This item was submitted to [Loughborough's Research Repository](#) by the author.
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

‘Put that in your fucking research’: reflexivity, ethnography and disability sport coaching

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794120931349>

PUBLISHER

SAGE Publications

VERSION

AM (Accepted Manuscript)

PUBLISHER STATEMENT

This paper was accepted for publication in the journal Qualitative Research and the definitive published version is available at <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794120931349> Users who receive access to an article through a repository are reminded that the article is protected by copyright and reuse is restricted to non-commercial and no derivative uses. Users may also download and save a local copy of an article accessed in an institutional repository for the user's personal reference.

LICENCE

All Rights Reserved

REPOSITORY RECORD

Townsend, Robert C, and Christopher Cushion. 2020. “‘put That in Your Fucking Research’: Reflexivity, Ethnography and Disability Sport Coaching”. Loughborough University.
<https://hdl.handle.net/2134/12464702.v1>.

“Put that in your fucking research”: Reflexivity, ethnography and disability sport coaching.

Robert C. Townsend^a

Christopher J. Cushion^b

^a*Te Huataki Waiora* School of Health, Sport and Human Performance, University of Waikato, New Zealand. robert.townsend@waikato.ac.nz

^bSchool of Sport, Exercise and Health Sciences, Loughborough University, UK, c.cushion@lboro.ac.uk

Corresponding author: Robert Townsend, robert.townsend@waikato.ac.nz

Abstract

Reflexivity is continually called for as a marker of quality ethnographic research. In this paper we put reflexivity to ‘work’, providing a critical commentary on data generated through ethnographic fieldwork in high-performance disability sport. Drawing on Bourdieu’s reflexive sociology, we situate the ethnographer in the field of disability sport, turning a reflexive lens onto the practices that are associated with occupying the role of coach *and* researcher simultaneously. We illustrate the centrality of researcher subjectivity - through the reflexive device of ‘crossing fields’ - as a productive resource for examining the social and intellectual unconscious embedded in the process of doing ethnographic research. In so doing, we provide a unique example of how reflexive practice can offer a rigorous, power-conscious reading of an ethnography of high-performance coaching in disability sport.

Key words: ethnography; reflexivity; disability; disability sport; coaching

Word count: 7975

Introduction

Reflexivity is firmly embedded within the language of social science and is well-established as a critical component of qualitative research. The reflexive turn has a long history, embedded in earlier critiques of epistemology, methodology and representation in social science (see Clifford and Marcus, 1986; Geertz, 1987; Denzin and Lincoln, 2011). Reflexivity itself, however, is a difficult concept to put to ‘work’, and can be subject to a good deal of conceptual slippage. There are different interpretations, approaches and positions for researchers to make sense of and operationalise (Foley, 2002), suggesting that, as Olive and Thorpe (2011) claim, reflexivity is increasingly “under-defined, and hollow” (p. 424).

It might be reasonably argued that despite ongoing recourse to reflexive practice, reflexivity constitutes a taken-for-granted or uncritically-accepted term (Maton, 2003) in which to be reflexive is taken as a proxy for individualistic self-reflexivity, either through autoethnographic or confessional tales (Van Maanen 1988; Sparkes, 2002). This refers to the ways in which the researcher writes themselves and their backgrounds into the text or analysis in order to demonstrate how their social history and identity influence their interpretations (e.g. Berger, 2015). These analyses are valuable for explaining ‘hidden insight’ into phenomena through either personal connections or lived experience, or for reflecting on the social problems that ethnographers have to ‘grapple’ with, such as negotiating power relations, ethical dilemmas, voice, subjectivity and interpretation (Sparkes, 2020).

Self-reflexive analysis, naturally, places emphasis on the agency of the researcher. However, this ‘ethnocentric’ position is not without its criticisms (see Wacquant, 1989; Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). Indeed, such approaches have been dismissed as a “self-indulgent discussion about ethnographers between ethnographers” (Gibson and Atkinson, 2018: 446; Wacquant, 1989) that, at worst, provides a platform for tedious, benign and unrevealing description (Lynch, 2000). Such research risks consigning ethnography to cultural

relativism or regressive self-analysis, thus bringing the ethnographic enterprise to “a grinding halt” and leading to the rather disheartening conclusion that “all is in the final analysis nothing but discourse” (Bourdieu, 2003, 282).

In direct contrast to this form of reflexivity is the more ‘objective’ reflexivity of Pierre Bourdieu. A key component of Bourdieu’s sociological method was the “methodical reflection on the act of objectivation itself” (Wacquant, 2004: 389). Bourdieu’s particular stance of epistemic reflexivity demands that social scientists interrogate their ‘scholastic posture’, turning the ‘tools of social science’ (i.e. theory) on to the researcher themselves and the fields in which they are situated (Bourdieu, 2003). For Bourdieu, a truly reflexive sociology must make transparent how ethnographers, situated within the academic field, produce ‘truth’ claims and facts (Foley, 2002), highlighting the social and intellectual conditions that shape research practice. Reflexivity, thus, represents “the permanent sociological analysis and control of sociological practice” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 40). Bourdieu’s reflexive practice might therefore be understood as both methodological *and* theoretical; recognising how engaging in research shapes, and is shaped by, the situated aspects of the researchers’ social selves and the “invisible determinations” inherent in the scholarly gaze (Wacquant, 1989: 34).

Such is the strength and value of reflexivity that it is routinely called for in ethnographic research broadly (Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2009; Van Maanen, 1988). This necessity for reflexive practice is magnified in areas of research that demand reflexive self-scrutiny and the careful theorising of claims made (Howe, 2009). Following this, our specific use of reflexivity is anchored in the context of coaching in disability sport. Berger (2015) recently argued that it is important to deepen our understanding of reflexivity across diverse contexts. Indeed, disability sport is a social institution that has considerable sociological significance, providing a lens to consider the grounded, historical and everyday discourses and practices that perpetuate social differentiation and accentuate the social categories of disability and disabled people.

For example, research investigating disability sport through the use of ethnography has illustrated the ways in which sport acts as a complex site of empowerment *for* disabled athletes. In disability sport, disabled people are able to negotiate an affirmative disability identity associated with an ‘athlete-first’ discourse (see Berger, 2008; Powis 2018). Focusing specifically on coaches and coaching provides critical insight into the constructed patterns of social reality that constitute disability sport (cf. Alvesson and Skoldberg, 2009). Coaches are central figures in maintaining such discourses and coaching itself is a set of social practices that are produced as a response to these situated understandings of disability. Recent research has illustrated that the pedagogic function of coaching reproduces rather than redistributes unequal social relations, thus imposing ‘athlete-first’ discourses based on highly-regulated principles of performance, self-government, achievement, challenge and independence, to construct a disabled *athlete* subject (Author A, B and others, 2018). At the same time, this high-performance sport value system refracts deeper value judgements based on ableism. It is in these complexities and contradictions that frame disability research that this study sits.

Crossing Fields

In this paper we operationalise Bourdieu’s reflexive stance through the notion of ‘crossing fields’ (cf. Thorpe, Barbour and Bruce, 2011; Olive and Thorpe, 2011). *Fields* are social spaces that are defined as a “network, or a configuration, of objective relations between positions” (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992: 97). Crossing fields as a reflexive device illustrates how the first author was deeply embedded in the local relationships, politics and ideologies of a distinctive disability sport context, as well as the disciplinary specialty. Crossing fields therefore brings to the forefront the way I (first author) moved between my field experience and the abstract theoretical explanations of that experience. In doing so, we attempt to provide a practical and theoretical grasp of the social conditions of ‘doing’ fieldwork, and a close scrutiny and mutual questioning of the very production and interpretation of field data (Wacquant, 2004).

In putting the idea of crossing fields to work, we emphasise the “destabilizing and potentially subversive effects that might arise from movement across fields” (McNay, 1999: 107), suggesting that moments of misalignment and tension between habitus and field may give rise to increased reflexive awareness (Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). It is in these moments of tension that *habitus* forces a degree of “negotiation with itself and its ambivalences” (Thorpe, 2009: 503). This process of introspection when engaging in fieldwork can be productive, acknowledging the social rooting and split subjectivity of the ethnographer “without reducing ethnography to the rhapsodic evocation of subjectivity” (Wacquant, 2004: 398).

Aims and Purpose

Despite extensive debate and discussion about the importance of reflexive practice to social science research, there is a lack of research actively putting reflexivity to ‘work’ (Berger, 2015). As a result, there is little guidance for researchers wishing to provide grounded and reflexive accounts of the research process. Consequently, the aim of this paper is to demonstrate how Bourdieu’s reflexive framework acted as a theoretical resource to enable heightened awareness of the sensitivities of ‘doing’ research in a social site that is routinely described as ‘non-disabling’ and ‘empowering’, yet is constructed according to ableist values and practices (Author A, B and others, 2018; DePauw, 1997; Powis, 2018). Our specific reading and use of reflexivity, however, should not be seen as *the* way, rather we hope to illustrate a way in which sport coaching research can offer a level of criticality and rigorous self-awareness that has relevance for social science researchers more broadly.

Our (somewhat overdue) turn to reflexivity is not a call for naval-gazing. Sharing these insights has the potential to bring into sharper focus perhaps the most consuming issue faced by ethnographers: that of accessing, negotiating and representing socially-significant patterns of culture. The second, and related, purpose of this research then, is to provide a level of

ethnographic authenticity to representations of social reality. We do this not through ‘truth telling’, but through reflexive recognition of the problems and complexities involved in moving “within and between academic and research fields—or put another way, between theory, practice and culture” (Olive & Thorpe, 2011: 430).

Fieldwork context

In the following sections, I (first author) present my experiences as a researcher and a coach embedded within a high-performance disability sport coaching context. At the outset it is important to acknowledge that my position as a non-disabled researcher and coach is a significant factor in the production of this research¹ (Oliver, 1992). In this process of presenting my experiences, I necessarily abstract them, but do so in order to detail the tensions, processes and conflicts comprising the fieldwork. Doing so may provide a shared language and conceptual framework for researchers undertaking ethnographic research in highly stratified disability contexts.

The experiences presented below were produced through eighteen months of fieldwork with a national learning disability sports team. My role as observer in the ethnographic study for this research was formulated entirely through my experiences as a member of the coaching staff, working closely with both the staff and the players². My participation was more or less complete physical, social and psychological involvement within the coaching culture throughout training and competition cycles. This immersion enabled the representation of the

¹Although my focus was on coaching practice and not the disability experience, there is still a degree of cultural sensitivity and nuance required in the claims made about practice and it was not our intention to provide a reflexive standpoint ethnography (see Howe, 2009).

²Given the unique coaching context, discussions of confidentiality were had with participants at the outset of the research as a means of obtaining informed consent. It was explained that all possible precautions will be taken to disguise individuals’ identities in the data. Anonymity proves a problem, however, as Kaiser (2009) notes, removing all of the identifying characteristics from the research (i.e. learning disability), would inhibit our ability to convey the lessons learned from this particular study. These choices are confronting in every aspect of ‘writing up’ the research.

191 routine, everyday action of the participants over time. In so doing, I occupied a complex
192 position in that I was simultaneously a part of the object of study, both participating *and*
193 observing. Throughout the fieldwork process I kept detailed field notes of the day-to-day
194 workings of the training camps and competitive fixtures. These included, but were not limited
195 to, the interactions between players and staff at various points, such as evening meals and time
196 spent in hotel bars, spas and the gym, as well as the dedicated practice sessions or in the
197 changing room during a competitive fixture. What follows are my reflexive analyses of some
198 of the more difficult situations that arose as I worked through the research process.

199 ***“Full of spiel, mate”: Power and Respect***

200 My integration into the team environment was swift. The players, for the most part, were
201 familiar with me, and the coaching staff welcoming. Like most elite sport environments, the
202 coaching staff³ of the learning disability squad was structured along hierarchical lines, with the
203 Performance Director responsible for the overall strategic and financial direction of the squad.
204 The head coach oversaw the contributions of the individual members of the management staff
205 and the technical, tactical and social direction of the team, and in particular expressed an
206 interest in my research topic. This meant that my cultural capital in the form of educational
207 qualifications, combined with a pre-existing understanding of the conventions of the field were
208 crucial in enabling a position on the coaching staff, positioning me in a legitimate social
209 position that guaranteed both entry *and* access (cf. Ball, 1990).

210 During the research I developed a close friendship with the assistant coach. He worked
211 closely with the players on a day-to-day basis, where I occupied a supporting role, highlighting
212 the often natural and embedded hierarchies of coaching. We would often travel to training

³Alongside the coaches, the team manager was responsible for organisational and administrative duties for the team and the coaching staff. However, during the period of fieldwork a financial commitment from the governing body meant that the team manager was able to take on an additional part-time role as Personal Development and Welfare Officer (PDW). The rest of the management staff was comprised of a physio, a part-time nutritionist and a strength and conditioning coach.

213 camps together, forming a tight relationship and engaging in many ‘off-the-record’
214 conversations⁴. I would actively spend time with him, spending evenings with him in the bar
215 and travelling with him to games. In doing so I had to negotiate my continually shifting role as
216 participant and researcher, where, despite his public scorn of academia (“academics are just
217 full of spiel mate - overcomplicating simple things” - field notes), and prolonged ‘banter’
218 toward my research, in private he was thoughtful and would regularly probe my views on
219 coaching.

220 It was common for the coaching and management staff to give their opinions on players
221 and discuss confidential information in my presence whether in the training hall or in the hotel
222 bar. Issues continually arose, for instance, about players’ sexualities, medication and
223 impairment effects, their (sometimes volatile) home lives or concerns about lifestyle and
224 behaviour, despite knowing that I was actively conducting research on the topic. Inevitably my
225 positioning within this subculture was more complex than ‘insider’ status indicates. While I
226 actively sought to declare affinity between myself and the participants and to distance myself
227 from constraining identities (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007), to do so I was drawing on my
228 bodily resources, my maleness, my able-bodiedness (and with it my athletic ability) to position
229 myself in simultaneous competing roles as both researcher *and* coach. Here, blurring the lines
230 between fields was both necessary and beneficial in gaining *entry* to the research site in a
231 position of power, i.e. as a member of the coaching staff, but to provide *access* I had to actively
232 disassociate from the role of ‘researcher’. Despite this, the fact that I was a researcher was
233 never forgotten completely:

234 During one particular morning of training, the assistant coach and I had set out a number
235 of activities across the sports hall.

236
237 “Okay, lads, you know what to do. Off you go” the coach barked.

⁴ While some might conceptualise this as cultivating a ‘key informant’, I reject this as it invokes a level of strategy and cunningness to an otherwise naturally unfolding social relationship. Of course, our relationship helped me to navigate the power dynamics of the context and learn my ‘role’ in the field.

The players turned and made their way sluggishly to the ‘stations’ spread around the hall. A minute passed and they were still not in position. The assistant coach swore under his breath and shouted for the players to gather around him. He addressed them angrily.

“Lads, LD or not, when I say, ‘off you go’, what do you do?”

There was a painful pause. One of the players eventually piped up “off we go?”

“Fucking right!” He looked at me . “Put that in your fucking research, (author name)!”

(Field notes).

Players would often express an interest in my research, and a keenness to be interviewed. At first, the players’ reaction to my wearing a microphone was wary, and it became an object of masculine-dominated humour, as exemplified in the following passage:

M had been staring at me during the team briefing. I had noticed, and though I tried to encourage him to continue listening, his eyes kept flicking down to my collar, and mouthing silently to me “the fuck’s that?”

He grabbed me as the players dispersed into the warm up routine and pointed at my collar: “Oi! Is that thing on?”, as he nodded towards my microphone, tucked on the inside of my top. I smiled,

“Yep, everything you say mate. I’ve got to listen back to it, no swearing though, okay?”

M beamed a smile: “ah” He leaned close and growled, “you’re a cunt!” before running off towards the rest of the boys ‘whooping’ with glee.

(Field notes).

These data give a flavour of the subtle authoritarian, ableist and masculine discourse which housed the coaching environment, wherein I had to actively protect my position as a coach while at the same time conserving my research interests. After this incident I quickly abandoned the microphone to allow the players to get over any sense of curiosity, and stopped bringing my notebook to the training hall. While the fact that I was actively researching the squad was recognised as part of a wider process of professionalisation and high-performance in disability sport I actively sought to minimise my ‘otherness’ and maximise my associations to the rest of the coaching staff:

275 For me it's a performance environment now. It wasn't four years ago. I think...we've
276 got better backroom staff, more professional backroom staff. I think by having people of
277 that calibre around it automatically ups the game, and I think the players have responded
278 to that. We're very different people (which) is to me the biggest thing. We've got one
279 and a half doctors (laughs) but when you get your letters at the end of your name then
280 we're going to have potentially two doctors involved in the squad. We've got a highly
281 experienced level four coach; we've got a former pro. We've got a physio who works for
282 first-class county. We've got a nutritionist who is also a teacher. So having not only a
283 massive personality shift across the board but also actually everyone is pretty much kind
284 of at the top of their game in terms of qualification, and that's made a big difference as
285 well. (Team Manager - interview).

286
287 I think where we're at as a management team at the minute is probably as strong as I've
288 ever felt it. Yeah there's a high calibre of education, I think a high calibre of people is
289 a different thing, but I think this group combine that education and personal attribute
290 well. (Head Coach – interview).

291 In negotiating the fieldwork setting the underlying processes of micro-access were continually
292 constrained and enabled by the exchange and recognition of cultural capital. Cultural capital is
293 useful in illustrating the micro-interactional processes through which individuals are judged
294 according to cultural frameworks of evaluation and distinction. For example, though
295 educational qualifications had social currency within the environment, a mark of distinction
296 exists in coaching for those that have played at a professional level (Blackett *et al.*, 2015), such
297 as the assistant coach:

298 I think straightaway there's an instant respect. There's a respect I think from the start
299 that these lads, you know, and I'm still playing now, which is nice, and I think that
300 there's a respect as a player. From what I've been involved with and what I've done as
301 a player, obviously not, nowhere near as high as a lot of players, but I'd like to think
302 that I've certainly done enough as a player to warrant a place in the performance
303 environment, I think. (Assistant coach, interview).

304 The 'technical' skills and knowledge regarding 'the game' are a highly valued aspect of
305 coaching (Author A and B, 2015; Blackett *et al.*, 2015), which are "the product of an
306 investment of time and cultural capital" (Bourdieu, 1986: 244). For researchers, there are
307 unavoidable implications. For example, sometimes the fieldworker may find her or himself
308 being 'tested', and it is not uncommon for new members within the group to effectively have
309 to 'prove their worth' or gain acceptance (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). In my case, during

310 my first ‘official’ training camp, I was challenged to a target throwing competition by the
311 assistant coach in front of the players. I was expected to demonstrate the technical skills the
312 players had been working on and execute the throw towards a target around twenty metres
313 away. As the players gathered around, failure would have undoubtedly resulted in good-natured
314 ridicule and ‘banter’, and perhaps more insidiously, undermined my credibility as a coach.

315 While I was taken aback, I executed the throw well and hit the target to the cheers of
316 the players (and indeed to my own delight). The assistant coach was then left with the task of
317 maintaining face with the players by completing the ‘challenge’ himself. Afterwards, banter
318 aside, he explained that “the boys love that sort of thing, you have to be able to do it y’know?
319 To get their respect” (field notes). In this sense, technical competence was a strategic resource
320 by which I was able to secure my position within a status hierarchy (cf. Lareau & Weininger,
321 2003). Engaging in these strategies for the “appropriation of symbolic wealth” (Lareau &
322 Weininger, 2003: 578) within a field permeated and structured by the distribution of capital
323 was advantageous. Bourdieu (1996: 119) suggested that these displays of competence are
324 highly gendered, and have both a technical dimension and a status dimension, arising as actors
325 pursue different interests:

326 “dominants always tend to impose the skills they have mastered as necessary and
327 legitimate and to include in their definition of excellence the practices at which they
328 excel”.

329 The implications for ethnographers are clear in terms of considering the social relations that
330 structure their chosen sites of research, and the social resources held that impact on the
331 possibilities of data collection. In other words, the history and proximity of the power relations
332 in the field make it possible (or not) to structure workable research relations, and grant the
333 access to be able to construct meaningful data. Though I began this work as a relatively
334 inexperienced coach in the disability sport context, I had ‘institutionalised’ cultural capital
335 (Bourdieu, 1986) in the form of ‘mainstream’ coaching experience, knowledge and academic

qualifications guaranteeing a level of technical capacity and social competence to access the environment. My level of ‘credibility’ as a ‘decent player’ (and therefore naturally a ‘good’ coach⁵) enabled me to leverage enough cultural capital to gain a level of acceptance with the players⁶, and certainly my maleness contributed to my acceptance into a male-dominated coaching culture. However, as the research developed I became increasingly aware of the various forms of power operating through an entrenched coaching culture and the subtle strategies members of the coaching staff would employ to negotiate space within the hierarchy:

The strength and conditioning coach and I had gone for a walk around the pitch during one of the games. As we discussed working with the team, he asked me for feedback on his coaching. At first, I was reluctant –

“I know very little about strength and conditioning, mate”

“No, fuck that – you know coaching”. We clapped in support of one of our players.

I paused as I thought how best to reply. “Okay well, you know your stuff. I think sometimes you use pretty complex or technical language with the players, I mean, it would throw me off, but you compensate that with clear demonstrations”.

“Yeah that’s important with these boys. You’re right though I just can’t help it sometimes. I’ve got to the point now where I just don’t give a shit anymore”.

As we completed our lap we reached the rest of the coaching staff who were sat by the changing rooms.

“Oh, here they are look, bet that was an interesting chat” the assistant coach chirped. The physio chuckled.

I faked a laugh, “actually, mate, we were discussing coaching, funny how you never ask me for feedback on your coaching?” I smirked. The head coach turned to his assistant with his eyebrows raised.

“yeah, it’s because I don’t respect you as a coach!” the assistant coach laughed.

(Field notes).

⁵For a further explication of the assumed relationship between high levels of playing competence and coaching expertise, see Blackett *et al.*, (2015).

⁶For example, during one of my first training camps, one of the players mistakenly referred to me as a former professional player. I never corrected him.

In this interaction I was inserted into a “struggle for status” (Aune, 2011: 429) - a network of power relations where cultural capital was used as a ‘weapon’ (expressed as ‘banter’), defining the “limits of competence” and therefore the “right to speak” (Bourdieu, 1984: 412). The relationship between the researcher and the field was characterised by the composition and volume of capital each member possessed and the extent to which they recognised similar forms in others. Indeed, Atkinson and Gibson (2017) contend that power is central to understanding the production and distributions of practices and systems of knowing, creating ‘social facts’ – in this case - assigning symbolic power to certain understandings of coaching disabled athletes. Thus, for Bourdieu capital is central to the process of domination that defines the orthodoxies within the field, that is, the way things were ‘done’.

“Let him have it” – (Re)producing the orthodoxy

Reflecting on my scholastic point of view; the “dispositions, productive of unconscious theses” (Bourdieu, 1990b: 381) which were acquired through sustained engagement with critical disability studies (e.g. Thomas, 2007) inevitably shifted the emphasis and orientation of my analysis throughout the fieldwork onto the construction of disability. What was immediately observable in the coaching context was a concerted effort to ‘leave the disabilities at the door’ of the training hall and to reinforce the high-performance nature of the squad. Though the head coach in particular resisted this designation, the practical effect of this was that the coaching staff endeavoured to look beyond the players’ ‘disability’ in the design of practices, skill development, target and goal-setting and lifestyle modification. Together, we as a coaching staff operated according to a shared and implicit framework of disability ‘empowerment’ that involved high levels of ‘challenge’ for the athletes. As a result, maintaining and occupying my coaching ‘role’ required an acceptance of the pre-existent conditions that constituted the field – i.e. a doxic order (Bourdieu, 1977) related to a culturally-specific understanding of disability and the patterns of response embedded in social practice (coaching).

Over time my relationship with these doxa changed. Initially, I could (and still can) recognise this as a ‘positive’ coaching approach. Nevertheless, at a conceptual level – and away from the urgency of practice – I felt that there were serious limitations to approaches that downplayed the immediacy of impairment. The impairment(s) that an athlete presents has a *direct* and important influence on the role and function of the coach (cf. Thomas, 2007) particularly in a social world which had been shaped by and was contingent on the players’ *disabilities*. The literature was clear – looking past impairment blurred the lines with ableism (Campbell, 2009). However, as a member of coaching staff immersed in the everyday demands of coaching, I embodied the ideologies of ‘challenge’ and discourses of empowerment that underpinned the coaching process enthusiastically. This analytic act did not sit comfortably.

Throughout the fieldwork, as a coach I was implicated in, and a producer of, practices that emphasised “a particular kind of self and body” (Campbell, 2009: 5), that is, practices designed to shift the orientation of the coaching environment towards high-performance. These ideas were seductive, couched in positive rhetoric and encouraging of an ‘empowering’ view of disability coaching practice. They were ‘common sense’. To challenge this focus felt like it was against the ‘rules’ of the game, or ‘disempowering’ for the players. Assuming I could articulate and voice concern, I risked alienating myself from the other coaches, providing empty critique. So, while I recognised and problematised some aspects of the coaching process, as Adkins (2003: 36) argued, simply “the habitus will always submit to the field”:

During the individual skills work at the last camp, I worked with A in a batting practice. My directive was to feed the ball quickly, quite short and straight, therefore likely to hit A in the chest, ribs or head. A was expected to “make a decision” to either get out of the way, to defend, or to play an aggressive shot. As we settled into the practice, my ‘feeds’ gradually became faster until I let him ‘have one’. The ball leapt up and thudded into A’s ribs. He crumpled almost immediately.

I jogged over to him.

“are you okay, mate?”

425 He was on all fours, his back rising and falling quickly as he struggled to control his
 426 breathing.
 427
 428 “Sorry mate, I didn’t mean to, you know what you did wrong though?”
 429
 430 He didn’t speak to me. Just shook his head before getting to his feet.
 431
 432 As I returned to my position, A faced up, and I fed a visibly slower, fuller delivery to
 433 which A played a tentative shot.
 434
 435 I looked across the hall at the head coach. He’d seen what had happened. With a grim
 436 face, he said:
 437
 438 “Don’t let up, don’t back off. Let him have it”.
 439
 440 The next delivery was faster. A barely moved before it hit the back net, flashing past
 441 the grille of his helmet.
 442
 443 Again.
 444
 445 The next delivery. Fast and short. The ball thudded into the back net.
 446
 447 A walked out of the net. As he walked towards me his face showed a grimace of pain.
 448 With tears in his eyes he croaked “I’m done”. I just nodded.
 449
 450 After, I quietly approached the physio to ask if he had ‘taken a look’ at A.
 451
 452 “Yes, he came over to me. He said he’d been hit by a ball. End of conversation” He
 453 laughed.
 454
 455 (Field notes).

456 Such was the weight of the high-performance doxa that I consciously facilitated practices
 457 designed to encourage ‘failure’. This was a performative response to the expectations the
 458 coaching environment necessitated and demanded. As coaches we constructed an ongoing
 459 discourse of dominant ideas about the ‘correct way’ of coaching in this context that was
 460 reinforced from the top down:

461 You know I still think we’ve got, there’s still a bit of a patronising culture I think
 462 sometimes towards disability and I think some of our coaches have had it when they’ve
 463 come but I think they soon lose it once they start working with the guys and they see
 464 the ability. I don’t think disabled people want continuously reminding of their disability,
 465 they want to be spoken to as (athletes). (Performance Director - Interview).

In my role as a coach, these discourses had all the appearance of a common-sense response to oppression. In the closeness required for the fieldwork, however, I failed to recognise the highly individualising, ableist (Campbell, 2009) and masculinist coaching gaze that framed these practices. As a coach, working to emphasise the high-performance nature of the team, the coaching staff and I were drawing on a set of co-constructed beliefs and ideas that were linked to a collective (mis)recognition that disability empowerment could be achieved through association with performance-level sport.

However, the social relations that structured these ideas and beliefs were inherently unequal – the dominant group (coaches) imposed a valued identity on the players creating a powerful social framework for the development of collective habitus (Bourdieu, 1977). Such was the power of this coaching approach that the coaches *and* athletes were oriented towards a singular and common purpose:

Coaching practice today was focusing on playing off the ‘back foot’ at pace. There were four ‘working’ nets, each with a bowling machine with a different task to be completed. They were generally presided over by the players who moved between nets in groups of three and four, feeding each other six to twelve balls each before swapping. The assistant coach presided over one net, with me observing, and we worked with a player (J). As I observed the practice, I noticed the level of intensity in this particular net. It involved J repeatedly facing balls out of the machine upwards of 75mph, generally directed towards J’s chest, neck and head. J’s directive was to “get in a good position”.

Time after time the ball flashed past J’s head, thudded into his gloves or crunched into his rib cage. More than once J ended up in a heap on the floor, getting to his feet shakily. As this happened, the rest of the players began to watch. As I stood next to the coach, I could see J’s face getting redder and redder, his eyes wide, but not backing down. The coach continued to feed the balls into the machine, giving J little respite as the ball continued to strike him on the pads, into his thigh-pad or whistling past his head. There was a hushed silence from the other players, broken only by loud exclamations from the coach. I could see that the player was in pain and getting anxious and upset, despite not taking a backward step. This practice continued until eventually there were no balls left, and J walked out of the net in tears.

(Field notes).

Collectively, we as a coaching staff produced a situated and practical understanding of disability coaching that was “commensurate with the interests of dominant groups (and the

499 assumed interests of subordinated groups)” (Campbell, 2009: 11). At times, of course, these
500 practices were productive, reinforcing the use of such methods as a means of disability
501 ‘empowerment’:

502 It’s good for the other players to see a player of his (J’s) stature struggle. [It] is a massive
503 message that, hang on here, well J’s struggling, I’m allowed to struggle. For me that
504 was a defining moment because it became an *acceptance amongst the boys*, that
505 actually you know what, we don’t have to get it completely right every time, failing
506 occasionally is okay. You know, I’m not going to get things completely right every
507 single time, and to me that was a defining moment, a big statement that, a big statement.
508 (J) was always going to bounce back, he’s that sort of lad, he’s keen, there’s a wider
509 context to it, he’s always messaging me, he’s looking for reassurance, he wants to
510 improve his game, he wants to be the best he can be, so it wasn’t, it was done in the
511 right way. The intention wasn’t to upset him. (Assistant coach – interview).

512 Thus, the framework on which practice was based therefore had all the appearances of an
513 enabling structure that, in the coaching field, made ‘practical sense’ and was firmly embedded
514 and internalised within the coaching culture through positive discourse and collective
515 acceptance (Silva & Howe, 2016; Purdue & Howe, 2012). My sense of unease and disquiet
516 with these practices, however, continued:

517 J: I will confess last year I had a bit of a shock to the system in terms of how much I’d
518 been challenged in the past although I’d been challenged it was still relatively within
519 my comfort zone.

520
521 I: we took you out of your comfort zone.

522 J: It really did, I will confess as well, I actually broke down in one session and it took
523 me a while to get over it.

524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162
2163
2164
2165
2166
2167
2168
2169
2170
2171
2172
2173
2174
2175
2176
2177
2178
2179
2180
2181
2182
2183
2184
2185
2186
2187
2188
2189
2190
2191
2192
2193
2194
2195
2196
2197
2198
2199
2200
2201
2202
2203
2204
2205
2206
2207
2208
2209
2210
2211
2212
2213
2214
2215
2216
2217
2218
2219
2220
2221
2222
2223
2224
2225
2226
2227
2228
2229
2230
2231
2232
2233
2234
2235
2236
2237
2238
2239
2240
2241
2242
2243
2244
2245
2246
2247
2248
2249
2250
2251
2252
2253
2254
2255
2256
2257
2258
2259
2260
2261
2262
2263
2264
2265
2266
2267
2268
2269
2270
2271
2272
2273
2274
2275
2276
2277
2278
2279
2280
2281
2282
2283
2284
2285
2286
2287
2288
2289
2290
2291
2292
2293
2294
2295
2296
2297
2298
2299
2300
2301
2302
2303
2304
2305
2306
2307
2308
2309
2310
2311
2312
2313
2314
2315
2316
2317
2318
2319
2320
2321
2322
2323
2324
2325
2326
2327
2328
2329
2330
2331
2332
2333
2334
2335
2336
2337
2338
2339
2340
2341
2342
2343
2344
2345
2346
2347
2348
2349
2350
2351
2352
2353
2354
2355
2356
2357
2358
2359
2360
2361
2362
2363
2364
2365
2366
2367
2368
2369
2370
2371
2372
2373
2374
2375
2376
2377
2378
2379
2380
2381
2382
2383
2384
2385
2386
2387
2388
2389
2390
2391
2392
2393
2394
2395
2396
2397
2398
2399
2400
2401
2402
2403
2404
2405
2406
2407
2408
2409
2410
2411
2412
2413
2414
2415
2416
2417
2418
2419
2420
2421
2422
2423
2424
2425
2426
2427
2428
2429
2430
2431
2432
2433
2434
2435
2436
2437
2438
2439
2440
2441
2442
2443
2444
2445
2446
2447
2448
2449
2450
2451
2452
2453
2454
2455
2456
2457
2458
2459
2460
2461
2462
2463
2464
2465
2466
2467
2468
2469
2470
2471
2472
2473
2474
2475
2476
2477
2478
2479
2480
2481
2482
2483
2484
2485
2486
2487
2488
2489
2490
2491
2492
2493
2494
2495
2496
2497
2498
2499
2500
2501
2502
2503
2504
2505
2506
2507
2508
2509
2510
2511
2512
2513
2514
2515
2516
2517
2518
2519
2520
2521
2522
2523
2524
2525
2526
2527
2528
2529
25

531 immediacies of fieldwork were troubling. These are what Guillemin and Gillam (2004) refer
532 to as ethically important moments. For example, one afternoon while observing the players
533 taking part in a fitness session, the strength and conditioning coach described his frustration at
534 the players' lack of physical fitness and remarking to me how "dumb" they are. Though such
535 language is not uncommon in many sporting interactions, considering the context I was
536 immediately confronted with a wave of shock and laughed nervously in response. My
537 complicity and silence, however, were embedded in a relational hierarchy and habitual
538 response to protect my position. Responding critically was not an easy, or – I felt – available,
539 choice to make. In this encounter, I felt that my position in the 'field' was not sufficiently stable
540 that I felt I could challenge this, and, more invidiously, for the purpose of obtaining authentic,
541 'good' data, discretion was as much a social accomplishment as frankness (Hammersley &
542 Atkinson, 2007). In reflexive consideration of my role, the unique social dynamics and the
543 immediate politics of academic research, I stood to lose more than I had to gain by resisting
544 the relations of power. My laughter ultimately is an example of what Pillow (2003: 192) argued
545 is a "failure of our language and practices" as researchers, and the guilt of being complicit as
546 an agent of ableism (Campbell, 2009) continues.

547 Guillemin and Gillam (2004) argue that such situational ethics can be messy and
548 difficult to navigate. Throughout the fieldwork the choices I made, while confronting and
549 uncomfortable, were ethical acts that were reflective of a "sense of one's place" (Bourdieu,
550 1989: 17). In order to 'maintain my rank' with the coaches, and 'keep my distance' from the
551 players, I displayed the symbolic competencies expected in that role (i.e. a high-performance
552 coach). Furthermore, to add a layer of complexity, on the face of it I *agreed* - and still do - with
553 the situated and practical ideologies that framed the practices (though not always the practices
554 themselves). Indeed, Bourdieu (1989: 17) suggested that agents who "occupy similar or
555 neighboring positions are placed in similar conditions and subjected to similar conditionings",

and therefore may consciously or unconsciously acquire similar dispositions (and therefore practices) that imply an adjustment to the position occupied in the field. As I actively participated in social practice I passed through the field, internalized it, and shaped my thoughts and actions in order to profit from it. My failures to confront these seemingly ‘natural limits’ that shaped my coaching practice – and subsequently my research - meant that I was an accomplice in the reproduction of the doxic order, mainly as it was in my *interests* to do so.

Crossing Fields, Crossing Back

This paper is anchored in what Ball (1990) described as the ‘self-doubt and distrust’ of my ongoing analyses. What followed was an attempt to highlight my relation to my object of study (Wacquant, 1989). Crossing fields as a reflexive device provided access to the ‘blind spots’ – structured by doxic acceptance of the conditions of the field – that were immediately unobservable. The use of a reflexive method therefore illustrated the “difference between practical knowledge and scholarly knowledge” (Bourdieu, 1988: 1), and particularly the difficulties involved in breaking with ‘inside experience’.

It was at times easy to forget the gap that separated the interest that I had in coaching as a researcher who set out to understand and to collect ‘good’ data, and the practical interest I had in conserving this same system as an ambitious, keen coach (cf. Bourdieu, 1990b). In particular, field crossing highlighted how I conformed to the logic of the field and became an ‘artifact’ of the field to the extent that while I recognized and problematized many of the practices, I continued to invest in, and see the value of, ‘playing the game’ in the coaching field. Furthermore, there were advantages to being in a relation of belonging; money, travel, association with an international squad, bespoke kit, support for my coach development, and – importantly - closeness and friendship with players and staff. These tensions are accentuated by the ethical implications of the unequal power relations between the athletes and I, both as a coach and as a non-disabled person. I was in a position in which I was able to control and

influence the transmission and exchange of capital for the players, while at the same time placing the athletes as *subjects* of the research that I controlled (cf. Walmsley, 2004).

However, in blurring the lines between academic and coaching fields, and providing “secondary explanations” (Bourdieu, 1977: 20) for what I was observing and experiencing, my sense of unease with the methods and assumptions within the environment was ever-present and inhibiting of total investment. Indeed, field crossing prompted reflection upon the multiple and conflicting roles and responsibilities as a researcher, coach and critical voice in disability sport. My reluctance now to share these reflections is anchored in the dilemma of whether or not I risk alienating those whom I worked alongside.

Implications and lessons learned

The rigour of any ethnographic work rests firmly upon the researcher's awareness of what it is, and what is not, possible to say (Ball, 1990). In this paper we have discussed how through the use of epistemic reflexivity – enacted through the practice of ‘crossing fields’ – researchers can make sense of, and perhaps challenge, that which ‘goes without saying’ in stratified sites of ethnographic inquiry. Importantly, “objectifying one's own universe” (Wacquant, 1989: 33) does not come ‘naturally’ (Lynch, 2000). As Bourdieu (1990a) argued, aspects of habitus owe their specific efficacy to the fact that they are not easily accessible, which explains why reflexive analyses tend to be “circumstantial and contingent” (Lynch, 2000: 36) on the researcher’s social location. It is therefore important to analyze the relationship between the researcher, their object of study, and the broader field conditions in which both are situated (Maton, 2003). Field crossing creates the conditions for an ongoing dialogue with theory, reflection on the genesis and consequences of one’s actions, and close scrutiny of our research practices, which are seldom disclosed yet crucial in establishing transparency in the production of research.

Ethnography has much to offer the development of research in disability sport through providing insight into patterns of interaction, complexity and social context. Increased critical scrutiny on the impacts of situating disabilities within high-performance coaching cultures is particularly valuable for understanding disability sport as a site for resisting and reproducing disability. However, these reflections on conducting research in disability sport coaching should be seen not as confessions or ‘hand-wringing’ (Pillow, 2003; Gibson and Atkinson, 2018), but an attempt to decentre the analyst in relation to the field itself. The ‘method’ of crossing fields highlighted how a socially instituted position as a researcher placed “outside of the urgency of a practical situation” (Bourdieu, 1990b: 381) enabled critical reflection on the hidden mechanisms and ideologies functioning within the coaching process that appeared commonsense and natural.

For ethnographers, this research prompts critical questions on the extent to which researchers can succumb to the practices and belief systems of a field, and how we can reconstruct our research practices to provide useful challenge and critique. For social scientists, ethnographic accounts that take a reflexive position are therefore better placed to problematise the seemingly productive or unquestioned aspects of social life and how they intersect with macro-structures such as – in this case - disability. In presenting this reflexive analysis, we hope to provide a frame of reference to better understand the process of ‘doing’ ethnographic research in socially significant yet contested social fields. To produce better research, we encourage a reflexive gaze that recognizes and focuses attention on the ways that researchers are situated across multiple intersecting fields, locating the foundations for knowledge production and methodological rigour in networks of power and ideology, as a means for the possibility of liberation from them.

References

- 629 Adkins, L. (2003). Reflexivity: Freedom or Habit of Gender? *Theory, Culture & Society*, 20(6),
630 21-42.
- 631 Alvesson M and Skoldberg K (2009) *Reflexive Methodology: New Vistas for Qualitative*
632 *Research*. (2nd Ed.), London: Sage Publications.
- 633 Atkinson M & Gibson K (2017) Power and Power Relations. In: Silk ML Andrews DL and
634 Thorpe H (eds) *Routledge Handbook of Physical Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge, pp.
635 59-67
- 636 Aune, J.A. (2011). The Scholastic Fallacy, Habitus, and Symbolic Violence: Pierre Bourdieu
637 and the Prospects of Ideology Criticism. *Western Journal of Communication*, 75(4), 429-
638 433.
- 639 Author A and B (2015) Details withheld for peer review.
- 640 Authors A, B and others (2018) Details withheld for peer review.
- 641 Ball SJ (1990) Self-doubt and soft data: social and technical trajectories in ethnographic
642 fieldwork. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 3(2): 157-171,
643
- 644 Berger, R. (2015). Now I see it, now I don't: researcher's position and reflexivity in qualitative
645 research. *Qualitative Research*. 15(2): 219-234.
646
- 647 Berger, R.J. (2008). Disability and the Dedicated Wheelchair Athlete: Beyond the "Supercrip"
648 Critique. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*. 37 (6): 647-678.
649
- 650 Blackett AD, Evans A and Piggott D (2015) Why 'the best way of learning to coach the game
651 is playing the game': conceptualising 'fast-tracked' high-performance coaching pathways.
652 *Sport, Education and Society* 22(6): 744-758.
- 653 Bourdieu P (1977) *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 654 Bourdieu P (1984) *Distinction*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- 655 Bourdieu P (1986) The forms of capital. In: Richardson (Ed) *Handbook of theory and research*
656 *for the sociology of education*. New York: Greenwood, pp. 241-258.
- 657 Bourdieu P (1988) *Homo Academicus*. Cambridge: Polity Press
- 658 Bourdieu P (1989) Social Space and Symbolic Power. *Sociological Theory*, 7(1): 14-25.
- 659 Bourdieu P (1990a) *The logic of practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- 660 Bourdieu P (1990b) The Scholastic Point of View. *Cultural Anthropology* 5(4), 380-391.
- 661 Bourdieu P (1996) Masculine Domination Revisited. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology* 41 : 189-
662 203.

- 663 Bourdieu P and Wacquant LJD (1992) *An invitation to reflexive sociology*. Cambridge: Polity
664 Press.
- 665 Campbell FK (2009) *Contours of Ableism: The Production of Disability and Abledness*.
666 London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- 667 Clifford J & Marcus G (Eds.) (1986) *Writing culture: The poetics and politics of*
668 *ethnography*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press
- 669 Denzin NK & Lincoln YS [eds.] (2011) *Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research*, [4th ed.]
670 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- 671 Foley DE (2002) Critical ethnography: The reflexive turn. *International Journal of Qualitative*
672 *Studies in Education*. 15(4): 469-490.
- 673 Geertz C (1987). *Works and lives: The anthropologist as author*. Stanford: Stanford
674 University Press.
- 675 Gibson K and Atkinson M (2018) Beyond Boundaries: The Development and Potential of
676 Ethnography in the Study of Sport and Physical Culture. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical*
677 *Methodologies* 18(6): 442–452
- 678 Guillemin M, and Gillam L. (2004) Ethics, reflexivity, and “ethically important moments” in
679 research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 10(1): 261-280.
- 680 Hammersley M and Atkinson P (2007) *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. [3rd ed.]
681 Abingdon: Routledge.
- 682 Howe P D (2009). Reflexive ethnography, impairment and the pub. *Leisure Studies*, 28(4):
683 489-496.
684
- 685 Kaiser K (2009) Protecting Respondent Confidentiality in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative*
686 *Health Research*. 19(11): 1632–1641.
- 687 Lareau A and Weininger E (2003) Cultural capital in educational research: A critical
688 assessment. *Theory and Society* 32(5–6): 567–606.
- 689 Lynch M (2000) Against reflexivity as an academic virtue and source of privileged
690 knowledge. *Theory, Culture and Society* 17(3): 26–54.
- 691 Maton K (2003) Reflexivity, relationism, & research: Pierre Bourdieu and the epistemic
692 conditions of social scientific knowledge. *Space and Culture* 6(1): 52-65.
- 693 McNay L (1999) Gender, habitus and the field: Pierre Bourdieu and the limits of reflexivity.
694 *Theory, Culture & Society* 16(1): 95–117.
- 695 Olive R and Thorpe H (2011) Negotiating the ‘F-Word’ in the Field: Doing Feminist
696 Ethnography in Action Sport Cultures. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 28(4): 421-440.

- 697 Oliver M (1992) Changing the social relations of research production? *Disability, Handicap*
698 *and Society* 7(2): 101-104.
- 699 Pillow W (2003) Confession, catharsis or cure? Rethinking the uses of reflexivity as
700 methodological power in qualitative research. *Qualitative Studies in Education* 16(2): 175-
701 196.
- 702 Powis B (2018) ‘We are playing for England, we wear the same shirt; just because I have a
703 disability, it doesn’t make me any different’: empowerment, eliteness and visually impaired
704 cricket. *European Journal for Sport and Society*, 15(2): 189-206.
- 705 Pringle R and Thorpe H (2017) Theory and reflexivity. In: Silk ML, Andrews DL and Thorpe
706 H (eds.) *Routledge Handbook of Physical Cultural Studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 68-78.
- 707 Sparkes AC (2020) Autoethnography: accept, revise, reject? An evaluative self reflects.
708 *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*. 12(2): 289-302.
- 709 Thomas C (2007) *Sociologies of disability and illness*. London: Palgrave.
- 710 Thorpe H (2009) Bourdieu, Feminism and Female Physical Culture: Gender Reflexivity and
711 the Habitus-Field Complex. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 26(4): 491-516.
- 712 Thorpe H, Barbour K and Bruce T (2011) ‘Wandering and wondering’: theory and
713 representation in feminist physical cultural studies. *Sociology of Sport Journal* 28(1): 106–
714 134.
- 715 Van Maanen J (1988) *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago: University of
716 Chicago Press.
- 717 Wacquant LJD (1989) Towards a reflexive sociology. A workshop with Pierre Bourdieu.
718 *Sociological Theory* 7(1): 26- 63.
- 719 Wacquant LJD (2004) Following Pierre Bourdieu into the field. *Ethnography* Vol 5(4): 387–
720 414
721
- 722 Walmsley, J. (2004). Inclusive learning disability research: the (nondisabled)researcher’s
723 role. *British Journal of Learning Disabilities*. 32(1) 65-71.
- 724