23 Cushion 2017). A key determinant of this, as already alluded to, will be a coaches'
24 developed dispositions and mediating habitus. Further analysis highlighted how for

1 coaches such as Jesse, their horizons for learning set the boundaries of what learning was
2 possible and identifiable within a non-formal learning situation (Hodkinson et al. 2008).

3 The biggest barrier? Hmm I suppose it's identifying easily where I can pick
4 something out, and take it, and use it possibly... It may be the content of the
5 session, actually saying "yeah, I can hone in on that bit and take it away". In the
6 session, it's often got a route to go down, so how do you take something off that
7 route? (Jesse, hockey).

8 Over time, Jesse's habitus has developed 'meaning-giving perceptions' (Bourdieu 1984,
9 170), attempting to 'pick out' information and knowledge espoused from the CTP
10 workshops' which matches his pre-existing dispositions and beliefs, arbitrating the
11 process of coach learning. For Jesse, a reproduction and confirmation of underlying
12 dispositions towards coaching practice ultimately transpired through a cherry-picking
13 process, with new or unknown concepts ignored and not embodied within his habitus
14 (Griffiths and Armour 2013; Hodkinson et al. 2008; Stodter and Cushion 2017).

15 Hodkinson et al. (2008, 39) advocate 'a person's dispositions can enable or
16 facilitate some forms of learning, whilst inhibiting or preventing others'. Within this
17 research, coaches' dispositions and their engagement within their SGB's social field
18 influenced their engagement (or not) with the online forum developed by the CTP,
19 designed to encourage lasting communication outside of physical attendance. Coaches
20 are becoming more open to the use of online support mechanisms to enhance their
21 learning, due to the increased accessibility of the internet and coaches' preference for
22 informality (Trudel, Culver, and Werthner 2013). Yet, the analysis offered contradictory
23 results, signifying the online forum was not exploited by any of the interviewed coaches.
24 Jesse (hockey) exemplifies this: 'I'm aware of it but I haven't utilised it... I think it would

1 be useful. It's like everything else, its time'. Logistical issues such as time have
2 previously been cited as a potential reason why online forums may not be effective for
3 coach learning (Stoszkowski, Collins, and Olsson 2017). Nevertheless, coaches'
4 developed dispositions and embodied experiences from SGB fields may prove significant
5 in explaining the reasons behind the limited online engagement.

6 I wouldn't do all those blogs or the online stuff anyway... it gets a bit too much
7 then. If I really want to do all those things then I'm 24/7 on every website... There
8 are other things like Twitter that connects coaches, if you really look for those
9 things, there's loads of things going on (Andy, table tennis).

10 From my experience of my Level 3 coaching course we have a closed page, but
11 very few people post in there or expose themselves to what they are doing. There
12 seems to be a fear of exposing what they are doing in case there's a gap in their
13 knowledge or they are doing something wrong... it seems people are scared to put
14 stuff on there (Stanley, table tennis).

15 In the case of Andy, his horizons for action, how personal dispositions influence future
16 activities, potentially elucidates why he failed to perceive the online platform as a
17 significant opportunity for learning, with time constraints and an acknowledgment of
18 other sources proving influential (Barker-Ruchti et al. 2016). Likewise, Stanley's
19 previous experiences of a SGB learning culture potentially impacted upon his own and
20 other coaches' dispositions, revealing the fear of being scrutinised was a potential reason
21 behind the online forum's limited utilisation (Stoszkowski et al. 2017). An individual's
22 habitus is shaped through lasting exposure within fields of practice, with dispositions
23 becoming embodied and evident in practice (Bourdieu 1990). Hence, through
24 engagement and exposure to their primary sport's social field and associated doxa, some

1 coaches arrived at the CTP with deep-rooted dispositions towards online learning,
2 significantly influencing their decisions to engage (or not) with that afforded learning
3 opportunity. Cushion and Townsend (2018, 16) have recently argued that technology
4 enhanced learning can provide environments that enable ‘individuals to address unique
5 learning interests and needs relevant to coaches’ individual contexts, study multiple levels
6 of coaching complexity, and deepen understanding of reflective practices’. Therefore,
7 non-formal learning situations and their distinctive learning cultures may provide a social
8 space for coach developers to promote and facilitate the use of technology enhanced
9 learning, away from some sport’s doxic formal coach education provision coaches may
10 have experienced previously.

11 *Tutor capital and the coaching field*

12 Learning cultures are permeated by wider social fields, with Bourdieu (1990, 98)
13 describing fields as ‘structured systems of social positions within which struggles or
14 manoeuvres take place over resources, stakes and access’. Individuals and social groups
15 are positioned in fields based upon the volume of capital they possess, with capital
16 considered a form of power operationalised principally as being economic, cultural, and
17 social (Bourdieu 1986; Bourdieu 1998). These forms of capital can become symbolic
18 when they are perceived as significant by those within that designated field. An
19 appreciation of the influence wider social fields can have on local learning cultures helps
20 to locate power relations within the holistic process of coach learning (Hodkinson et al.
21 2008).

22 Attendance at non-formal learning situations such as CPD workshops is often
23 determined by who delivers the session, with coaches respecting workshop tutors who
24 possess extensive knowledge and practical experience (Nelson et al. 2013; Winchester et
25 al. 2013). Despite Trudel et al. (2013, 381) arguing the decision on who delivers non-

1 formal workshops ‘has to be judicious and cannot be based purely on sport experiences’,
2 the CTP’s workshops were generally tutored by full-time coaches who operate within
3 elite sporting contexts such as professional sport clubs or work with Olympic/Paralympic
4 athletes. These individuals were described as ‘very experienced people within their
5 sphere’ by Joseph (fencing), with the analysis suggesting that some coaches attended the
6 workshops they were invited to purely based upon the tutor delivering the session.
7 Seemingly, the opportunity to network with cross-sport coaches and gain knowledge via
8 the workshop’s theme were considered inferior by Claire and Jesse.

9 I think they've had really good speakers. I think really good quality speakers. I
10 am not bothered about who else is there to network to be honest... I
11 suppose I’m going for the experience of the person who’s up there more than
12 perhaps local experiences (Claire, tennis).

13 The theme is not the key driver. It's “I’ve heard of that person, I'd be interested to
14 hear what they say”. Some people probably need to understand what the theme
15 is, but it's not so important the theme, it's more important the individual who's
16 presenting it possibly (Jesse, hockey).

17 The sports coaching field bestows symbolic capital upon coaches possessing practitioner
18 knowledge/experience (embodied cultural capital), along with connections to elite
19 sporting individuals or institutions (social capital). Sports coaches are disposed to
20 ‘valorise practitioner knowledge’ and experience (Cushion, Griffiths, and Armour 2017,
21 1) over alternative educational credentials, potentially explaining why the symbolic
22 capital possessed by the workshop tutors was fundamental in dictating coaches’
23 attendance at the CTP workshops. Bourdieu’s concept of doxa demonstrates how fields
24 can develop ‘a set of shared opinions and unquestioned beliefs that bind participants

1 together' (Wacquant 2008, 70). An individual's thoughts and dispositions may evolve
2 and reshape after engagement with a field's doxa. In this research, through being
3 positioned within the wider sports coaching field and experiencing its associated doxa
4 (the valorisation of practitioner experience), some coaches had developed dispositions
5 that distinguished what they believe 'good' learning constitutes (Bourdieu 1998). In the
6 case of Claire and Jesse, their embodied dispositions and habitus may have orientated
7 them towards perceiving the opportunity to hear from elite coaches as 'good learning' at
8 the expense of social interaction with other coaches and the CTP workshops' designated
9 theme. Jesse (hockey) provides further evidence on the importance of coaches'
10 dispositions towards learning from tutors who embody the required symbolic capital.

11 I think you've got to have someone at that level to attract people. If you just had
12 "Johnny Smith" from some hockey club down the road you wouldn't get
13 people there. I think it has to be national level, or you know Premiership level,
14 because otherwise, you won't get the people in... You need to have the elitist...
15 not just the grassroots locals. Otherwise, you spend half the time not learning
16 anything (Jesse, hockey).

17 Learning cultures have the potential to be influenced through a combination of
18 dispositions, capital, and the position individuals behold within a learning culture
19 (Hodkinson et al. 2008). Consequently, coaches' dispositions towards what 'good'
20 learning entails along with the capital and position of the tutors had an influence on the
21 learning culture of the CTP workshops, regardless of whether this influence was intended
22 or not (Hodkinson et al. 2008). The extracts provided within this study are illustrative of
23 this factor, highlighting how learning cultures and non-formal learning situation may be
24 permeated by the doxa of wider social fields, with the symbolic capital tutors possess
25 significant in structuring legitimate knowledge (Bourdieu and Wacquant 1992).

1 In adopting the theoretical concept of learning cultures, we can begin to
2 understand more succinctly the relationship between how people learn and the context or
3 setting in which they learn (Hodkinson et al. 2007). Therefore, in focusing on how social
4 practices influence individual learning, our findings suggest that the opportunity to learn
5 from tutors embodying the requisite symbolic capital was made possible by the CTP's
6 learning culture. However, the possibility for learning to occur was equal for all coaches.
7 For some coaches' their embodied dispositions guided their attendance at the workshops
8 to specifically exploit this opportunity, but at the expense of neglecting the value of
9 interacting with other coaches and utilising online learning resources.

10 **Conclusion**

11 Bourdieu (2000, 136) has argued that 'to deny the existence of acquired dispositions, in
12 the case of living beings, is to deny the existence of learning'. Consequently, this research
13 has explored how coaches' experiences of non-formal learning situations, such as CPD
14 workshops, are significantly influenced by their developed dispositions, in conjunction
15 with the learning cultures and wider social fields they are engaged with (Bourdieu 1990;
16 Hodkinson et al. 2008). To date, research on non-formal CPD workshops has overlooked
17 the influence of dispositional changes towards coach learning (see Falcão et al. 2017;
18 Jacobs et al. 2015), or merely stated whether they are a preferred source of knowledge
19 acquisition (Stoszkowski and Collins 2016). Thus, the significance of this research lays
20 with its ability to illuminate how individual differences in learning within non-formal
21 situations are mediated through the interacting elements of learning dispositions, coaches'
22 habitus, and the learning cultures of CPD workshops. By merging the conceptual tools of
23 Pierre Bourdieu along with Hodkinson and colleagues' (2007, 2008) work on cultural
24 learning, it is argued learners within non-formal situations cannot be viewed as isolated
25 empty vessels. Instead, we develop the understanding that learning to coach is social,

1 embodied, and part of a wider process of becoming, where dispositions towards coaching
2 can be re-constructed through engagement with non-formal learning situations. In moving
3 away from a focus on formal coach education, this research provides further evidence
4 that non-formal learning situations are significant for coach learning, with both learning
5 cultures and dispositions proving influential in structuring the potential for individual
6 learning within the same social space (Hodkinson et al. 2008).

7 Crucially, this research highlights the need for SGBs who provide non-formal
8 learning situations to recognise ‘the influence of dispositions on how coaches act and
9 organise new knowledge’ (Griffiths and Armour 2013, 686). Moreover, the use of
10 specific tutors is an important consideration for SGBs designing and developing non-
11 formal learning situations. The capital of individuals within learning cultures and indeed
12 any social field can dictate what is considered as legitimate knowledge. It is therefore
13 proposed that SGBs should attempt to account for coaches’/teachers’/sports practitioners’
14 dispositions prior to attending delivered educational provision. Through this enhanced
15 understanding, it might be possible to design transformative CPD provision that has the
16 potential to modify the dispositions and the beliefs of the attending learners. SGB coach
17 developers and tutors through their possession of symbolic capital, may help to
18 restructure more expansive learning environments by utilising cross-sport non-formal
19 learning situations to overcome the doxic cultures embedded within sports. Future
20 research should consider in greater depth the impact that expansive cross-sport CPD
21 workshops might have on enhancing coaching practice and promoting innovative
22 approach towards developing coaches i.e. technology enhanced learning.

23 Nevertheless, it should be recognised that engagement with non-formal learning
24 situations such as CPD workshops is not a means-to-an-end for coach learning.
25 Experiences both within and outside of a learning situation will take precedence and

1 structure individual dispositions and positions within social fields (Hager and Hodkinson
2 2009). In any learning situation, there are always opportunities to learn; however, these
3 opportunities will fluctuate with learners' dispositions being either developed or
4 confirmed through engagement with the learning culture (Hodkinson et al. 2008).
5 Through this notion, we suggest 'a person [coach] is constantly learning through
6 becoming, and becoming through learning' (Hodkinson et al. 2008, 41; insertion added).
7 In encompassing the metaphor of becoming which presents learning as a continual,
8 transformative, and embodied process, it is appropriate to leave the final word to Joseph
9 (hockey) who articulates: 'I think the one thing you are going to have to go away with is
10 that you never stop learning'.

Notes

1. The UK Coaching Certificate (UKCC) is a framework that supports the development, endorsement, and improvement of SGB delivered coach education.
2. County Sports Partnerships are networks of local organisations and agencies aimed at improving sporting opportunities and experiences at a regional level. Across England there are 44 County Sports Partnerships, who work together with other partners such as SGB's to improve the workforce development of coaches, clubs, and volunteers.
3. Coaches working within the 'First Selective Environment' refers to the 'entry level' of the talent pathway within that sport. Although variable, generally it will refer to coaches who are working with county, district or regional athletes.

Acknowledgments:

Thank you to Dr. Robert Townsend for his insightful feedback on earlier drafts of this article.

Disclosure statement:

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

1 **References**

- 2 Armour, K. M., and M. R. Yelling. 2004. “Continuing Professional Development for
3 Experienced Physical Education Teachers: Towards Effective Provision.” *Sport,*
4 *Education and Society* 9 (1): 95–114.
- 5 Barker-Ruchti, N., D. Barker, S. B. Rynne, and J. Lee. 2016. “Learning Cultures and
6 Cultural Learning in High-Performance Sport: Opportunities for Sport Pedagogues.”
7 *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy* 21 (1): 1-9.
8 DOI:10.1080/17408989.2015.1072512
- 9 Bertram, R., D. M. Culver, and W. Gilbert. 2017. “A University Sport Coach
10 Community of Practice: Using a Value Creation Framework to Explore Learning and
11 Social Interactions.” *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching* 12 (3): 287–
12 302. DOI: 10.1177/1747954117710503
- 13 Bourdieu, P. 1984. *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London:
14 Routledge.
- 15 Bourdieu, P. 1986. “The Forms of Capital.” In *Handbook of Theory and Research for*
16 *the Sociology of Education*, edited by J. Richardson, 241–258. New York: Greenwood.
- 17 Bourdieu, P. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 18 Bourdieu, P. 1998. *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action*. Cambridge: Polity
19 Press.
- 20 Bourdieu, P. 2000. *Pascalian Meditations*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 21 Bourdieu, P., and R. Chartier. 2015. *The Sociologist and the Historian*. Cambridge:
22 Polity Press.
- 23 Bourdieu, P., and L. J. D. Wacquant. 1992. *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*.
24 Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 25 Braun, V., and V. Clarke. 2006. “Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology.” *Qualitative*
26 *Research in Psychology* 3 (2): 77–101.
- 27 Braun, V., V. Clarke, and P. Weate. 2016. “Using Thematic Analysis in Sport and
28 Exercise Research.” In *Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise*, edited
29 by B. Smith and A. C. Sparkes. 191-205. London: Routledge.
- 30 Coombs, P. H., and M. Ahmed. 1974. *Attacking Rural Poverty: How Nonformal*
31 *Education Can Help*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- 32 Costa, C., and M. Murphy. 2015. *Bourdieu, Habitus and Social Research: The Art of*
33 *Application*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 34 Creswell, J. W. 2013. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design*, 3rd Ed. London: Sage.

- 1 Cushion, C. J., and R. L. Jones. 2014. "A Bourdieusian Analysis of Cultural
2 Reproduction: Socialisation and the 'Hidden Curriculum' in Professional Football."
3 *Sport, Education, and Society* 19 (3): 276-298. DOI:10.1080/13573322.2012.666966
- 4 Cushion, C. J., and R. C. Townsend. 2018. "Technology-enhanced learning in coaching:
5 a review of literature." *Educational Review* 1-16. DOI:
6 10.1080/00131911.2018.1457010
- 7 Cushion, C. J., M. Griffiths, and K. Armour. 2017. "Professional Coach Educators In-
8 situ: A Social Analysis of Practice." *Sport, Education and Society* 1-14.
9 DOI:10.1080/13573322.2017.1411795
- 10 Cushion, C., L. Nelson, K. Armour, J. Lyle, R. Jones, R. Sandford, and C. O'
11 Callaghan. 2010. *Coach Learning and Development: A Review of Literature*. Leeds:
12 Sports Coach UK.
- 13 Falcão, W. R., G. A. Bloom, and A. Bennie. 2017. "Coaches' Experiences Learning and
14 Applying the Content of a Humanistic Coaching Workshop in Youth Sport Settings."
15 *International Sport Coaching Journal* 4 (1): 279-290.
- 16 Griffiths, M. A., and K. M. Armour. 2013. "Volunteer Sport Coaches and Their
17 Learning Dispositions in Coach Education." *International Journal of Sports Science &*
18 *Coaching* 8 (4): 677-688.
- 19 Griffiths, M. A., K. M. Armour, and C. J. Cushion. 2016. "'Trying to Get Our Message
20 Across': Successes and Challenges in an Evidence-Based Professional Development
21 Programme for Sport Coaches." *Sport, Education and Society* 1-13. DOI:
22 10.1080/13573322.2016.1182014
- 23 Hager, P. 2008. "Learning and metaphors." *Medical Teacher* 30 (7): 679-686. DOI:
24 10.1080/01421590802148899
- 25 Hager, P., and P. Hodkinson. 2009. "Moving Beyond the Metaphor of Transfer of
26 Learning." *British Educational Research Journal* 35 (4): 619-638.
27 DOI:10.1080/01411920802642371
- 28 Hodkinson, P., G. Biesta, and D. James. 2007. "Understanding Learning Cultures."
29 *Educational Review* 59 (4): 415-427. DOI:10.1080/00131910701619316
- 30 Hodkinson, P., G. Biesta, and D. James. 2008. "Understanding Learning Culturally:
31 Overcoming the Dualism Between Social and Individual Views of Learning." *Vocations*
32 *and Learning* 1 (1): 27-47.
- 33 Jacobs, F., A. Knoppers, R. Diekstra, and M. Sklad. 2015. "Developing a Coach
34 Education Course: A Bottom-Up Approach." *International Sport Coaching Journal* 2
35 178 -186.
- 36 Jones, R. L. 2007. "Coaching Redefined: An Everyday Pedagogical Endeavour." *Sport,*
37 *Education and Society* 12 (2): 159-173. DOI: 10.1080/13573320701287486

- 1 Light, R. L., and J. R. Evans. 2013. "Dispositions of Elite-level Australian Rugby
2 Coaches Towards Game Sense: Characteristics of their Coaching Habitus." *Sport,
3 Education, and Society* 18 407–423. DOI:10.1080/13573322.2011.593506
- 4 Lyle, J., and C. Cushion. 2017. *Sports Coaching Concepts: A Framework for Coaching
5 Practice*. 2nd Ed. London: Routledge.
- 6 Makopoulou, K. 2017. "An Investigation into the Complex Process of Facilitating
7 Effective Professional Learning: CPD Tutors' Practices under the Microscope."
8 *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*. DOI: 10.1080/17408989.2017.1406463
- 9 Nash, C., J. Sproule, and P. Horton. 2016. "Continuing Professional Development for
10 Sports Coaches: A Road Less Travelled." *Sport in Society*. DOI:
11 10.1080/17430437.2017.1232414
- 12 Nelson, L., C. Cushion, and P. Potrac. 2006. "Formal, Non-Formal and Informal Coach
13 Learning: A Holistic Conceptualisation." *International Journal of Sports Science and
14 Coaching* 1 (3): 247–259.
- 15 Nelson, L., C. Cushion, and P. Potrac. 2013. "Enhancing the Provision of Coach
16 Education: The Recommendations of UK Coaching Practitioners." *Physical Education
17 and Sport Pedagogy* 18 (2): 204-218. DOI: 10.1080/17408989.2011.649725
- 18 Phelan, S., and M. Griffiths. 2018. "Reconceptualising Professional Learning Through
19 Knowing-in-Practice: A Case Study of a Coaches High Performance Centre". *Sports
20 Coaching Review* DOI: 10.1080/21640629.2018.1424405
- 21 Piggott, D. 2015. "The Open Society and Coach Education: A Philosophical Agenda for
22 Policy Reform and Future Sociological Research." *Physical Education and Sport
23 Pedagogy* 20 (3): 283-298. DOI: 10.1080/17408989.2013.837435
- 24 Purdy, L. 2018. *Sports Coaching: The Basics*. London: Routledge.
- 25 Sfard, A. 1998. "On two metaphors for learning and the dangers of choosing just one."
26 *Educational Researcher* 27 (2): 4–13.
- 27 Smith, B., and A. C. Sparkes. 2016. "Interviews: Qualitative Interviewing in the Sport
28 and Exercise Sciences." In *Handbook of Qualitative Research in Sport and Exercise*,
29 edited by B. Smith and A. C. Sparkes. 103-123. London: Routledge.
- 30 Sparkes, A. C., and B. Smith. 2014. *Qualitative Research Methods in Sport, Exercise
31 and Health: From Process to Product*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- 32 Stodter, A., and C. J. Cushion. 2017. "What Works in Coach Learning, How, and For
33 Whom? A Grounded Process of Soccer Coaches' Professional Learning. *Qualitative
34 Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*. DOI:10.1080/2159676X.2017.1283358
- 35 Stoszkowski, J., and D. Collins. 2016. "Sources, topics and use of knowledge by
36 coaches." *Journal of Sports Sciences* 34 (9): 794-802, DOI:
37 10.1080/02640414.2015.1072279
- 38 Stoszkowski, J., D. Collins, and C. Olsson. 2017. "Using Shared Online Blogs to
39 Structure and Support Informal Coach Learning. Part 2: The Participants' View and

- 1 Implications for Coach Education.” *Sport, Education and Society* 22 (3): 407-425.
2 DOI:10.1080/13573322.2015.1030382
- 3 Taylor, B., and D. Garratt. 2010. “The Professionalisation of Sports Coaching:
4 Relations of Power, Resistance and Compliance.” *Sport, Education and Society* 15 (1):
5 121–139.
- 6 Townsend, R., and C. Cushion. 2015. “Elite Cricket Coach Education: A Bourdieusian
7 Analysis.” *Sport, Education and Society* DOI: 10.1080/13573322.2015.1040753
- 8 Trudel, P., D. Culver, and P. Werthner. 2013. “Looking at Coach Development from the
9 Coach Learner’s Perspective: Considerations for Administrators.” In *Handbook of*
10 *Sports Coaching*, edited by P. Potrac, W. Gilbert, and J. Denison, 375–387. London:
11 Routledge.
- 12 Trudel, P., and W. Gilbert. 2006. “Coaching and Coach Education.” In *Handbook of*
13 *Research in Physical Education*, edited by D. Kirk, D. Macdonald, and M. O’Sullivan.
14 516-539. London: Sage.
- 15 Wacquant, L. 2008. “Pierre Bourdieu.” In *Key Sociological Thinkers*, edited by R.
16 Stones, 261-277. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 17 Winchester, G., D. Culver, and M. Camiré. 2013. “Understanding how Ontario high
18 school teacher-coaches learn to coach.” *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy* 18 (4):
19 412-426. DOI: 10.1080/17408989.2012.690376