**CHAPTER 20**

**Closing reflections on football coach education: Towards a rhizomatic approach**

*Thomas M. Leeder*

**Introduction**

Having divided the book into thematic sections organised around a central theme, with each chapter exploring a contemporary issue within a designated country’s football coach education programme and provision, this final chapter attempts to offer innovative steps forward for both research and practice. The chapter begins by providing a short section summary for each of the 7 thematic areas which have come before this concluding section. Each summary is accompanied by 3 critical questions for readers to consider, with the aim of stimulating reflection and insight into areas for future research within football coach education. Next, the chapter introduces the work of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (1987), specifically the notion of rhizomatic learning and the associated concepts of assemblages, *becoming*, and lines of flight. Research into coach education over recent years has been informed by a variety of sociological and theoretical frameworks (e.g., Bernstein, Bourdieu, Goffman, Foucault), yet somewhat surprisingly Deleuzoguattarian concepts have received little application within the sport coaching and coach education field, bar some exceptions (e.g., Avner et al., 2021; Manley et al., 2012). Consequently, a principle aim of this chapter is to put several Deleuzoguattarian concepts to ‘work’, producing a language to understand how change (learning) occurs within football coach education, while helping readers to think critically, productively, and differently about enhancing current provision (Strom & Martin, 2017).

It is beyond the scope of this chapter to fully delve into every analytical concept developed by Deleuze and Guattari (1987), which are claimed to be “hard to grasp without significant investment of energy” (Pringle & Landi, 2017, p. 118). However, to understand the conceptual, theoretical, and practical issues which occur across football coach education programmes globally, I believe this body of work can provide an explanatory framework that pushes our understanding and opens avenues for future scholarly and practical inquiry (Strom & Martin, 2017). In sum, this final chapter concludes the book by drawing upon the tools of Deleuze & Guattari (1987) with the intention of stimulating “a re-think of the dominant influences of highly systematic structures that are proving futile in regard to [football] coach education and learning” (Williams & Bush, 2019, p. 386; *insertion added*).

**Thematic areas: Section summaries and critical questions**

The following section will provide a concise summary of each thematic area contained within this book, before offering 3 critical questions for readers to consider. These questions may encourage policy makers, coach developers, and other practitioners to reflect upon their past and current practice, or instead act as a catalyst for researchers and academics to identify areas of future research within football coach education globally.

***Section 1: Introducing football coach education***

**Summary:** Despite arguably being the most popular sport in the world, coach education in football is largely under researched. However, evidence suggests current provision does little to enhance coach learning, and could be enhanced further by the inclusion of content related to interpersonal skills and political astuteness, to prepare football coaches for the realities of practice.

1. Why has football coach education been under researched within the sport coaching literature, despite its global size and popularity?
2. How can football national governing bodies globally collaborate with each other, to understand successes, challenges, and opportunities within football coach education programmes?
3. If there are calls for content related to interpersonal skills and political astuteness to be embedded with football coach education, how, where, and for whom would this be most feasible and effective?

***Section 2: High-performance football coach education***

**Summary:** High-performance football coaching is a volatile, nuanced, and challenging environment, meaning the needs of high-performance football coaches are bespoke. Football national governing bodies and professional football clubs need to work harmoniously and collectively to offer holistic coach education initiatives which appreciate the complexity of the high-performance coaching role.

1. Beyond technical and tactical knowledge, which content areas need to be embedded within coach education programmes to meet the bespoke needs of high-performance football coaches?
2. How can football national governing bodies support professional football clubs in becoming learning organisations, to cope more effectively with the complex and dynamic high-performance environment?
3. What innovative methods could football national governing bodies adopt to provide enhanced informal learning opportunities for high-performance football coaches?

***Section 3: Youth and amateur football coach education***

**Summary:** Youth and amateur football coaches face unique stressors related to parental pressure, juggling a work-life balance, and limited time, which are all associated with the voluntary nature of the role. While football coach education and support are vital for coaches operating within these constraints, such provision needs to be delivered in a contextualised, meaningful, and time-efficient manner.

1. How might coach developers utilise storied representations of learners’ experiences of engaging with football coach education pre-course, during, and post-course to help grassroots football coaches grapple with the relational demands of the role?
2. Considering the global growth of grassroots/amateur 55–65+ small-sided football, what support are football national governing bodies providing coaches who operate within this unique context?
3. How can football national governing bodies continue to foster positive relationships with grassroots football clubs to help deliver coach education *in situ*?

***Section 4: Supporting the progression of female football coaches***

**Summary:** Despite the growth of female football coaches across the world in recent years, several organisational, intrapersonal, interpersonal, and sociocultural barriers still exist. Consequently, football national governing bodies are exploring the use of learner-centred female-only coach education programmes, coupled with mentorship and online learning opportunities, to overcome these challenges.

1. How does a constructivist, learner-centred approach to designing, delivering, and assessing football coach education benefit female coaches?
2. How can football national governing bodies support female football coaches in overcoming the organisational, intrapersonal, interpersonal, and sociocultural barriers which impede their learning and progression?
3. What training and education is available to coach developers to ensure they know how to recognise, act, and prevent gender stereotyping and gender-based violence within football coach education?

***Section 5: Critical reviews of current football coach education provision***

**Summary:** Despite limited research, football coach education has still been frequently critiqued within the sport coaching literature for several years. Specifically, there is a need to critically analyse both past and current provision, to understand how course content, delivery, and assessment procedures can be modified to enhance football coach learning longitudinally in the future.

1. How can conducive and coordinated working relationships between football national governing bodies, federations, universities, and other agencies be nurtured to support the development of football coach education programmes within less developed countries?
2. To objectively capture the impact of football coach education, what methods could be embedded within programme delivery and assessment procedures to longitudinally monitor coach learning?
3. Why might football national governing bodies take a historical ‘look back’ at previous iterations of their coach education provision?

***Section 6: ‘Lessons learned’ from empirical research into football coach education***

**Summary:** Football national governing bodies are not the sole organisation for delivering coach education provision, with higher education institutions, agencies, and independent researchers amongst others all providing interventions aimed at supporting football coach learning. Yet, football coach education providers each possess their own agendas, influencing not only the quantity and structure of provision, but also the measures of success and evaluation strategies.

1. When football national governing bodies, federations, universities, and other agencies design and deliver interventions geared towards enhancing football coach learning, what is considered as success and why?
2. To further support the professionalisation of sport coaching, how might football national governing bodies and higher education institutions work collaboratively to produce productive blended learning environments for football coaches?
3. To enhance the practice of coach developers, how can football national governing bodies provide a space (physical or virtual) for coach developers to share their experiences, to ultimately improve the design and delivery of football coach education provision?

***Section 7: Technological and pedagogical developments within football coach education***

**Summary:** Over the last 20 years, the sport coaching field has witnessed a growth in the use of technological aids coupled with an increase in progressive pedagogical approaches to enhance coaching practice and player learning. To stay contemporary, football coach education providers need to ensure course content addresses these developments to a greater or lesser extent, dependent upon the context and bespoke needs of learners.

1. When delivering coach education programmes, how can coach developers facilitate an optimal blend of subjective discussion-based activities while incorporating the use of objective data?
2. What are the most significant challenges coach developers encounter when introducing football coaches to game-based pedagogical approaches within coach education programmes, and how can these challenges be mitigated?
3. How can mobile devices support the delivery of football coach education programmes and how much content should be dedicated towards supporting learners in understanding the role of technology in coaching?

Having summarised the essence of this book, the attention of this concluding chapter now turns towards introducing rhizomatic learning as a framework to critically analyse past and current football coach education, while (re)imagining the implementation of future provision.

**Introducing Deleuze, Guattari, and rhizomatic learning**

Put simply, the notion of rhizomatic learning provides a set of theoretical concepts which helps us to understand how social actors (e.g., coaches, coach developers) and ideas (e.g., policy, curriculum, beliefs) interact to produce learning and practice within educational settings, such as football coach education (Strom et al., 2018). In their seminal book *A Thousand Plateaus*, Deleuze & Guattari (1987) provide a cluster of concepts, with the analogy of a rhizome at the core, which can be employed both theoretically and methodologically to disrupt Westernised, linear thinking patterns within education and society (Strom et al., 2018). Rhizomatics offers a different way of looking at the world and educational settings, through emphasising a process of *becoming* rather than a state of being (Sherman & Teemant, 2021).

When considering educational systems, Deleuze and Guattari (1987) refer to the analogy of a tree and a rhizome. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) argue that dominant educational discourses can be considered *arborescent* or tree like. Westernised education systems are flawed with dualist and positivist thinking mirroring a tree like structure, with one trunk (or universal idea) which reproduces itself into branches in a unidirectional and hierarchical trajectory (Strom et al., 2018; Strom & Viesca, 2021). Arborescent thought is essentialist and linear, representing a binary logic that reproduces thinking uncritically, and provides distinctions between what is right or wrong and good or bad (Strom & Viesca, 2021). Tree thought is therefore dangerous and dogmatic, as it perpetuates the status quo and reduces the potential for creative and different ways of knowing and being (Strom & Viesca, 2021).

***Current coach education programmes: A tree like approach?***

We can contend that most coach education programmes, within football and beyond, represent arborescent or tree like thought, encapsulating a binary logic underpinned by “the law of the one that becomes two, then of the two that becomes four” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 6). Indeed, much coach education provision has its roots in positivism (Bowes & Jones, 2006), with these assumptions having a “pervasive influence and legacy on coaching practice and shaping coach education” (Lyle & Cushion, 2017, p. 193), and representing the essence of instructor-centred teaching (Paquette et al., 2019). Positivist, arborescent, and tree like coach education provision is generally characterised by coach developers utilising passive teaching methods to transfer pre-determined curriculum knowledge, thus, limiting learner agency (Paquette et al., 2019). As a result, coach education is said to incorporate a dogmatic and closed circle format (Piggott, 2012), where coach developers use techniques to (re)produce knowledge and power which maintains the status quo (Piggott, 2012).

Over the last 20 years, a significant body of research has critiqued formal coach education for its positivist and arborescent tendencies, with coaches being subjected to standardised curriculums which privilege technocratic rationality and reinforce normative practices (e.g., Cushion et al., 2003, 2021; Chapman et al., 2020; Piggott, 2012; Williams & Bush, 2019). Despite a learner-centred rhetoric, coach education is largely oppressive and dogmatic (Chapman et al., 2020), where current provision produces uncritical consumers of knowledge who reproduce prescriptive practice designs, pedagogical approaches, coaching philosophies, and perceptions towards ‘good’ and ‘bad’ coaching and learning (Cope et al., 2021; Cushion et al., 2021). In this sense, a dogmatic image of thought within coach education will result in a process of over coding regarding the organisation, signification, and identity of content and learners (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). For example, coach education will perpetuate strong beliefs which are resistant to change e.g., this is how to coach; this is what coaching means; this is what coaching is; this is how coaching should be.

In Deleuzoguattarian terminology, coach education can be considered akin to a process of tracing, “referring to a process of transferring an image from one medium to another” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 5). Thus, coach education is structured via “a logic of tracing and reproduction” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 11), where generative coaching practices and strategies are presented. Therefore, programme content is “something that comes ready-made” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 12), to be reproduced by learner coaches within predictable, linear, and uniform assessment methods to be deemed competent following a novice-expert continuum (Cushion et al., 2021; McCarthy et al., 2021).

***Future coach education programmes: A rhizomatic approach?***

If we accept the assertion that sport coaching is an inherent social, relational, and pedagogical endeavour, the case for presenting coach education as “a functional, positivist, behaviourist activity no longer rings true” (Jones et al., 2016, p. 211). Consequently, a different perspective is needed to challenge linear, dogmatic, and tree like thinking which encompasses the majority of (football) coach education programmes globally. In contrast to a tree, a rhizome represents a way to think about the world (and education) in more complex terms. Rhizomes are plants (bulbs) which grow and develop unpredictably in multiple, non-linear directions. Rhizomes contain “heterogeneous elements that connect, and as these elements forge new connections, the rhizome changes or becomes different. Rather than a single unity operating in isolation and reproducing itself” (Strom et al., 2018, p. 9). As such, Deleuze and Guattari (1987, p. 6) indicate that “if tree logic operates via the binary in either/ors, rhizomes operate in *ands*, connecting and expanding rather than closing off or creating boundaries”.

Rhizomatics allows us to interrupt normalised educational ideas that are largely resistant to change (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). From this perspective, coach education can be considered an assemblage, an amalgamation of human and non-human (e.g., beliefs, values, norms) elements that produce something in a physical or virtual space (Strom & Martin, 2017). Assemblages are formed via people, discourses, and abstract ideas within a social space, which interact to produce both learning and practice. Rhizomes are made up of multiple lines (molar, molecular, lines of flight) and connections, which have the potential to reconfigure, maintain, or adapt the makeup of assemblages (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). These three types of lines are summarised below:

* **Molar lines:** These are rigid lines of territorialisation which reinforce normalised and dominant ways of thinking, reproducing dogma and restricting alternative perspectives (e.g., within football coach education this may be a standardised curriculum, promoted coaching philosophy or approach, normative behaviours and ‘gold standards’ of practice, accepted ways of doing things, or entrenched national governing body beliefs).
* **Molecular lines:** More subtle and flexible lines, which either reinforce molar lines or break free and deviate away from the norm (e.g., the individual thoughts, feelings, and practices of coaches and coach developers, which may reinforce or challenge the beliefs of a football national governing body).
* **Lines of flight:** When molecular lines deviate away from the norm, they become lines of flight, which have the ability to challenge the status quo overtime and present ‘new ways’ of doing through a process of deterritorialisation. Lines of flight have a temporal nature and may eventually become recaptured by molar lines; however, small shifts and changes overtime have the potential to disrupt arborescent thought (e.g., lines of flight can develop within football coach education via coaches questioning coach developer practices, challenging the agendas of national governing bodies, engaging in critical discussions with peers, or experimenting with creative ideas *in situ*).

Thus, the aim for football coach education programmes should be to encourage lines of flight and deterritorialisation, where both coaches and coach developers feel comfortable to ‘think outside the box’ to produce creativity, difference, and change (Denison, 2019). Rather than the *striated space* which encapsulates tree like coach education formats, where coaches are fixed along bordered and pre-determined paths, rhizomatic learning encourages progression through a *smooth space*, which is open to change and transformation (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). However, rhizomatic learning should be considered as a set of guiding principles, rather than prescriptive methods for football coach education programmes. Indeed, Deleuze (1995, p. 165) advocated that “there is no more a method for learning than there is a method for finding treasures”.

Nevertheless, as opposed to the tracing analogy used to describe Westernised, linear, and tree like educational structures, the rhizome can be considered a map which “does not reproduce an unconscious closed in upon itself; it constructs the unconscious… the map is open and connectable in all of its dimensions; it is detachable, reversible, susceptible to constant modification… reworked by an individual, group, or social formation” (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987, p. 12). While tracings often decontextualise knowledge, concepts, and ideas, maps are more active and are constantly being transformed and adapted (Sherman & Teemant, 2021). The analogy of a map is useful for presenting rhizomatic learning as a pedagogy of risk (Mackness & Bell, 2015), concerned with processes over states, and becoming over being, where learners follow individual nomadic paths (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). When adopting a rhizomatic approach to learning, coach education programmes should place a high emphasis on learner autonomy, self-organisation, and giving control to learners, liberating them from arborescent and dogmatic structures (Mackness & Bell, 2015). Within such an approach, the assumption is that the curriculum emerges from the community (Bell et al., 2016), as learners share their experiences, thoughts, and beliefs, ultimately making the content of any coach education course bespoke and meaningful. The benefits of designing a coach education programme in this manner relate to learners’ obtaining a sense of freedom and autonomy, which may lead to transformational learning occurring (Mackness & Bell, 2015).

The notion of a rhizome is not necessarily about resistance, rather, it is about connection and experimentation (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). Furthermore, a rhizomatic approach focuses on questions that ask about context, function, and production. Within a football coach education programme, some examples of these types of questions include:

* How does that pedagogical approach work for you and your players?
* How does that coaching style work for you and your players?
* Within your coaching context, how does this idea/method/approach function with your current beliefs?
* What types of outcomes and learning does that approach produce?
* What different thoughts does this idea/method/approach enable you to reflect upon?

Having provided a brief overview of Delueze and Guattari’s (1987) key concepts and their implications for football coach education and beyond, the next section focuses more explicitly on the process of learning. Drawing further upon Deleuzoguattarian analytical tools, coach learning within formal coach education programmes is critically discussed, with a focus on the role and practices of coach developers.

**Becoming-football coach: Understanding learning through a Deleuzoguattarian lens**

Regarding learning, Deleuze (1995) often discussed the notion of an apprenticeship to explain how individual thinking and creativity can be developed through engagement with ‘Ideas’. Specifically, Deleuze (1995, p. 164) advocated that “learning is the appropriate name for the subjective acts carried out when one is confronted with the objectivity of a problem (Idea), whereas knowledge designates only the generality of concepts or the calm possession of a rule enabling solutions”. Deleuze (1995) referred to the example of learning to swim to explain this process. A swimming teacher will be able to describe and demonstrate swimming techniques to a student who can practice these on land (e.g., the acquisition of knowledge), however, this will never fully amount to learning how to swim, as the water represents a problem (Idea) which needs to be confronted and engaged with fully by the student (Snir, 2018).

While Deleuze uses the example of learning to swim, this example can be adapted to explain the process of learning to coach within coach education programmes. In this sense, coaching is not merely a matter of abstract and theoretical knowledge, which coach developers can simply transmit to coaches in an unproblematic and dogmatic fashion (Cushion et al., 2021). The assumption that coaches are merely the recipients of knowledge within coach education programmes does not grasp the complexity of learning to coach (Chapman et al., 2020; Cope et al., 2021). Rather, thinking (and subsequently learning) occurs when coaches experience a set of problems (Ideas) *in situ*, and must experiment with creative solutions and strategies to overcome their issue. It is perhaps fair to suggest that for Deleuze, coach education should incorporate a “performance of thinking in action more than the teaching of a subject matter and what is learnt is not necessarily what is taught” (Snir, 2018, p. 307), hinting towards the informality of learning even within formalised programmes. Such a stance lends weight to the importance of contextualised coach education, which occurs within coaches’ own local club settings, while harnessing the experiences of others (Cushion et al., 2003).

Unfortunately, most coach education provision often involves “puerile examples taken out of context and arbitrarily erected into models… the master [coach developer] sets a problem, our [coaches] task is to solve it, and the result is accredited true or false by a powerful authority [national governing body]” (Deleuze, 1995, p. 158; *insertions added*). Hence, Deleuze (1995, p. 23) insisted that “we learn nothing from those who say: ‘Do as I do’. Our only teachers are those who tell us to ‘do with me’… rather than propose gestures for us to reproduce”. Therefore, learning is a reciprocal process where the teacher also learns from the student (Snir, 2018), with recent sport coaching research highlighting how coach developers can learn from the coaches they are working with (Leeder et al., 2021). For Deleuze, learning within coach education would entail developing new perspectives towards understanding coaching practice, where “every act of learning is an interpretation of signs” (Deleuze, 2000, p. 4).

Coach developers should emit signs within their programmes which cause problems for attending coaches, forcing them to deal with experiences that disrupt and challenges their deep-rooted beliefs (Bogue, 2004). However, as opposed to encouraging coaches to overcome natural modes of thinking (Deleuze, 2000), learning within much coach education is more akin to the reproduction of orthodox beliefs (Chapman et al., 2020; Cushion et al., 2021; Piggott, 2012). Instead, coach education programmes within football and beyond should appreciate the process of *becoming-coach.* While the metaphor of becoming has been used previously within the coach education literature (e.g., Webb & Leeder, 2021), from a Deleuzoguattarian perspective appreciating coach learning as a process of *becoming* acknowledges how transformations-in-action occur, produced by engagements with coach education assemblages (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987).

As outlined previously, an assemblage can be considered an “aggregate of elements, both human and non, that function collectively in a contextually unique manner to produce *something”* (Strom & Martin, 2017, p. 7). Thus, people (e.g., learners, coach developers), discursive (language, dress codes), and abstract (ideas, beliefs) factors combine within coach education courses, which are engaged with by coaches as an ongoing process of *becoming*, to (co)produce learning and practice (Sherman & Teemant, 2021). Assemblages have the potential to create something new continually, therefore, *becoming* helps reframe identity in a way which acknowledges its dynamic nature, emphasising a rhizomatic shift towards the relational process of learning (Deleuze, 1990).

Assemblages are engaged with differently by learners, consequently, within a coach education course coaches will each be at a different stage of learning and *becoming,* with the programme assemblage (people, discourses, norms) influencing them in idiosyncratic ways (see Stodter & Cushion, 2017; Webb & Leeder, 2021). Coach learning within rhizomatic programmes can be considered nomadic, with each coach following their personal pathway of transformation, experimentation, and difference in relation to Ideas, signs, and course content (Bogue, 2004; Waterhouse, 2011). In appreciating coach learners as nomads, who are constantly *becoming*, coach developers should facilitate “an encounter with the new by emitting signs, by creating problematic objects, experiences or concepts” (Bogue, 2004, p. 341), to encourage coaches to think critically about past practice to help re(imagine) future coaching. This requires coach developers to adopt an ethics of violence, which involves encouraging disorientation, critical thinking, and problem solving amongst learner coaches (Waterhouse, 2011). While rhizomatics has some obvious similarities to social constructivist theories, which have become popular within coach education discourse (see Paquette et al., 2019), social constructivism is an epistemological perspective, and not a specific theory that explains learning (Strom et al., 2018). The role of the coach developer within a rhizomatic coach education programme, amongst other elements, is briefly outlined in Table 20.1.

**Table 20.1** Features of rhizomatic coach education

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Feature of coach education** | **Deleuzoguattarian concepts** | **Description** |
| The role of the coach developer | Apprenticeship*Becoming*Nomadic learners | Viewing learning as an apprenticeship positions the coach developer as a reciprocal learner with coaches. Coach developers recognise themselves as a product of previous experiences, who welcome difference, challenge, and change. Coach developers recognise that coaches are in a constant state of *becoming* and are following nomadic paths. |
| Curriculum enactment | Ethics of violenceIdeas/signsDeterritorialisation Lines of flight | While following the striated space of a curriculum, coach developers seek opportunities to encourage an ethics of violence and alternative perspectives on practice. Violence in this sense denotates deterritorialisation, a move into smooth spaces, a line of flight which challenges the status quo and encourages critical thinking away from the norm. |
| Assessment and measures of success | AssemblagesSmooth spaces | Rather than prescriptive competency-based assessments derived from positivist assumptions, coach developers should measure success in terms of creativity, experimentation, and difference which occurs through learners’ engagement with assemblages and smooth spaces. Coach developers should offer choice and appreciate each coach’s nomadic journey, moving away from linear, uniform, and pre-determined forms of assessment. |

**Closing thoughts**

This concluding chapter has attempted to summarise the key themes within this book, while offering critical questions for readers to reflect upon in order to move football coach education forwards in both research and practice. Furthermore, Deleuze and Guattari’s (1987) concept of the rhizome and accompanying analytical tools have been briefly introduced, offering an innovative new ‘lens’ to view football coach education. It is important to note that the rhizome itself should be considered as an analytical tool, rather than a prescriptive metaphor, as Deleuze & Guattari (1987) offer alternatives examples to challenge arborescent and linear thinking within *A Thousand Plateaus*. Indeed, the rhizome alongside all Deleuzoguattarian analytical tools should not be pressed ‘too hard’ as it is possible to ‘over think’ these concepts (St. Pierre, 2004), with Gregoriou (2004, p. 240) advocating that “the goal is not to represent the rhizome but to implant it in thought”.

Nonetheless, I am of the opinion that football coach education informed and underpinned by practices associated with rhizomatic learning may help national governing bodies, policy makers, and coach developers move away “from the comfortable steady flame of replicating expertise to the dim flicker of promoting creative difference” (Marble, 2012, p. 29). However, there needs to be an appreciation that rhizomatic learning is at present, a prescription *for* rather than *of* coach education, with no empirical evidence to support its implementation within football coach education and impact (or not) on coach learning (Cushion & Nelson, 2013). Hence, in building upon recent research exploring the notion of rhizomatic learning within teacher education (e.g., Adams, 2021; Hordvik et al., 2020; Sherman & Teemant, 2021; Strom & Viesca, 2021), an obvious avenue for future research is to explore the application of Deleuzoguattarian analytical tools within sport coaching and coach education.

In echoing the sentiments of Biesta (2008), the introduction of rhizomatic learning and its implications for football coach education (and beyond) can be considered a form of counter-practice within sport coaching (Cushion et al., 2021). In this sense, rather than providing a ‘fix’ for a broken coach education system, Deleuzoguattarian concepts offer a potential avenue to view coach education differently and (re)imagine new ways of facilitating coach learning. The idea here is not to produce a rigid step-by-step guide for practitioners to merely copy, but instead to provide a set of malleable concepts for coach developers, coaches, and researchers to ‘think with’, with the hope that a rhizomatic approach will result in knowledge production, as opposed to arborescent tree like knowledge reproduction (Pringle & Landi, 2017).

In closing both this final chapter and the book itself, I hope the content throughout each chapter has encouraged readers to critically reflect on past, present, and future practice related to the football coach education programmes they are involved with. I hope this book amongst other initiatives can act as a catalyst to ignite change and ultimately improve the learning and practice of football coaches globally, enabling them to continue inspiring, motivating, and providing equal opportunities for players to continue enjoying ‘*O Jogo Bonito’* (‘The Beautiful Game’).
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