"It's just been learning on the job": becoming and developing as a ParaHockey coach

Amy Elizabeth Hardwick, Tabo Huntley, Anthony Maher & Amy Whitehead

Published online: 17 Apr 2024.

Submit your article to this journal ⇗

Article views: 301

View related articles ⇗

View Crossmark data ⇗

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

"It's just been learning on the job": becoming and developing as a ParaHockey coach

Amy Elizabeth Hardwick[a], Tabo Huntley[a], Anthony Maher[b] and Amy Whitehead[a]

[a]School of Sport and Exercise Science, Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool, UK; [b]Carnegie School of Education, Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, UK

ABSTRACT

Although the body of literature around disability sport has grown in interest over the last decade, there remains a lack of research focusing on contexts where athletes have intellectual impairments. Not only this, but despite recommendations made several decades ago to improve coach education for disability sport, there remains very few opportunities available. Therefore, this study foregrounds the experiences and opinions of ParaHockey coaches in becoming and learning to coach in this context. Data were collected via semi-structured interviews with 8 coaches and 2 staff from the International Hockey Federation (FIH). The essence of constructivist grounded theory was employed to analyse these data, from which two categories were constructed; 1) Becoming a ParaHockey Coach and 2) Developing as a ParaHockey Coach, which are discussed in light of Models of disability. The study concludes by advocating for integration of disability within FIH coach education provision and the value in utilising the social-relational model of disability to make sense of coaches' experiences.

Introduction

The United Nations published a protocol entitled "*Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities*", with a purpose to "promote, protect and ensure the full and equal enjoyment of all human rights and fundamental freedoms by all persons with disabilities" (United Nations: Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2006, p. 4) Therefore, it is vital that disabled people are provided with opportunities to participate in sport and recreation that are available to non-disabled people. Coaches are key agents in providing these opportunities and aiding the development of disabled athletes (Townsend, Huntley, Cushion, & Culver, 2022), yet coach learning and development in this context is under-researched (Townsend, Cushion, & Smith, 2018).

CONTACT Amy Elizabeth Hardwick ✉ a.e.hardwick@ljmu.ac.uk 🏢 School of Sport & Exercise Science, Liverpool John Moores University, Student Life Building, Copperas Hill, Liverpool L3 5AJ, UK

Notably, there is a dearth of research focusing on coaching athletes with an intellectual impairment (ID) (Turgeon, Turgeon, & Morin, 2023), which has been defined as, "a state of arrested or incomplete development of mind" (Hassan, Dowling, & McConkey, 2014, p. 4). Thus, it is important that we attempt to address this gap to develop our understanding of this context so that coaches can create meaningful sporting experiences for people with ID.

Despite the importance of coach education, disability coaching research continues to highlight the lack of relevant formal coach education or development opportunities (Bentzen, Alexander, Bloom, & Kenttä, 2021). The combination of ineffective coach education provision and a lack of critically aware coaching research, often means the reality of living with an impairment and the socially constructed nature of disability is ignored (Townsend, Smith, & Cushion, 2015). This results in the conjecture that non-disabled sporting principles can simply be transferred to the disability sport context without considering the complex and diverse needs and abilities of disabled people (Cushion, Stodter, & Clarke, 2022). Consequently, by ignoring disability, researchers (e.g. McMaster, Culver, & Werthner, 2012) often fail to illuminate inappropriate practices that are ableist in nature, and address social inequalities experienced by disabled athletes and their coaches (Townsend et al., 2018; Cushion, Stodter, & Clarke, 2022; Wareham, Burkett, Innes, & Lovell, 2017). The reality is the lived experiences and needs of disabled people, are often different from the nondisabled population and so require focused attention to ensure they have every opportunity to access inclusive and empowering sporting opportunities (Huntley et al., 2019).

To make sense of the socially constructed nature of disability and disabling barriers within sport, some authors have drawn upon models of disability (e.g. Allan, Blair Evans, Latimer-Cheung, & Côté, 2020; Culver & Werthner, 2018; Townsend et al., 2015). Historically, disability has been defined according to the medical model, focusing attention on the biological defects of impairment, rendering the disabled person a problem to be fixed (Barnes, Mercer, & Shakespeare, 1999). Disability coaching and coach education is often underpinned by medical model discourses with the specific goal to improve performance whilst ignoring the lived experiences of disability (Townsend et al., 2015). Opposing the medical model is the social model of disability, whereby disability is viewed as socially constructed through structural, cultural, and social barriers that are enacted upon disabled people (Thomas, 2014). Consequently, the social model focuses attention on disability as a form of social oppression, excluding disabled people from their full participation in society. Adopting this position meant that it became possible to begin to understand the disabled peoples' lived experiences and the different ways oppressive practices were encountered (Thomas,

2007). A more encompassing view can be recognised through the social-relational model (SRM) which focuses attention on Impairment effect – the perceived physical and social effects of altered function; Construction – societal attitudes and discourse; Structural barriers – exclusion from opportunities and services, and Psychological well-being – the perceived effects of attitudinal oppression on emotion and behaviour (Thomas, 1999, 2004, 2007; Townsend et al., 2022). The application of the SRM is significant step within disability sport and in particular the current context because this model recognises the social construction of disability, yet accounts for contextual nuances and lived experiences of disabled people (Townsend et al., 2018), by accounting for "the interaction of biological and social factors" (Thomas, 1999, p. 43).

Thus, the current study aims to address the paucity of coaching research within sport for athletes with ID by being the first to explore coaches learning within the context of ParaHockey, an adapted version of field hockey for players with ID. While working within the concise restrictions of this special issue, this paper is the first empirical insights to larger body of work. Considering the disability sport context, this paper is influenced by Thomas's (1999, 2004, 2007) social-relational model, to explore how coaches learning and development experiences may be influenced by societal discourses of disability. The implication of which may positively impact the development and provision of integrated coach education within this context.

Following this brief introduction, an overview of the research design is provided. Then, two themes from the wider dataset are provided. The themes will be presented and discussed together to make the case for the value of the social-relational analysis of ParaHockey coaching.

Methodology

Philosophical positioning

This research was underpinned by social constructivism (Sparkes, 2015), aligning with the interpretivist paradigm (Guba & Lincoln, 2005). Therefore, the authors are seeking to understand how participants construct their experiences of becoming and developing as ParaHockey coaches. A qualitative approach was utilised to explore these experiences, whereby ontologically, reality is contextual and multifaceted (Chowdhury, 2014) and from a subjectivist epistemological position, knowledge is socially constructed through experience (Levers, 2013). Authors have interpreted coaches' experiences to help

Table 1. Coach participant demographics.

Coach	Gender	Age	Country	Overall Coaching Experience (years)	ParaHockey Coaching Experience (years)	Level Coaching	Coaching Qualification/s
Thomas	Male	20	Belgium	6	5	Elite	L2
Emma	Female	31	Germany	6	4	Elite	None
Gary	Male	47	England	20	4	Elite	L2
Maria	Female	22	Spain	5	1	Elite	None
George	Male	63	England	5	5	Participation	L2
Ida	Female	36	Belgium	21	<1	Elite	L2 (working towards L3)
William	Male	61	Netherlands	9	6	Elite	None
Sofia	Female	58	Argentina	41	2	Participation	None

Table 2. FIH staff participant demographics.

FIH Staff Member	Gender	Age	Experience in Current Role (years)
Daniel	Male	66	3
Ricardo	Male	44	2

make sense of coach learning and development within the context of disability sport.

Participants

Participants were recruited through criteria-based, purposeful sampling (Sparkes, 2015) comprising of ParaHockey coaches ($n = 8$), and staff with responsibilities aligned to coach education and ParaHockey at the International Hockey Federation (FIH) ($n = 2$), Further information can be seen in Tables 1 and 2.

Data collection

Semi-structured interviews

Data were generated through online semi-structured interviews, providing participants with the time and space to share and make sense of their lived experiences, lasting between 40 and 90 minutes ($M = 56.6$ minutes), totalling 445.25 minutes for coach interviews and 120.81 minutes for FIH staff interviews. Interviews were audio recorded and transcribed verbatim. Participants took part in individual member reflections, reading through their transcripts to identify if anything further could be added (Smith & McGannon, 2018).

The interview schedules for coaches and FIH staff were different, however both were informed by literature (e.g. Douglas, Falcão, & Bloom, 2018; Stodter & Cushion, 2017; Townsend, Huntley, Cushion, & Fitzgerald, 2020). Taking into consideration the different experiences and perspectives of these two groups, it was important to design the interview schedule

accordingly to encourage meaningful discussion. Coaches' interviews were centred around the following topics; philosophy, coaching role, coaching experiences, education, coaching practice and athletes. FIH staff interviews considered; their role at FIH, involvement with ParaHockey, coach education and ParaHockey coaches. This promoted interaction and dialogue, meaning the researcher cannot be wholly detached from the process, reflecting the social constructivist nature of this research (Sparkes, 2015).

Data analysis

Data were analysed using the principles of Charmaz (2006), constructivist grounded theory method, whereby the researcher used "line by line" and "paragraph by paragraph" coding to reduce the data inductively into codes and categories (Charmaz, 2012). Although not drawn upon explicitly throughout the analysis process, or used as an analytical tool, the SRM was drawn upon by authors to acknowledge their positionality in the understanding of disability and impairment. It was also used to help make sense of and draw connections within the research findings in relation to the disabling features experienced within this context. This was an iterative process which also made use of critical friends to provoke further thought and understanding of the rich data (Smith & McGannon, 2018). The most pertinent themes relating to aims of the research were selected by a process of constant comparison (Charmaz, 2012).

Findings and discussion

Two categories were established 1. Becoming a ParaHockey Coach and 2. Developing as a ParaHockey Coach, and underpinned by codes, refer to Table 3 for detail.

Category 1: becoming a ParaHockey coach

Social connection to ParaHockey or coaching

General reflections from coaches highlight the unstructured pathways into coaching ParaHockey, yet despite the individual nuances, the associating features were having a connection to the sport, a desire to coach participants

Table 3. Categories and corresponding codes.

Categories	Codes
Becoming and Developing as a ParaHockey Coach	Social Connection to ParaHockey or Coaching
	Becoming through doing
	"Attempting" Relevant Coach Education
Developing as a ParaHockey Coach	View and understanding of disability and impairment
	Desires for Specific Coach Education

with ID or having a child participating in ParaHockey, "well the path is Maria ... I don't know if I would have done this if I didn't have Maria [coaches daughter]" (Sofia). Daniel (FIH staff member) shared that many coaches begin because their children have ID and need a coach. This is similar to Wareham et al'.s (2017) findings, where their coaching cohort began coaching due to having experience with disability or to meet the request of an athlete. This is best demonstrated in the current study with William being asked to coach his child's team:

> The simple answer was I was being asked to do it, the group didn't have a coach so they asked basically the group of parents ... I mean I played hockey in the past. I have a child as well who's part of the group. I can handle the impairments with the disabilities of certain guys, but my background is not being a teacher (William)

This interview response is illustrative of the serendipitous entry pathways and a lack of coaching resource often reported within disability sport coaching (Townsend & Peacham, 2021), and one that William as a parent, filled. However, entry into coaching without any previous experience or coach education may leave coaches feeling like they have been "dropped in the deep end of practice" (Townsend & Cushion, 2017) and ill-equipped to meet the needs of participants with ID. Furthermore, navigating parent-coach roles, commonly reported in the wider field of coaching adds another layer of complexity (Knight & Holt, 2014), such as, managing expectations, role clarity and communication (Zehntner, McMahon, & McGannon, 2020), as well as the parent-coaches potentially lacking in sport-specific, impairment-specific knowledge or as alluded to by William, *how* to teach [coach].

Becoming through doing

Coaches in the current study placed a high level of importance on experiential learning. This included their experiences as players with some coaches emphasising the impact of this on their coaching, "I am also a player, we train like two or three times a week, we also play matches and the best way to learn is playing, I haven't, haven't done any courses", (Maria). Echoing previous research in disability sport, Tawse, Bloom, Sabiston, and Reid (2012) explored coach learning and highlighted how knowledge developed as players informed coaches' development and practice. The problem with relying on previous athletic experience in non-disabled sport is that knowledge of "able-bodied models" are transferred onto disability sport without question and therefore, may perpetuate ableist views of ability and disability that focuses on impairment as an individual problem to overcome (Thomas, 2004; Townsend & Cushion, 2017).

Although, it is important to acknowledge that experience as players was often within non-disabled sporting contexts, so there may be disparity in

application of this knowledge to the disability context. The reproduction of ableist views of coaching may also be mediated by learning from other coaches (Townsend & Cushion, 2017). For instance, coaches within the current study discussed learning to coach through observing and conversing with other ParaHockey coaches within practice and competition environments:

> I have seen some coaches, coaching a different way than I did so it was interesting for me to see how they [other coaches] deal with their team and how they do something else different than I do. So, it's interesting to see and then learn from it. (Thomas)

Here Thomas's quote reflects the important influence experiential or social learning has within disability coaching (Culver, Kraft, Trudel, Duarte, & Werthner, 2020) much like the wider coaching field (Griffiths & Armour, 2012). However, through this learning approach, it could be argued that these coaches are uncritically "cherry picking" and reproducing the "practice designs" of others without reflecting on wider notions of disability and the suitability for their specific athlete population or coaching context (Townsend et al., 2022). This narrow focus on learning practice design further highlights the influence of implicit medical model assumptions in which "overcoming limitations" is foregrounded, whilst the relational nature of impairment and disabling experiences are often overlooked (Thomas, 1999).

The reliance on developing knowledge and practice through "experiential learning" and "trial and error" reported in disability coaching research was also an important feature of this research (e.g. Townsend et al., 2022). For instance, George explained how he gained insight into "what works" through "learning on the job really, trial and error". However, this common finding across coach learning literature (Fairhurst, Bloom, & Harvey, 2017), is reflective of an under resourced coach education context and it could be argued that coaches have no choice but to learn this way (Townsend et al., 2022). However, it is often a preference for coaches (MacDonald, Beck, Erickson, & Côté, 2016), as exemplified by one of the participants: "I like learning how I can do it on a field and not just see people explaining on a board" (Thomas). Although a common thread in the coaching literature, this approach can be problematic, as taken-for-granted discourses can be reproduced by coaches without critical thought, so they may only acknowledge what they deem to be meaningful with potential disregard of wider perspectives and consideration of coaching literature or theory (Cushion, Stodter, & Clarke, 2022). Arguably this further contributes to the gap between research and practice, and some may question coaches' preparedness to coach in these contexts (McMaster, Culver, & Werthner, 2012; Townsend et al., 2022).

"Attempting" relevant coach education

In addition to becoming through doing, four coaches (Thomas, Gary, George and Ida), also sought learning opportunities through formalised coach education courses, each having completed their corresponding NGBs Level Two coaching certification. Indeed, all coaches noted the absence of formal education for ParaHockey, and so relied on adapting practices from the non-disabled course, with Ida stating, "There was mention of sort of inclusive coaching on the course, but it didn't really give me specific activities and tools to use that were appropriate for a disability group". Thus, the lack of coach education in this context continued to reflect the "structural barriers" (Thomas, 1999) faced by coaches within the disability sport, leaving them to adapt content from non-disabled courses to suit their athletes' needs (e.g. Douglas, Falcão, & Bloom, 2018). This limited or absence of interaction with context-specific formal education due to the dearth of opportunities, results in coaches relying on learning by doing and experience, which can lead to attempts at adapting mainstream practices, often resulting in the reproduction of ableist values (Townsend et al., 2022). This can have a negative impact on athletes as impairment effect can often be disregarded (Thomas, 1999), resulting in coaches striving to improve performance and ability in line with abled-bodied norms. As such athletes' autonomy may be constrained as the negative impact of medical model practices on their psychosocial and emotional wellbeing is not understood or considered (Thomas, 1999). Similarly, exposure to medical model discourses further influenced coaches learning as they sought knowledge from disability specific courses which Townsend et al., (2022) termed "categorical" in nature due to their emphasis on accommodating difference. A view best illustrated by Ida's positive reflection of the disability course where she learnt, "how to try and make it [training sessions] more accessible and disability friendly activities". This demonstrates coaches' consideration for impairment effect. However, as Townsend et al. (2022) suggest, categorical courses can offer "comfort for coaches lacking confidence and a level of technical capacity", but they continue to reduce impairment and the person as a problem to be intervened upon which is counters the ideal of inclusivity (p. 252). Thus, aligning with the SRM, all coach education provision should consider "impairment effect" relationally to account for the structural ways ideals associated with "ableism" and "disablism" are perpetuated through communication and practice (Thomas, 1999). In other words, coach education should move away from "ableist normative" technical coaching models and langue, that overemphasise impairment as a limitation to be overcome, whilst ignoring the disabled barriers experienced by different disabled people across a variety of social contexts (Goodley, 2014). To counter this, we advocate for disability to be integrated across the field of coach education and

development by drawing on the SRM as a conceptual framework (cf. Townsend et al., 2022). Doing so would be a significant leap forward, in creating a critically aware coaching workforce who are able to understand and respond positively to how and why disabled people are impacted by functional limitations caused by impairment (impairment effect), socio-cultural barriers and the lived reality of experiencing oppression (Thomas, 1999). However, there is an argument that coach education does not always adequately prepare coaches who desire to learn, with the knowledge, skills and practices needed to deliver inclusive and empowering experiences within disability sport. Therefore, it could be considered that more informal sources of learning, as highlighted by coaches as beneficial for their practice, could be integrated into coach education.

Category 2: developing as a ParaHockey coach

View and understanding of disability and impairment

A key aspect of being a coach in disability sport is knowledge implicitly and explicitly related to impairment and disability, allowing practice to be adapted to meet the needs of athletes with impairments (Townsend et al., 2018). However, during interviews, there was some conceptual confusion related to the two terms. For instance, some coaches expressed their aversion to the term disability, with one coach portraying a non-disabling view: "I dislike the term. I think that every person has abilities and disabilities" (Sofia). Taking this view, although it may be well intended, can have negative implications as it pushes disability to the background (Cushion, Stodter, & Clarke, 2022) thereby disregarding the social construction of disability, lived experiences and impairment effect (Thomas, 1999, 2004, 2007).

On the other hand, one coach's description appeared to align with the social-relational lens (Thomas, 1999). George's interview response highlighted the social construction of disability whilst acknowledging the potential limitations caused by an impairment:

> Disability is seen as the consequence of . . . the result of societies response to the impairment . . . and that leads to a lack of inclusion because people are seen as being inferior . . . services and facilities are not adapted to provide for them. Impairment technically is the deficit that somebody may have in terms of their intellect being less able than other peoples or their bodies not moving in the same way.

Viewing impairment and disability relationally allows coaches to effectively adapt their practice for individual athletes whilst critically reflecting on the disabling barriers within the context (Townsend et al., 2022). The strength of the SRM lies in its potential to illuminate the interaction between individuals, impairment, disability, and the environment, which could be

socially constructed differently by different cultures (Townsend et al., 2015). Daniel, reflecting on his personal experiences compared the difference between two countries, in how disabled people are viewed and treated, by recounting a story regarding a friend who is visually impaired:

> She would not have a life in Portugal . . . In Australia . . . she went to uni, they got her a tutor. They got her everything she needed such as audiobooks . . . she did school just like any other individual . . . I find it quite amazing and I'm really sorry that the whole world has not yet been able to achieve this level of development.

Daniel's interview response further exemplifies the socially constructed nature of disability in which more culturally sensitive contexts can lead to the identification and removal of some structural barriers that "disable" people with impairment. However, it is important to note that whilst barrier removal is positively viewed, the long-term effects of experiencing disability cannot be ignored (Thomas, 1999). This is an important point, because barrier removal itself may not challenge ableist attitudes, beliefs and communication (Shakespeare, 2006). Hence, the need for effective coach education to promote critical reflection amongst the coaching workforce by drawing on the social relational model of disability (Townsend et al., 2022).

Desires for specific coach education

Coach education is a significant factor in contributing to "the delivery of high-quality sporting experiences" (Townsend & Cushion, 2017, p. 528). All eight coaches highlighted the desire and motivation for ParaHockey specific coach education to develop the coaching workforce, and in turn athletes, "I think that if there is a coaching education, in general, it will move your team to a higher level" (William). By educating coaches, they can provide more effective, positive sporting experiences for their athletes, "Better sessions for the athletes and make them grow in their abilities" (Emma). Coaches must possess the relevant knowledge to successfully provide positive opportunities for disabled people, yet there is a still a lack of formal education provision. There have been calls for the integration of disability across coach education (Townsend et al., 2022), so as not further add to the disparity between disability and non-disabled contexts. There is also an argument that this method would expose more coaches to disability sport, potentially increasing the workforce and therefore opportunities for disabled people. One FIH staff member echoed this concept: "If every level one and every level two FIH [coaching course] delivered has a ParaHockey module within it . . . you've to improve your workforce and increase your workforce, if you want to increase your athlete base" (Ricardo).

However, careful consideration should be taken with relation to the placement and curriculum of disability content, as there is currently little research-informed evidence (Huntley et al., 2019; Townsend et al., 2022).

Often formal education is underpinned by the medical model, problematising disability and placing the blame on disabled individuals rather than society.

Coaches in the current study highlighted several topics that they believe should be included in future ParaHockey coach education, including; impairment knowledge, adapting practices and the importance of the coach–athlete relationship to understand the athletes' experiences and needs, aligning with the SRM perspective. They also emphasised the need to include a practical element of the course: "Maybe you think you will never be able to accomplish it [coaching disabled participants], you go to 2 or 3 sessions with the kids and your view changes completely . . . .that's number one to have sessions with athletes with ID" (Sofia). This practical application is significant, as it will allow coaches to identify disabling barriers present within their context and practice, and potentially increase confidence in coaching in disability sport.

Conclusion and recommendations

The purpose of this study was to investigate coaching, coach learning and development in the context of ParaHockey. This is an important area as research is limited on coaching and coaches of athletes with ID (Turgeon et al., 2023), and often fails to acknowledge disability or impairment effectively. The social-relational model has proved to be a useful tool for helping us to understand the socially constructed nature of disability and the identification of disabling barriers in a sporting context.

Findings echoed that of wider disability sport research in that coaches are forced to rely upon experiential learning, due to the lack of formal education opportunities available, which could further exemplify exposure to ableist and medical model influences. However, although we say coaches are "forced" to rely on non or informal means of learning, this is a contested and complex area that has long been in the coaching literature regarding the value associated with different "sites" of learning. Often formal education provision is absent or lacking in context-specific content (Townsend et al., 2017), therefore resulting in coaches learning non or informally. However, where content is relevant, taking part in formal education can have "added learning impact" (Stodter & Cushion, 2019, p. 2092), on top of experiential learning.

Indeed, the current research highlighted coaches' desire for education and continual development but evidenced a lack of structure or opportunity for this to occur. This evidences that coaches are not merely subject to the structural inequalities of disability sport, but actively crave change. They expressed their ideas for curriculum content for coach education, and the hope that development of such material

would increase and improve the coaching workforce, therefore providing more meaningful, positive opportunities for people with ID to participate. It would be apt to suggest disabled participants and their coaches are meaningfully involved in the production and delivery of coach education with disability content embedded, and with further research in this area. As a result, we advocate for the integration of education for ParaHockey coaches into the FIH coach education provision, Townsend's et al. (2022) and Huntley's et al. (2019) provides examples of how this can be achieved. Not only would this provide a development opportunity for current coaches, but also increase the awareness of ParaHockey and provide a pathway for those interested in coaching in this unique context.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

References

Allan, V., Blair Evans, M., Latimer-Cheung, A. E., & Côté, J. (2020). From the athletes' perspective: A social-relational understanding of how coaches shape the disability sport experience. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *32*(6), 546–564. doi:10.1080/10413200.2019.1587551

Barnes, C., Mercer, G., & Shakespeare, T. (1999). *Exploring disability: A Sociological Introduction* (1st ed.). Cambridge: Polity.

Bentzen, M., Alexander, D., Bloom, G. A., & Kenttä, G. (2021). Parasport coaches? A scoping review.

Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. New York: Sage.

Charmaz, K. (2012). The power and potential of grounded theory. *Medical Sociology Online*, *6*(3), 2–15.

Chowdhury, M. F. (2014). Interpretivism in aiding our understanding of the contemporary social world. *Open Journal of Philosophy*, *4*(3), 432–438. doi:10.4236/ojpp.2014.43047

Culver, D. M., Kraft, E., Trudel, P., Duarte, T., & Werthner, P. (2020). Coaching Athletes with Disabilities. In R. Resende & A. R. Gomes (Eds.), *Coaching for Human Development and Performance in Sports*. Springer.

Culver, D. M., & Werthner, P. (2018). Voices: Para athletes speak. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *10*(2), 167–175. doi:10.1080/2159676X.2017.1393004

Cushion, C. J., Stodter, A., & Clarke, N. J. (2022). 'It's an experiential thing': The discursive construction of learning in high-performance coach education. *Sport, Education and Society*, *27*(7), 844–861. doi:10.1080/13573322.2021.1924143

Douglas, S., Falcão, W. R., & Bloom, G. A. (2018). Career development and learning pathways of paralympic coaches with a disability. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, *35*(1), 93–110. doi:10.1123/apaq.2017-0010

Fairhurst, K. E., Bloom, G. A., & Harvey, W. J. (2017). The learning and mentoring experiences of paralympic coaches. *Disability and Health Journal*, *10*(2), 240–246. doi:10.1016/j.dhjo.2016.10.007

Goodley, D. (2014). Who is disabled? Exploring the scope of the social model of disbility. In J. Swain, S. French, C. Barnes, & C. Thomas (Eds.), *Disabling Barriers–Enabling Environments* (pp. 130–137). London: Sage.

Griffiths, M., & Armour, K. (2012). Mentoring as a formalized learning strategy with community sports volunteers. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*, *20*(1), 151–173. doi:10.1080/13611267.2012.645605

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2005). *Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences*. New York: Sage.

Hassan, D., Dowling, S., & McConkey, R. (Eds.). (2014). *Sport, coaching and intellectual disability*. London: Routledge.

Huntley, T. D., Whitehead, A., Cronin, C., Williams, C., Ryrie, G., & Townsend, R. C. (2019). *Pan-European work force audit and best practice case study report: The experiences of coaches in paralympic and disability sport*.

Knight, C. J., & Holt, N. L. (2014). Parenting in youth tennis: Understanding and enhancing children's experiences. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *15*(2), 155–164. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.10.010

Levers, M. J. D. (2013). Philosophical paradigms, grounded theory, and perspectives on emergence. *SAGE Open*, *3*(4), 2158244013517243. doi:10.1177/2158244013517243

MacDonald, D. J., Beck, K., Erickson, K., & Côté, J. (2016). Understanding sources of knowledge for coaches of athletes with intellectual disabilities. *Journal of Applied Research in Intellectual Disabilities*, *29*(3), 242–249. doi:10.1111/jar.12174

McMaster, S., Culver, D., & Werthner, P. (2012). Coaches of athletes with a physical disability: A look at their learning experiences. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *4*(2), 226–243. doi:10.1080/2159676X.2012.686060

Shakespeare, T. (2006). The social model of disability. *The Disability Studies Reader*, *2*, 197–204.

Smith, B., & McGannon, K. R. (2018). Developing rigor in qualitative research: Problems and opportunities within sport and exercise psychology. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *11*(1), 101–121. doi:10.1080/1750984X.2017.1317357

Sparkes, A. C. (2015). Developing mixed methods research in sport and exercise psychology: Critical reflections on five points of controversy. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *16*, 49–59. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.08.014

Stodter, A., & Cushion, C. J. (2017). What works in coach learning, how, and for whom? A grounded process of soccer coaches' professional learning. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *9*(3), 321–338. doi:10.1080/2159676X.2017.1283358

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

Tawse, H., Bloom, G. A., Sabiston, C. M., & Reid, G. (2012). The role of coaches of wheelchair rugby in the development of athletes with a spinal cord injury. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *4*(2), 206–225. doi:10.1080/2159676X.2012.685104

Thomas, C. (1999). *Female forms: Experiencing and understanding disability*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Thomas, C. (2004). How is disability understood? An examination of sociological approaches. *Disability and Society*, *19*(6), 569–583. doi:10.1080/0968759042000252506

Thomas, C. (2007). *Sociologies of disability and illness: Contested ideas in disability studies and medical sociology*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Thomas, J. A. (2014). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. London: Routledge.

Townsend, R. C., & Cushion, C. (2017). Elite cricket coach education: A Bourdieusian analysis. *Sport, Education and Society*, *22*(4), 528–546. doi:10.1080/13573322.2015.1040753

Townsend, R. C., Cushion, C. J., & Smith, B. (2018). A social relational analysis of an impairment-specific mode of disability coach education. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, *10*(3), 346–361. doi:10.1080/2159676X.2017.1407355

Townsend, R., Huntley, T., Cushion, C., & Culver, D. (2022). Infusing disability into coach education and development: A critical review and agenda for change. *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, *27*(3), 247–260. doi:10.1080/17408989.2021.1873932

Townsend, R. C., Huntley, T., Cushion, C. J., & Fitzgerald, H. (2020). 'It's not about disability, I want to win as many medals as possible': The social construction of disability in high-performance coaching. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, *55*(3), 344–360. doi:10.1177/1012690218797526

Townsend, R., & Peacham, G. (2021). Reflections on coaching policy and practice in community disability sport. In *Community Sport Coaching* (pp. 167–180). Routledge.

Townsend, R. C., Smith, B., & Cushion, C. J. (2015). Disability sports coaching: Towards a critical understanding. *Sports Coaching Review*, *4*(2), 80–98. doi:10.1080/21640629.2016.1157324

Turgeon, S., Turgeon, J., & Morin, D. (2023). Coaching special olympics: A scoping review. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, *18*(1), 304–323. doi:10.1177/17479541221134338

United Nations: Department of Economic and Social Affairs. (2006). *Convention on the rights of persons with disabilities [online]*. Retrieved May 25, 2023, from https://www.un.org/development/desa/disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities-2.html

Wareham, Y., Burkett, B., Innes, P., & Lovell, G. P. (2017). Coaching athletes with disability: Preconceptions and reality. *Sport in Society*, *20*(9), 1185–1202. doi:10.1080/17430437.2016.1269084

Zehntner, C., McMahon, J., & McGannon, K. R. (2020). An intensive longitudinal investigation of a parent–coach's practices and strategies 'in action'; challenges and opportunities. *Sports Coaching Review*, *9*(2), 147–167. doi:10.1080/21640629.2019.1590082