

## **Provocative, disruptive and re-orientating approaches to sports coaching research**

Alexandra Consterdine<sup>a\*</sup>

*<sup>a</sup>School of Sport and Exercise Sciences, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, UK*

*\*Corresponding author email [A.Consterdine@LJMU.ac.uk](mailto:A.Consterdine@LJMU.ac.uk)*

Alexandra Consterdine - ORCID number 0000-0002-8564-1960

Email [a.consterdine@bham.ac.uk](mailto:a.consterdine@bham.ac.uk)

Twitter handle @aconsterdine1

Linked in [www.linkedin.com/in/dr-alexandra-consterdine-211161150](https://www.linkedin.com/in/dr-alexandra-consterdine-211161150)

Dr Alexandra Consterdine is a Senior Lecturer in the Sociology of Sport, Exercise and Health at Liverpool John Moores University. Alex completed her PhD on power and high-performance athletics in the UK in February 2021, and is continuing her research into the sociology of sport, focusing on power, the coach-athlete relationship and culture. She is also active in sports coaching pedagogy, physical education, and qualitative research methods.

## **Provocative, disruptive and re-orientating approaches to sports coaching research**

This paper originates from my personal struggles and dissatisfaction with the unproblematic treatment of methodologies, politics, and procedures of doing sports coaching research. In response, I offer a radical counternarrative where I apply disruptive and unorthodox guiding principles of postmodern thought and approaches to fieldwork, analysis, and writing. Although these approaches have received some attention in general sports scholarship (Rail, 1998; Munslow, 2012; Thorpe, 2012), incorporating a full commitment to postmodernist approaches to sports coaching research is still gaining traction. By way of contribution, I have used postmodernism as both a sensibility, and as a set of orientating principles that influences my thinking and encourage a rigorous reflexivity that creates novel ways through which to consider both the research process, and the process of knowledge creation in sports coaching research. I offer these reflections as an illustration of *how* postmodernism could be adopted as a scaffold for others.

Keywords: sports coaching, postmodernism, postmodernist approaches, methodology

## **Breaking the mould – daring to be different**

Simultaneously misunderstood, notoriously difficult, and frustratingly ambiguous, postmodernism stands as a provocative yet stimulating sociological approach to qualitative research (Gubrium & Holstein, 1997; Rosenau, 1992). According to Lyotard (1984), postmodernism takes a position outside of traditional paradigms to question or deconstruct the assumptions of qualitative inquiry. Postmodernism is infamous for disrupting “humanist, modernist, imperialist, representationalist, objectivist, rationalist, epistemological, ontological and methodological assumptions of Western Enlightenment thought and practice” (St. Pierre, 2011, p. 615). Put differently, postmodern discourses challenge accepted ways of knowing and doing research. They make us suspicious towards principles of knowledge, power, language, the self, and truth that are often unquestioned (Flax, 1990). In short, postmodernism challenges what we think we know about a phenomenon, acknowledging fragmented and contested truths, wrestling with notions of incompleteness, and fractured ontologies. Doubt and uncertainty imbue the research process which can be unsettling to the researcher.

Consequently, it has been represented as a radical paradigm, sensibility, cultural critique, and as an expression of the *avant-garde*. Perhaps part of its difficulty is that postmodernism is often used as an umbrella term to cover a multitude of diverse theories, topics, and approaches (Grenz, 1996; Rosenau, 1992). Usher and Edwards (1994) provided the following summary of postmodernism:

...perhaps it is best understood as a state of mind, a critical, self-referential posture and style, a different way of seeing and working, rather than a fixed body of ideas, a clearly worked out position, or a set of critical methods and techniques (p. 2).

Taken together with its close cousin poststructuralism, these approaches could offer different ways of thinking and doing sports coaching research. This paper will attempt to explicate some of the challenges of taking a postmodernist approach by acknowledging the intellectual and practical difficulties. The intention is to elucidate how postmodernist thinking has been valuable in disrupting established ways of my thinking and, in turn, promote edgy approaches to research that might be useful to other researchers. Whilst these approaches are not new in qualitative research, they are not yet mainstreamed into coaching scholarship. Furthermore, this is not to merely offer postmodernism as a break with modernism (Bauman, 1992), but to recognise its relation to disruptive and critical thinking.

Despite the insurgence of coaching research that has brought poststructuralism/postmodernism to sport coaching, arriving at this position is a conversation scarcely discussed. Researchers do not always make their philosophical positioning explicit, not do they make clear their paradigmatic choices in their approach to research questions (North, 2013). By paying closer attention to the tenets of postmodernism, then, I suggest that researchers could become more tentative and reflexive, which might develop open-ended understandings of reality that embrace a plurality of viewpoints. This article takes up that challenge by suggesting ways to have a more intimate relationship with methodology (e.g., by playing closer attention to the politics and processes of doing research), and to produce work which is radically different to become more daring, interesting, and persuasive. And yet to present this as unproblematic would not do justice to the radical challenges I had in shifting to a new paradigm. In order not to fall into the trap of ‘navel-gazing’ and indulgent self-analysis that some qualitative methodologies often invite (Finlay, 2002), I had to strike a balance between acknowledging my authorial voice and enhanced reflexivity, with the voices of my interviewees, and development of appropriate theoretical and conceptual frameworks.

Consequently, the purpose of the article is to provide a counter-narrative of how I have come to understand the unruly, yet stimulating guiding principles of postmodern thought that informs my engagement in the field of coaching, treatment of data, and stylistic conventions (Richardson, 2000). What follows is an account of my leap into the disorientating and provoking ways of thinking and doing qualitative research, where I try to lay bare my struggles and liberations of transitioning to a critical, postmodern-inspired scholar. Specifically, I will examine how I wrestled with these challenges in the context of postmodernist-informed interviews, with respect to processes of data analysis, selection of voices, reflexivity, and writing style. Moreover, whilst it is not my intention to produce an instruction manual, (for that would run counter to the tenets of postmodernism), this paper aims to present some 'good' postmodern sensibilities for others to consider.

### **Philosophical positioning and paradigm choice?**

During my PhD, I became more sensitive to alternative paradigms and philosophical positioning, together with a curiosity towards researcher standpoint and engagement, theoretical considerations, methodological inquiry, and questions of representation (St. Pierre, 2011). My thesis itself concerned the operation of power relationships within elite athletes in UK. As my research unfolded, I became sensitised to the potential of poststructuralism/postmodernism both as a vehicle for thinking differently, and as a powerful set of tools from which to reconceptualise how power operates in this rarefied world. Consequently, in the hope of provoking nuanced understanding, I turned such considerations of power onto the research process itself, as well as it being the central focus of my study (St. Pierre, 2011).

As a result of this duel engagement with power, my thesis underwent a radical change in its tenor, structure and focus. For example, rather than simply claiming to be 'reflexive' in

an attempt to demonstrate rigour and credibility (Alvesson & Sköldbberg, 2018) – a point Townsend and Cushion (2021) warned against when poorly used or devoid of insight and integrity - I adopted a rigorous reflexivity to deal with the problematic realities of conducting research in dynamic organisations. Reflexivity, in this sense, required a more radical approach that is philosophically framed as poststructuralism/postmodernism<sup>1</sup>, which engendered a highly critical sensibility where knowledge, subjectivity, and reality are interrelated and problematised (Markula & Silk, 2011). Whilst poststructuralism and postmodernism share a number of characteristics (e.g., they are a loose collection of epistemologically linked approaches used to study a phenomenon, overlap in their paradigmatic assumptions, and are critical of an objective reality), it is important to recognise their differences (St. Pierre, 2011). Rosenau (1992) and Sarup (1993) identify four main ways that they do so including scope, time frames and origin, genealogy, and approach<sup>2</sup>.

In turn, I employed *poststructuralism* as a sensitising theoretical lens to read the co-constructed data through a poststructuralist standpoint. This operated as a powerful disruptive force which challenged me to think differently. Simultaneously, I used *postmodernism* as a sensibility that first, influenced my engagement in the field; acting as set of guiding

---

<sup>1</sup> As Sarup (1993, p. 144) wryly observes, 'There are so many similarities between poststructuralist theories and postmodernist practices that it is difficult to make a clear distinction between them'. Indeed, due to their shared onto-epistemologies, musing on the notion of 'truth', the politicisation of research itself, appropriate judgement criteria used and their approach to doing and writing up research, they are often used interchangeably in sports coaching research, as well as in broader qualitative research (Markula and Silk, 2011). In this paper, I use both together to represent a paradigm. When I use them singularly, I am specifically emphasising them as either a theoretical lens (poststructuralism) or as a sensibility and guidance to methodology (postmodernism).

<sup>2</sup> Scope: postmodernism is a broad church and cultural paradigm, bridging many disciplines, whereas poststructuralism has a narrower focus being grounded in academic debate, rather than culture and concerned with critical theory. Time frames and origin: postmodernism developed in 1960s New York, where it dissolved boundaries between high and low culture, whilst poststructuralism has its roots in European avant-garde in critical theory 20 years earlier. Genealogy: postmodernism takes its point of departure from modernism, whereas poststructuralism stands in critical relation to structuralism. Approach: postmodernism is a sensibility, a state of mind that deconstructs metanarratives, compared to poststructuralism which reveals power relations on which the reproduction of modern society depends (Rosenau, 1992; Sarup, 1993).

principles that informed my approach to interviewing, and second, influenced my writing style and presentation of data. Such methodologies are based on the onto-epistemological position that there are contested and fragmented truths, and that knowledge, reality, and truth are socially constructed and reproduced through evolving discourses (Markula & Silk, 2011). Doing so allowed me to shift away from the universal metanarratives and dualistic interpretations of power, often found in positivistic and interpretive work (Avner et al., 2014).

Central to my positioning was a sensitivity towards notions of subjective realities and to consider that knowledge is co-created (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2018). Yet, immersing myself into such contested, contradictory, fragmentated, and incomplete spaces (Pelias, 2011) was not easy. Indeed, while I found solace in the great deal of literature on postmodernism (Alvesson, 2002; Grenz, 1996; Rosenau, 1992), there was very little guidance on the practicalities of actually *doing it* (Alvesson & Sköldberg, 2018). My disquiet around applying postmodern tendencies is exemplified in my Reflexive Journal entry<sup>3</sup>:

...I really do not know what to do for the best. Maybe the criticism of the postmodernism agenda is that it offers plenty of critique, but fails to present what may be feasible alternatives to the 'status quo' holds true (June 2018).

This instance was centred around my anxieties about how to transform from an interpretivist standpoint to that of a postmodernist when interpreting my interview data. Despite my extensive reading and nascent understanding, I found it hard to let go of previous assumptions as the conceptual ground shifted beneath me. For guidance, I consulted the

---

<sup>3</sup> Throughout my PhD I created several Reflexive Logbooks to develop my critical consciousness. As a postmodern device I have used these extracts as data to enrich my work. Specifically, these approaches have allowed me to engage in a critical dialectical conversation with my reading and research, my changing position, and emergent ways of thinking. In this way, viewing writing both as a research endeavour and by writing oneself into the text is essential to developing a postmodern position. By choosing examples that exposes the vulnerabilities, uncertainties, tensions and/or paradoxes of doing qualitative research can the reflexively aware researcher move beyond most humanist/interpretivist practices involving reflection.

original writings of Foucault, Derrida, Lyotard, Kristeva, Barthes and Baudrillard, sought the advice of critical friends, and wrote myself into understanding via my reflexive logs. To clarify, whilst there is a growing body of poststructuralist informed literature in sports coaching using this approach (e.g., see Avner et al., 2014; 2019; Markula & Pringle, 2006; Markula & Silk, 2011; Mills et al., 2022; Sawiuk et al., 2021), this is *not* the case for postmodernism. It is true that these approaches have received some attention in general sports scholarship (Rail, 1998; Munslow, 2012; Thorpe, 2012), but there have only been a handful of examples of studies incorporating a full commitment to postmodernism in sports coaching (e.g., Friedman et al., 2022; Kuklick & Mills, 2023).

This brings me to a wider point; I am not providing a technical guide for others to follow. Instead, I am attempting to explain what postmodern scholarship means to me and how it might guide future researchers. Building upon the good examples of methodologically driven sports coaching research (e.g., Kuklick & Mills, 2023; Sawiuk et al., 2021; Taylor et al., 2017), the point is to make explicit the politics and processes of the entire research process. This stands in contrast to work that is epistemologically wedded to postpositivist approaches, which consider knowledge to be liberated from consciousness, and based upon a sole outward reality that can be explained through cause and effect (see, for example, Jowett & Cockerill, 2003; Jowett & Frost, 2007). The danger here is to perpetuate the grand narratives and scientific certainty that postmodernism actively resists (Rail, 1998), which can lead to a homogenous trans-contextual reading of sports coaching that is both limited and limiting.

## **Challenging words: Tasting ideas and textual concerns**

Until now, the article might be read as suggesting that the turbulence was a solo effort. This is far from the case. I give heartfelt thanks for the influence, support, and guidance from my Director of Studies (DoS) Dr William (Bill) Taylor. This has been a shared journey into the unknown and Bill has helped me map the landscape and suggest changes of direction. Specifically, he allowed me space to “try out the taste of ideas”, explore hidden routes in creating my own knowledge, suggest particular esoteric texts, but also in the robust, lively and sometimes dizzying exchanges in our frequent supervisory meetings. At the start of the process, I left early meetings with my head full of provocations; what I would later come to understand as shifts in my worldview. This was not easy, as I had been schooled in (post)positivism. Comments on early manuscripts queried my lapses into objectifying practices and scientism. Some of the key advice included; “Write yourself into the text. Have a conversation with yourself, not an information exchange”; “be careful that the defence of other methods are not premised on the fact that it is not positivism”; but also, “remember to be tentative, suggestive and person centred in your writing and when reading it back to yourself; challenge your own use of the written word. Give more of yourself and be brave”.

I have later come to realise such advice follows St. Pierre’s (2011) assertions to carefully consider the authority and legitimacy within texts. Specifically, this might include the formulations, textual representations, ways of presenting data, voices conveyed, and literary devices. Indeed, Richardson (2000) exhorts us not to think of writing as simply a transcribing of a particular reality, for to do so would underplay the complexity. Rather, we might consider writing as a three-way discovery process of the subject in question, the problem itself, and consequently, the discovery of the self (Pelias, 2011). Such analysis sparked an understanding of writing to be a performative, cerebral, and creative process that

becomes an extension of self and reaches out from across the page. As such, writing oneself into position is central to a postmodern sensibility, where the importance of the self in scholarly writing as a way of knowing is considered and problematised (Pelias, 2011; Richardson, 2000).

### **So what: A question of style**

So, what have I learnt? I offer the following five suggestions to summarise how postmodernism has influenced my writing. Firstly, I have learnt to speak directly to the reader with an unapologetic use of the first person. I adopt the position of what Richardson (2000, p. 928) described as a “situated speaker”. The point is to avoid sanitised author-evacuated texts that reflect unnecessary traditional scientific practices to writing research. A pertinent example of scholars who speak directly to the reader comes from Jones’ (2006) auto-ethnographic account of managing his coaching persona, performance, and uncertainly about others’ perceptions.

Secondly, I have tried to be cognisant of the notion of ‘voice’ or polyvocality, and take Hertz’s (1997) concerns with decisions about whose voice to privilege. In this way, silencing particular voices became a crucial concern, leaving me with a sense of unease for whom I did and did not select (Alvesson & Sköldbberg, 2018). The selection of these voices was fraught with difficulty, yet I took solace in the previously discussed multiplicity of doing research. Thus, by weaving my own voice into my writing forced me to act as a point or counterpoint to the narratives constructed.

Thirdly, linked to the point above, concerns ‘presence’, which questions the author as unified whole person with an unchanging essential essence (Richardson, 2000). In this way, the full person, complete with roving identities and competing multifarious selves, can never

be fully expressed. This was persuasively explored by Townsend and Cushion's (2021) discussion of representing multiple researcher subjectivities within disability sport coaching.

Fourth, as a stylistic convention I have included experimentation or playfulness where puns, word play, and metaphors invites a conversational exchange with the reader. Then fifth and finally, returning to the first point, to use one's own writing as data has much value in infusing a critical reflexivity. Consequently, the thinking, reflecting, and constantly evaluating is suggestive of looping hermeneutics, moving forwards, backwards, crossways, circling and twisting (Alvesson & Skoldberg, 2018). In this way, efforts to account for transparency and the messiness of conducting qualitative research by integrating examples of reflexivity adds rigour and transparency to the research endeavour (Pelias, 2011). I offer these sensibilities as a root to powerful explorations of meaning, language, multiple subjectivities, and shifting perspectives.

### **Chewing on sports coaching interviews with a postmodern flavour**

In the ensuing section, I will try to demonstrate how a postmodern perspective was infused into interviews more specifically, and my wider fieldwork more generally. Here, one of the most important lessons that I learnt was to not to see interviews as a technical tool to 'get to the truth', or to gain access to interviewee's personal experiences, but to recast the event as an active, dynamic and powerfully social encounter (Gubrium & Holstein, 2003). It is a far from simple activity, as Schostak (2006, p. 1) warns:

Don't be misled. The interview is not a simple tool with which to mine information. It is a place where views may clash, deceive, seduce, enchant. It is the inter-view. It is as much about seeing a world – mine, yours, ours, theirs – as about hearing accounts, opinions, arguments, reasons, declarations: words with views into different worlds.

This interactive exchange demonstrates the slippery nature of the interview encounter, complete with their temporal fleeting qualities, nuance, and multilayers of meaning imbued with politics and power. Doing so recasts interviews as a negotiated practice involving contestation, cooperation, and persuasion as a complex social dance between protagonists. For example, I am reminded of a challenging interview with an Athlete Performance Manager who became so taciturn and withdrawn it became almost impossible to entice him. In my desire to salvage the interaction, I worked hard to re-build our rapport by altering the style of questioning and going completely off-script. Furthermore, texts which rejected the notion of the interviewer and interviewee acting productively together to produce a shared and common meaning were seductive. For example, Scheurich (1997) argued that the interview has no *telos* in terms of a shared production of meaning, challenging the idea that the interview is purely a knowledge-producing phenomena. Instead, both parties may have many transparent or hidden objectives and motives. To illustrate, I draw upon my reflections of my interview with Toni, an elite UK coach:

In trying to follow him and give meaning to his words I had to concentrate fully. Yet I could not guarantee how my interview persona, strategies or motives were perceived in return, or how successful the interview actually was. He was verbose, seemingly very open and passionate, yet at times I felt like the one who was being interviewed. At the very least it was intense; I felt that I was being assessed and I did not want to disclose too much of myself or my intentions (Researcher Fieldnote Journal<sup>4</sup>, July 2018).

This exchange emphasised the challenge of interviews, where I felt deeply aware of the gender power (in)balances, and a perceived challenge to my status as a researcher (Gubrium & Holstein, 2003; Thorpe, 2012). Thus, a central postmodern concern with interviewing is

---

<sup>4</sup> These diary extracts are useful in helping me making sense of the shifting power dynamics of this contested field of action and to analyse what this might mean.

power. For as Markula and Silk (2011) have emphasised, the inherent asymmetries of power subsume the entire interview process, not only in its dynamic form as a social encounter, but from conception, creation, transcription, evaluation, (re)presentation, interpretation, and dissemination. This encouraged me to reflect on the role of power in the creation of interview knowledge, for this “raises both epistemological issues about the implications for the knowledge produced and ethical issues about the implications about how to deal responsibly with power asymmetries” (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015, p. 18).

Doing so also allowed for the role of the researcher to be transformed from a disembodied, neutral interrogator into a dynamic, empathic provocateur involved in the co-construction of meaning (Brinkmann & Kvale, 2015; St. Pierre, 2011). One particular site relates to transcriptions; that is, moving from oral to written data, raises questions as to representation and authenticity (MacLean et al., 2004). Indeed, Gubrium and Holstein (1997) question the notion of authenticity and meaning when they ask if a simple transcript of an interview can realistically capture its lived qualities, particularly its fundamental tenor? As a counter, some audio-recordings were not transcribed, but evaluated aurally. This enabled me to devote the time saved to listen back to the data, immersing myself in it. For example:

Bill highlighted the degree of separation that can occur when we go through stages of data creation and managing data itself. With each phase of data manipulation, there is the potential to move further away from the original, raw, unmediated experience of the *vis-à-vis* interview. He cautioned me to stay close to the audio and return to my recordings often as I could, so not to lose the immediacy and intimacy of those moments in time (supervisory meeting notes, July 2018).

Overall, I have been challenged by my initial assumptions about the ‘straightforwardness’ of conducting interviews and I align myself with Alvesson (2002) who proposes that there is so much more than seeing it purely in terms of a tool to gain access to

the minds of interviewees or the interiors of their social realities. As a result, I join with Fontana and Frey (2000) in developing my understanding of the interview as a multi-layered and intricate social phenomenon. The point being that postmodern critiques of interviewing offer “a set of orientating sensibilities” that can promote critical insights (Gubrium & Holstein, 2003, p. 4).

### **Bringing it all together**

Throughout this short article, I have tried to map out what it might mean to take a postmodern approach to sports coaching research in the hope of providing a scaffold for others. This has come in the form of five sensibilities that I have garnered from my experiences conducting a PhD studying the power relations within an elite sport organisation. The concern has included the notion of fragmented selves, stylistic considerations to writing, the interrelations between self, research questions, approach, and significant others, and a critical analysis of research method. In terms of the latter, the final section of the article introduces the political and contested nature of interviews. Here, I have drawn upon various notes and reflections from my supervisor meetings as an illustration of how paradigmatic tensions and the practicalities of doing research collide.

For researchers seeking a new approach, postmodernism may be a leap into the unfamiliar, but close reading of broad postmodern texts (Alvesson, 2002; Bauman, 1992; Grenz, 1996; Gubrium & Holstein, 2003; Rosenau, 1992), and general sports scholarship (Rail, 1998; Munslow, 2012; Thorpe, 2012), could open the door to new ways of doing sports coaching research. In trying to deconstruct contemporary sport and its new cultural logic we need a more erudite approach, and to not fall back on safe, reductive postpositive or interpretive approaches that perpetuate a particular way of knowing. To develop research that

embraces doubt, wrestles with the co-construction and representation of data, uses irony and irreverence, and sensitises language. Only then can we be considered disruptive.

In a world of Taylor Swifts, be Lady Gaga.

### **Acknowledgements**

I would like to give my sincere thanks to Dr Charlie Corsby and the reviewers for their invaluable insights and practical advice on earlier drafts of this manuscript. Their commentary has lifted my paper and added rigour to which I am grateful.

### **Declaration of interest**

Research carried out by the authors that helped inform the paper was part funded by the Cluster for Research into Coaching (CRiC).

### **References**

- Avner, Z., Jones, L., & Denison, J. (2014). Poststructuralism. In L. Nelson, R. Groom, and P. Potrac. (Eds.), *Research methods in sports coaching* (pp. 42-51). Routledge.
- Avner, Z., Denison, J., & Markula, P. (2019). “Good Athletes Have Fun”: a Foucauldian reading of university coaches’ uses of fun. *Sports Coaching Review*, 8(1), 43-61.
- Alvesson, M. (2002). *Postmodernism and social research*. Open University Press.
- Alvesson, M., & Sköldbberg, K. (2018). *Reflexive methodology: new vistas for qualitative research*. (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Brinkmann, S., & Kvale, S. (2015). *Interviews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing*. (3rd ed.). Sage.
- Bauman, Z. (1992). *Intimations of postmodernity*. Routledge.
- Finlay, L. (2002). Negotiating the swamp: the opportunity and challenge of reflexivity in research practice. *Qualitative Research*, 2(2), 209-230.
- Flax, J. (1990). Postmodernism and gender relations in feminist theory. In L. J. Nicholson (Ed). *Feminism/postmodernism*. (pp. 39-62). Routledge.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: from structured questions to negotiated text. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. (2nd ed.), (pp. 645-672). Sage.
- Foucault, M. (1988). Technologies of the self. In L. H. Martin, H. Gutman, & P. H. Hutton (Eds.), *Technologies of the self: A seminar with Michel Foucault*. (pp. 16-49). Tavistock.

- Friedman, A. C., Mills, J. P., & Gearity, B. (2022). Natural science and culture grapple on the mat: An autoethnography of a wrestler's rapid weight loss. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1-20.
- Grenz, S. J. (1996). *A primer on postmodernism*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (1997). *The new language of qualitative method*. Oxford University Press.
- Gubrium, J. F., & Holstein, J. A. (Eds.). (2003). *Postmodern interviewing*. Sage.
- Hertz, R. (Ed.). (1997). *Reflexivity and voice*. Sage.
- Jones, R. L. (2006). Dilemmas, maintaining "face," and paranoia: An average coaching life. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 12(5), 1012-1021.
- Jowett, S. & Cockerill, I. M. (2003). Olympic medallists' perspective of the athlete-coach relationship. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 4(4), 313-331.
- Jowett, S. & Frost, T. (2007). Race/ethnicity in the all-male coach-athlete relationship: black footballers' narratives. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 5(3), 255-269.
- Kuklick, C. R., & Mills, J. P. (2023). Post-structural pedagogy in a coach development curriculum. *Sports Coaching Review*, 1-22.
- Lyotard, J. (1984). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. (G. Bennington, & B. Massumi, trans). Manchester Press. (Original work published 1979).
- MacLean, L. M., Meyer, M., & Estable, A. (2004). Improving accuracy of transcripts in qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 14(1), 113-123.
- Markula, P., & Pringle, R. (2006). *Foucault, sport and exercise: Power, knowledge and transforming the self*. Routledge.
- Markula, P., & Silk, M. L. (2011). *Qualitative research for physical culture*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mills, J. P., Gearity, B., Kuklick, C., & Bible, J. (2022). Making Foucault coach: Turning post-structural assumptions into coaching praxis. *Sports Coaching Review*, 11(2), 192-212.
- Munslow, A. (2012). *Deconstructing sport history: A postmodern analysis*. State University of New York Press.
- North, J. (2013). Philosophical underpinnings of coaching practice research. *Quest*, 65(3), 278-299.
- Pelias, R. J. (2011). Writing into position: Strategies for composition and evaluation. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. (4th ed., pp. 659-668). Sage.
- Richardson, L. (2000). Writing: a method of inquiry. In N. K. Denzin, & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. (2nd ed., pp. 923-948). Sage.
- Rail, G. (Ed.). (1998). *Sport and postmodern times*. SUNY Press.
- Rosenau, P. M. (1992). *Post-modernism and the social sciences: Insights, inroads, and intrusions*. Princeton University Press.
- Sarup, M. (1993). *An introduction to post-structuralism and postmodernism* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
- Sawiuk, R., Lewis, C. J., & Taylor, W. G. (2021). "Long ball" and "balls deep": A critical reading of female coach-learners' experiences of the UEFA A licence. *Sports Coaching Review*, 10(1), 110-127.
- Scheurich, J. J. (1997). *Research method in the postmodern*. Falmer.
- Schostak, J. (2006). *Interviewing and representation in qualitative research*. McGraw-Hill Education.

- St. Pierre, E. A. (2011). Post qualitative research: The critique and the coming after. In N. K. Denzin, & Y.S S. Lincoln (Eds.). *The Sage handbook of qualitative research*. (4th ed., pp. 611-626). Thousand Oaks.
- Taylor, W. G., Potrac, P., Nelson, L. J., Jones, L., & Groom, R. (2017). An elite hockey player's experiences of video-based coaching: A poststructuralist reading. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 52(1), 112-125.
- Thorpe, H. (2012). The ethnographic (i)nterview in the sports field: Towards a postmodern sensibility. In K. Young, & M. Atkinson (Eds.), *Qualitative research on sport and physical culture* (Vol. 6, pp. 51-78). Emerald Group Publishing Limited
- Townsend, R. C., & Cushion, C. J. (2021). 'Put that in your fucking research': Reflexivity, ethnography and disability sport coaching. *Qualitative Research*, 21(2), 251-267.
- Usher, R. & Edwards, R. (1994). *Postmodernism and education: Different voices, different worlds*. Routledge.