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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to build upon existing socio-cultural research into sports coaching by exploring the complexities involved when coaches exclude athletes from competitive sporting events. Data were collected through a series of semi-structured interviews with four football coaches who operated at the university/semi-professional level. Arlie Hochschild’s (1983) work on emotional labour was used to interpret the data in an attempt to further illustrate the complex and dynamic relationships that need managing within sports coaching. In adopting this theoretical framework, the findings enhance previous research by continuing to place the person back into the practice of coaching (Cushion & Jones, 2006; Jones, 2009; Potrac & Jones, 2009; Purdy, Potrac, & Jones, 2008). Specifically, the findings illustrated that coaches engage in considerable performative and emotional labour when excluding athletes; a performance designed to portray the appropriate emotional state to keep athletes ‘on side’ despite their exclusion.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION
1.1 Introduction

Coaching research has recently experienced a considerable upsurge (Gilbert & Trudel, 1999; Gilbert & Trudel, 2001), indicating that sports coaching as an academic discipline has gained credibility, and, hence, is, worthy of study and investigation (Lyle, 2002). However, academics such as Jones, Armour and Potrac (2004) have recognised that much of the previous research into sports coaching has failed to explore and interpret the complexities involved in the activity. Instead, literature has viewed the process as a ‘knowable sequence’, presuming the coach to be in full control (Jones, 2000). While this rationalistic approach to coaching has provided valuable knowledge, Bowes and Jones (2006) contend that it has also limited our understanding of the social nature of coaching. In this respect, it has ignored the complexities of coaching, leaving the literature to depict an unproblematic activity (Jones & Wallace, 2005). In response, recent work has better appreciated the social and dynamic core of coaching (Jones, 2007). Here, Potrac, Jones and Armour (2002) addressed how coaches protect their carefully built up self-images when confronted by contextual difficulties through the use of ‘fronts’; strategic personas through which social power is exercised. As a result, research has addressed coaching as a personal, power-ridden endeavour where coaches utilise strategies in order to shape the context and manipulate those around them to reach a desired goal (Potrac & Jones, 2009). In doing so, the research has valued putting the person back into coaching (Cushion & Jones, 2006; Jones, 2009; Potrac & Jones, 2009).

Subsequently, research has suggested (Jones et al. 2004; Jones, 2007) that portraying coaching as a social performance provides an opportunity to better
analyse and understand what is involved within it. However, despite the recognition of the social complexity of coaching, Cushion and Jones (2006) claim that a gap still remains in our understanding of the social dynamics that construct and affect the relationships between coaches and athletes. This is particularly so when examining the emotional nature surrounding coaching. Jones et al. (2010) identify that our current accounts of emotions in coaching depict the coach to be a calculated and a rational being. However, given our recent better appreciation of the messy nature of coaching (Wallace and Jones, 2005), such accounts ignore the potential emotional strain within the activity (Jones et al. 2010).

1.2 Aims and Objectives:

This study aims to investigate the emotional labour of coaches; that is, the emotions that coaches display as part of their daily work. This includes such emotions’ characteristics, and how these are manipulated to develop successful working relationships. More specifically, the study will look at emotional labour when concerning athlete exclusion. The term exclusion in this context concerns athletes within a particular squad who have been ‘left out’; that is, any athlete who is not selected to be involved in an upcoming competitive event, not selected for the starting line-up in that event (game), and/or those who are substituted. This aim will be explored through a number of related objectives;

Objectives:

1. To explore what kind of emotional labour coaches use when excluding players
2. How do coaches exclude players? How do they cope/react with the emotional labour of excluding players?
3. How do these feelings impact upon future coaching decisions?

4. What are the consequences of emotional labour on the success and development of coaching relationships? What are these consequences?

1.3 Rationale:

Neu (1993) identifies that the selection process is an issue for coaches with very little literature existing concerning the exclusion of athletes; thus, the need for the study is grounded in the lack of current literature to inform and guide coaching practice within the specific area of investigation. The coaching process is versatile and requires input from a variety of different areas (e.g., physiology, psychology and sociology). Although recent literature has developed to better examine the complexities of coaching (Jones & Wallace, 2005; Jones, 2006; 2009), much of this research still has a tendency to be ‘emotionally anorexic’. This means emotions in coaching have been, to a large extent, treated as little more than a variable requiring the coach to manage, allowing him or her to concentrate on the ‘important’ technical and cognitive components of the role (Hargreaves, 1998). Given the increasing acceptance of sociology within coaching, it would, therefore, be beneficial to explore the effect of emotion within coaching in order to better inform practitioners (Jones et al., 2010).

The significance of the study also stems from a need to better grasp the social relationship between coach and athlete; how it is nurtured and developed, particularly from the coaches’ perspective. Social interaction lies at the heart of the coaching process (Jones et al., 2004), which consists of complex connections between and among coaches and athletes allowing us to view coaching as an
intricate social process. As a result, when a coach is required to exclude athletes from a team competing in an event, an extremely complicated situation emerges. This is often because players are not without power within this situation which provides an extremely dynamic context involving multiple factors (Tmnić et al., 2008). Player exclusion adds to the complexity of this social mix; its investigation could potentially allow greater understanding into the emotions (and emotional struggles) felt by coaches as they seek to maintain the allegiance and ‘buy in’ of athletes. As a result the study will utilise the emotional labour theory provided by Arlie Hochschild to address this inattention to the emotions involved in coaching (Jones et al. 2010).

In addition, Jones et al., (2010) has recognised that coaching research has increasingly valued putting the person back into the study of coaching by addressing the emotional nature of practice (e.g., Jones, Glintmeyer & Mckenzie, 2005; Jones, 2006; Jones, 2009). For that reason, there is value in contributing to the literature exploring the emotional struggle coaches may face, particularly when excluding athletes. Therefore, through utilising Hochschild's (1983) notion of emotional labour to help explore and uncover the emotions coaches’ experience, the work will expand upon the current literature to further understand the social complexities of coaching (Cushion & Jones, 2006; Jones, 2009; Potrac & Jones 2009). As a result, the study can provide critical knowledge that illuminates emotional labour within coaching and consequently may inform coaching practices and coach education.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE
2.1 Introduction:

The structure of the following chapter begins with a brief historical summary of coaching research. The next section reviews the relevant literature that demonstrates increased engagement with the complexities of coaching. The third section addresses coaching research from a sociological perspective. This is done by specifically looking at Erving Goffman’s notion of ‘impression management’. Subsequently, a review of Hochschild’s (1983) notion of emotional labour is provided. The final section discusses how the notion of emotional labour can be used to further our understanding of the complexities of coaching.

2.2 A (historical) summary of coaching research

Much of sports coaching literature (e.g. Lyle, 1999; Jones 2004, 2006, 2009) provide us with two differing interpretations of the coaching process. For instance, more traditional coaching work has suggested that the activity is rationalistic in nature, viewing the process as predictable and controllable (Smith, 1989). This approach was epitomised by modelling (e.g., Fairs, 1987; Lyle, 1986, 1991, 1996). A principal example here was the work of Lyle (1986, 1991 & 1996) who portrayed coaching as a sequential activity; as a planned, co-ordinated and progressive process which must be adhered to in order for improved athletic performance to occur. Viewing the coaching process through a series of models, many academics tried to analyse the whole process through isolated individual parts (Brustad, 1997).

The ‘model’ approach considered or comprised of two types of models; models of and models for coaching (Cushion, Armour & Jones, 2006). Models for the coaching process comprised sets of assumptions as to what the activity should
look like in an ideal situation. Cushion et al. (2006) identify four commonly cited models for the coaching process; those related to the work of Fairs (1987), Franks et al. (1986), Sherman et al. (1997) and Lyle (2002). The model proposed by Fairs (1987) involved a series of logical and interrelated steps calling for coaches to recognise, analyse and modify their behaviour to meet the requirements of their athletes in order to reach their performance goals. The model proposed here could be achieved through five interrelated steps; data collection; diagnosis; action planning; implementation of the plan; and evaluation. Thus, the model suggested coaching as a systematic procedure allowing events and outcomes to be constantly reassessed and revised. Cushion et al., (2006) recognised that the model proposed by Fairs (1987) took a positivistic or reductionist approach to the coaching process, thus possessing three major shortcomings. The first being that the model fails to appreciate the social complexities involved in coaching; secondly, that there is no value given to the variety of interpersonal relationships involved; and finally, it fails to give the coaching process any context and, therefore, does not adequately describe how the process may operate in practice. Additionally, Lyle (1999) identified the model as not suitable for a long-term cycle.

Cushion et al. (2006) identified that despite making valuable contributions, the models produced by Franks et al. (1986) and Sherman et al. (1997) were also oversimplified in terms of only capturing singular aspects of the coaching process. As a result, the models are subject to the same criticism levelled at the work of Fairs (1987). Alternatively, in an attempt to reconceptualise sports coaching, Lyle (2002), building upon his earlier work (1996; 1998) created a cyclical model which took into consideration the interpersonal relationships involved in coaching as well as
recognising the constraints within the activity. However, Cushion et al. (2006) point out that Lyle’s (2002) model was not found upon coaching practice, therefore, the model can also be criticised for possessing assumptions concerning the process. As a consequence, the model remains systematic and unproven within the messy complex environment endemic to coaching.

As distinct from models for coaching, models of the coaching process are derived from investigations based on analyses of expert coaches’ practice. Cushion et al. (2006) recognise three main examples of models of coaching; these include, McClean and Chellasdurai (1995) who proposed the coaching performance model; Cote et al. (1995) who offered the coaching practice model; and finally d’Arrippe-Longueville, Fournier and Dubois (1998) who attempted to conceptualize coach-athlete interactions using such a framework. All the above-mentioned studies utilised qualitative methodologies to develop a more comprehensive and holistic outline as an explanation of coaching. However, the work remained informed by the positivist tradition, resulting in the portrayal of the process that coaches experience as implicit and uncontested (Cushion et al., 2006). As a whole, although the empirical data collected from these studies to a degree recognised the complexities within coaching, they failed to appreciate these complexities within their findings (Cushion et al., 2006).

Potrac and Jones (2009) acknowledged that coaching practice has undoubtedly been improved as a result of traditional conceptualizations of the activity. However, their main argument claims that modelling the process has oversimplified, and thus stunted our appreciation of the realities of coaching. Martindale, Collins and Daubney (2005) agree, arguing that the modelling approach
neglects the varying needs of each athlete when they are at different stages of their development, therefore not reflecting the diversity in the coaching environment. Trudel (2006) reiterates this, by stating that modelling the coaching process is too complex a task due to the influence of both the coach and athletes personal characteristics, whilst considering the contextual factors present in the coaching environment. Consequently, as awareness of coaching has developed, research has highlighted that coaching is far more complex than traditional modelling allows. The often heard criticism by coaches here relates to the findings being ‘fine in theory, but divorced from reality’ of the messy world they work in (Jones et al., 2004).

A more recent conceptualisation of coaching has alternatively argued that the very nature of the context is in fact a complex one, suggesting that a rationalistic approach provides limited potential for understanding it (Jones & Wallace, 2005). Here, it has been acknowledged (e.g., Knowles, Borrie & Telfer, 2005) that coaches are placed under a variety of demands related to the team or squad, individual athletes, and the performance environment. In addition, financial and socio-cultural issues all increase the complexities associated with the coaching process. These variety of demands relate to Potrac and Jones’ (2009) notion of coaching as a contested activity; as a much more complex process which still needs to be refined through empirical and theoretical studies (e.g. Jones et al., 2005; Potrac & Jones, 2009).

2.3 Better engagement into complexity of coaching

Although such work on modelling has improved our understanding of the coaching process, Jones (2000) suggested that the rationalistic nature of such work has inhibited the results finding their way into coaches’ practices. In an attempt to
develop the literature, several authors conducted studies which sought to provide more meaningful perspectives on how coaches and athletes work within the coaching environment (Potrac et al., 2000; Cassidy, Jones & Potrac, 2004; Cushion & Jones, 2006). By providing more in-depth insights into coaching, such work has attempted to use sociological literature as theoretical pegs to make better sense of the activity. As a result, the work has attempted to move coaching research away from its traditional mechanistic origins and highlight coaching as a social endeavour (Jones, 2000).

Consequently, recent studies have explored social dynamics within coaching acknowledging social interactions to be at the centre of the process (e.g. Potrac, Armour & Jones, 2002; Jones et al., 2004; Cushion & Jones, 2006; Potrac & Jones, 2009). By attempting to appreciate the wider social complexities in coaching the work here has utilised qualitative methodologies (in-depth interviews and participant observations). A particular example can be seen from Potrac et al. (2002) where a mix-method approach was used to discover how the sociological concepts of ‘role’, ‘power’ and ‘social interactions’ were related within the presentation of self by the coach under investigation. A recurring theme evident within such studies is that coaching cannot be displayed as a sequential step by step process (Potrac et al., 2002; Cushion & Jones, 2006; Potrac & Jones, 2009).

Some coaching practitioners have questioned how sociology can improve their practice. Therefore, the value of a sociological viewpoint for coaches continues to suffer from some scepticism concerning its significance (Fleming & Jones, 2008). In agreement, Cushion and Jones (2006) recognises that the social dynamics within coaching are not yet sufficiently understood. Nonetheless, Jones (2000) identifies
that sociology should be used in coaching to reflect upon the social thoughts and perspectives of a situation rather than to try and explain the complexities involved within coaching. As a result, scholars are continuing to develop literature through adopting social theories.

2.4 Putting the person back into coaching (Impression Management)

It has been argued that sociology enables us to better appreciate coaches’ behaviours. For example Potrac and Jones (2009) highlighted that coaches are often dictated to by their expectation and their perception of athlete’s expectations. Looking at coaching through this sociological lens helps us to understand why coaches coach in the ways they do. The work of Cushion and Jones (2006) portrays coaching as a social performance, with coaches reflecting on their interactive strategies to achieve appropriate relationships (Jones, Armour, & Potrac, 2004). In addition, it has been identified by Potrac et al. (2002) that coaches adapt and manipulate their actions accordingly to protect their carefully designed images in the face of contextual difficulties. As a result, the enquiry into the social performance of coaching has highlighted how coaches attach considerable importance to presenting the ‘right front’ to athletes (Jones et al., 2010). Through applying Goffman’s concepts, such fronts can be explained as the coach getting the athletes to ‘buy into’ their practices. Potrac et al., (2002) identified that through presenting this image, the coach portrays him or herself as knowledgeable or sympathetic.

In addition, Jones et al. (2004) found that coaches employ defensive strategies to stop any discredit of the impression given. For example, by restricting their contact with athletes to particular settings, allows coaches to generate the space needed to create an impression. This was deemed a valuable strategy for two
reasons; firstly, it helped create an impression that they were acting in the best interest of the athlete; and secondly, the space reduced the chance of any close inspection that may lead to the presented image being discredited (Jones et al., 2004). Any lack of care within the presentation of the coaching front which may lead to a ‘phoney’ or ‘transparent’ perception would also result in a loss of credibility (Potrac et al., 2002; Jones et al., 2004), and thus had to be guarded against.

A further example of how coaches protect their image can be seen within the work of d’Arripe-Longueville et al. (1998), where the coaches under examination meticulously planned exercises and analysis of how they were to behave as the coach in practice in order to stimulate their athletes. Whilst these works coincide with Goffman’s (1959) strategy on advanced preparation and thus his notion of impression management, there has been little research into the potential damage to the coaches’ personal identity.

Goffman notes that to disclose information about a stigma can create a situation where personal identity is damaged. Taking this into consideration the impression management involved within coaching (e.g. d’Arripe-Longueville et al., 1998; Potrac et al., 2002; Jones et al., 2004) has yet to address the emotional nature behind this act. The emotional nature of coaching has been for the most part ignored, except for a few notable examples (e.g., Jones, Glintmeyer, & Mackenzie, 2005; Jones 2006, 2009; Purdy, Potrac, & Jones, 2008).

2. 5 Applying emotional labour to coaching

Hochschild’s work is based upon the interrelationship between social interaction and emotion. Although her work was not directly written for or about
Sports coaching, it is nevertheless possible to apply its analysis, as it is related to emotional understanding. This is because Hochschild's set criteria for emotional labour similarly involves face-to-face contact with others we want to influence. Therefore, Hochschild's work can be used to explore the emotions felt by a person, the emotions displayed, and the context in which the emotions arise (Jones et al., 2010).

A particular aspect of Hochschild's work related to emotional labour. She defined emotional labour as:

‘Labour that requires one to induce or suppress feelings in order to sustain outward countenance that produces the proper state of mind in others such as the sense of being cared for in a convivial and safe place. This kind of labour calls for communication of mind and feeling, and it sometimes draws on a source of self that we honour as deep and integral to our individuality.’

(Hochschild, 1983, p.7)

Hochschild (1983) proposed that when an individual is required to engage with emotional labour they may experience a subversion or substantial compromise of their true selves. A relevant example provided by Hochschild (1983) was when the air hostesses under observation were required to deal with a difficult customer. Meaning they were obligated to suppress any emotions they felt about the situation and display the correct emotions they were expected to show the passenger.

Ultimately, Hochschild (1983) believes the consequences of such continued labour could lead to a sense of alienation resulting in losing touch with personal feelings and creating burnout. Such feelings may be relevant to a coaching context, specifically to situations such as team exclusion, where a coach is required to tell an athlete whether they are playing or taking part in a competitive event or not. This
requires face-to-face interaction from the coach who must conduct him or herself in a manner that will not discredit a built up impression (Potrac et al., 2002), or cause long term harm to relationships.

Jones et al. (2010) recognise the value of Hochschild’s social theory in terms of coaching. However, her work has not been without criticism (Jones et al., 2010). Firstly, Brook (2009) criticised Hochschild for the tendency to classify the distinction between emotion management in the ‘private-self’ sphere and commodified ‘public-self’ realm, meaning that a very one-dimensional view of the work place is generated. Related to the previous point, Isenbarger and Zembylas (2006) identified that emotional labour does not have to be detrimental. Instead, individuals such as coaches may view the emotional labour as rewarding. This means that interactions can be referred to as having the potential to be subjectively satisfying (Wouters, 1989; Tolich, 1993). Indeed, coaching could be a prime example where practitioners may take pleasure from emotional labour as their role provides the opportunity to improve performances and influence the experience of their athletes (Isenbarger & Zembylas, 2006). Although sympathetic to the above criticisms, Brook (2009) acknowledged that Hochschild’s work can still provide coaches, coach educators and scholars with valuable information (Jones et al., 2010). In this regard, the emotional labour perspective allows for a unique lens to analyse the emotions coaches may encounter, thus, illuminating potential issues that currently lie undiscovered within the muddy depths of the activity (Jones, 2006).
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY
3.1 Introduction

Hardy, Jones and Gould (1996) state that qualitative research has seen a significant increase in sport in order to obtain rich detailed information which considers the perspective and context of its participants. Thus, qualitative research design is described by Denzin and Lincoln (1994) as a study of effects/features within their natural settings, to interpret and make sense of phenomena in terms of the meanings people bring to them. Therefore, qualitative research attempts to address the world ‘out there’ by analysing the experiences and knowledge of individuals or groups (Flick, 2007). Documenting interactions and communications through text allows for an analysis of how people behave in their natural social environment and, therefore, for meaningful and in-depth insights to be developed. Qualitative research is an umbrella term and consists of a multiple of different methods which have been exploited by different academics in an attempt to address the complexity involved in coaching. For example, Cushion and Jones (2006) used an ethnographic framework and semi-structured interviews to observe the work of Albion Football Club, whereas Purdy et al. (2008) used auto-ethnography in their study to address the complex relationships in a rowing team.

The aim of the research is to penetrate the complex topic being examined which involves an interpretive, naturalistic approach to its subject matter giving priority to what the data collected contribute to addressing the research question. Due to the exploratory nature of this study, it was deemed necessary to adopt a qualitative paradigm through semi-structured interviews.
3.2 Method

A series of semi-structured individual interviews were conducted as the means of collecting data. Denscombe (2007) recognises that such a method allows the interviewee to develop and speak more widely on issues raised by the researcher through open ended answers. Kumar (2005) adds here that information can be supplemented by the interviewer, allowing the participant to expand upon points of interest. This enables the researcher to gain an in-depth insight into the opinions, feelings, emotions and experiences.

Several studies have utilised interviews as a method of interpreting the messy, complex nature of coaching (Cushion & Jones, 2006; Potrac & Jones, 2009). Interviews were considered particularly relevant to this study given their potential to produce meaningful insights into coaches’ experiences, thoughts and feelings (May, 1999).

3.3 Participants

Four coaches were selected for interviewing. The coaches selected within this study involved a purposive sampling procedure. Tongco (2007) describes this process as the deliberate choice of participants based upon the quality of information they possess. Purposive sampling allows one or a few individuals to act as a guide into their culture or experiences. Tongco (2007) further states here that the sampling process in terms of the selection of the informants is non-random. Therefore, each participant was selected upon the basis that they were information rich in relation to this study. This means the participant selected has knowledge relevant to the aims of the study (Tongco, 2007).


3.4 Procedure

The interviews were informed through an interview guide, produced and developed to remain flexible and allow for valuable experiences to be expressed by the participants, whilst creating a foundation for the interview to flow (Patton, 2002). The guide was based upon the objectives previously discussed. It involved a clear list of issues to be addressed with cues for further probing as appropriate. However, the interviews were also flexible in terms of the order each topic was considered given their semi-structured nature (Denscombe, 2007). This meant having a guide to the list of topics to cover, any new ones which emerged were probed and explored as appropriate (Potrac & Jones, 2009). Within the study each interview lasted between 40-60 minutes and were conducted in an environment which best suited the respective coach being interviewed. A pilot study was completed to ensure the efficiency of the interview guide. The pilot study highlighted the need for any refinements to be made along with the organisation and phraseology of certain questions (Gillham, 2000). The interviews were audio-taped through the use of a Dictaphone to allow for subsequent transcription. The transcription of the data allowed for familiarity and to ensure accuracy of interpretations. In addition, further questioning was utilised at the end of the interviews for respondent validation. This involves obtaining feedback from the participants concerning the accuracy of their data (Torrance, 2012).

3.5 Data analysis

Following the transcription of the interviews, an inductive content analysis procedure was employed to address the aims and objectives of the study. Initially, transcripts were studied in detail allowing for the researcher to guarantee content
acquaintance. Subsequently, a coding process was utilised which Charmaz (2006) identifies as a technique to move statements in data to analytic interpretations. Line-by-line coding was the first step. Line-by-line coding involves putting a name to each line of the transcript. Charmaz (2006) suggests this technique can be extremely beneficial to avoid missing themes which may not occur when reading data as a general. This is particularly important when trying to identify implicit concerns as well as explicit statements which may be apparent when investigating emotions of a person. Initial codes help separate data into categories. These categories were then built upon to generate a range of themes within the data (Charmaz, 2006). The objective was to build a system of themes that emerged from the unstructured data representing the coaches’ emotions.

Daengbuppha, Hemmington and Wilkes, (2006) recognise that inductive research is a part of grounded research which is used to derive theory embedded within a phenomenon. The method allows for the interplay between data collection and theoretical analysis to examine experiences. In this respect, the process involved a move from raw data to patterned themes creating an understanding to be formed through the development of concepts and theories.

3.6 Theoretical framework

Hochschild's (1983) work was the result of an ethnographic study based upon the working practices of flight attendants. Central to her work was the exploration of workplaces exploiting the private emotions for commercial purposes. In her study, the flight attendants were selected on their ability to convey so-called ‘Southern Hospitality’, which included welcoming passengers and accepting the passenger was always right. The flight attendants were selected on their ability to ‘convey a spirit of
enthusiasm”; Hochschild recognised the result required the workers to engage in a performance.

Significant to Hochschild’s work was the requirement for flight attendants to manage their emotions to provide the expected service to passengers, and to recognise the passenger is always right. Undoubtedly, the airline used this to increase passenger satisfaction and thus increase profit. It is here where Hochschild recognised the emotional work the flight attendants were required to do, which transmuted into emotional labour. Hochschild recognised that the consequences of emotional labour can cause the workers to become alienated from their sense of self, which may result in a lack of motivation and burnout.

Although the work of Hochschild was not written directly for coaching, Jones et al. (2010) identified there are many areas to coaching practice and education which would benefit from the theorisations. First of all, Hochschild’s (1983) notion of emotional labour could be used to explore the emotional struggle for coaches, particularly in situations such as exclusion. In addition, such work could highlight to coaches and athletes the consequences of emotional labour, resulting in an understanding of their respective selves (Jones et al., 2010). A further way in which Hochchild’s notions could aid research is by examining the implementation of an ‘athlete-centred’ approach, thus addressing the paucity of empirical studies which implement such ideals in practice (Jones et al., 2010).

The value of Hochschild’s work then is clear and, therefore, can be used as an analytical tool to develop the understanding of the social nature of coaching and potentially inform coach education.
3.7 Ethics

Most traditional research ethical guidelines state that there are three main issues which must be addressed whilst undertaking qualitative research (Silverman, 2011). The first involves codes and consent; which refers to ‘informed consent’. This means making participants aware of the purpose of the research and that they have the opportunity to withdraw at any given time without penalty. All the coaches involved gave consent for the interviews to be audio-taped and were reassured that their identity would be kept confidential.

The second issue refers to confidentiality which refers to the obligation you have as a researcher to protect the participants involved (Silverman, 2011). De Vaus (2001) addresses confidentiality as an important methodological and ethical issue; that is, if participants feel truly confidential then they are more likely to open up to sensitive matters. Therefore, within this study, pseudonyms will be used to in order to keep participants anonymous.

Trust, the third and final issue, concerns the relationship between the researcher and the participant. Silverman (2011) identifies that sensitive issues may arise during in-depth interviews and, therefore, this must be a consideration whilst the interviews occur. To overcome this issue, the interviews will be conducted within a safe environment and all interview questions will be given to the participant prior to the interview in order to familiarise themselves with the content and allow for any retrospective recall (Jones, Hughes & Kingston, 2007).
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS
4.1 Performance of Emotional labour

Hochschild (1983) considers that emotional labour requires an individual, in this case the coach, to induce or suppress feelings in order to produce a proper state of mind in others. From the results, it was clear that all four coaches acknowledged their involvement in emotional labour. Some of the feelings which were identified in this respect included nervousness, sympathy, empathy and self-doubt. The emotional labour the coaches engaged with was always apparent when excluding their athletes: in doing so, the coaches identified using a ‘front’ or a certain performance. For example, in the words of two:

Tom: “you have to put a face on as such, you’ve got a coaching face where you’ve got to make them perceive that you know what you’re talking about, you have to be very confident in what you do and say.”

Jack reiterated that he was constantly engaged in emotional labour, thus required to have a front whilst excluding an athlete:

Jack: “you can never wear that outward feeling when you’re telling the player, how really sorry and sympathetic you are that they are not playing because they see me as a coach.”

In this respect, they believed that they were required to exclude or deselect athletes in a certain manner. This was done to keep their athletes ‘on side’, as they were aware that they would need them at a later date (similar to the air hostesses in Hochschild’s work who had to engage with emotional labour for job security [1983]). Furthermore, the coaches replicated the situation identified by Hochschild (1983)
where the flight attendants were required to convey a spirit of enthusiasm despite dealing with difficult customers. The mention of sympathy by the coaches highlights the need to produce the proper state of mind in others (Hochschild, 1983). In this instance, the coaches searched for athlete understanding and to accept why they were being left out. This was done to protect their relationships, because, as stated earlier, the excluded athletes would no doubt be needed to play at a later date (Potrac et al., 2002; Jones et al., 2004; Cushion & Jones, 2006; Potrac & Jones, 2009).

The coaches in this study clearly identified engaging in emotional labour due to an awareness of how they portrayed themselves while excluding athletes. Potrac et al. (2002) identified that top coaches consider their presentation of self to be very important in order to gain the respect of the athletes. This is supported by Purdy et al. (2008) where the coach in their study was shown to be very aware of the need to look and act like a coach should. The coaches in this study support such a contention, and had an appreciation for what they looked like whilst excluding their athletes. For example:

Joe:  “I try and hide the fact I'm pretty nervous about doing it... So I'll just make the decision and go with it. So, when I'm telling a player [that he or she is not starting the game] I try and tell them confidently so they don’t think ‘oh he doesn't really know what he is talking about’”
Adam: “I tend to try and be positive, I try to back my own decisions and not to reflect on it that much and let self-doubt come into my mind because if I’m not confident in my decision and I don’t come across well, then how are the players as a team going to be confident if I don’t actually know who should be playing in certain areas and certain units.”

Tom: “You have to stick to your guns and have to be confident in what you say, you can’t stutter when you’re out there, otherwise they are going to go against what you’re saying and won’t believe you as such, think of it as an excuse”

Jack: “You certainly have to put a serious act on, you can't clown around…there is a definite front you put on as the coach, you certainly jump in and out of your coaching suit that day and you have to be honest, you have to be sincere, show some integrity to the player so there is certainly a serious role you adopt in that situation…I think the body language and engagement with the eyes, I try to make sure I look at the player, make sure the body language is appropriate to the situation”

It was apparent throughout the transcripts that a consensus existed among the participants regarding an awareness of their performances as coaches; a recognition which coincides with the work of Potrac et al. (2002) and Purdy et al. (2008). Each coach was found to engage with a social performance or front. The performance included suppressing and portraying specific emotions, thus, engaging
in Hochschild’s emotional labour. The front, then, allows the coach to influence athletes into experiencing certain feelings, giving credence to the coach as a sensitive, sincere individual, still worthy of an excluded athlete’s respect. This is essential as Cassidy et al. (2004) established that fruitful working relationships and maintaining trust and respect to be essential in coaching practice; a belief which highlights the need for a successful performance and engagement in emotional labour.

This coincides with the teachers in O’Connor’s (2008) work where practitioners were required to engage in a performance for professional reasons, very much like coaches to keep players ‘on board’. However, interestingly the teachers here considered that they were not always engaging in a performance, as the emotions they felt were sincere. Jack includes ‘sincerity’ and ‘integrity’ in his description of his performance of exclusion, suggesting that not all the emotions the coaches portray are forced. However, Jack contradicts this as he felt that he could not show his athletes ‘how really sorry and sympathetic you are that they are not playing’. The reason for this may be due to his self-awareness of what emotions he displayed to each athlete due to his conscious act of how he was seen as the coach (Purdy et al., 2008). As a result, coaches are required to manage their emotions whether they are genuine or as a part of their performance within the exclusion of their athletes. Thus, adding to the complexity involved in the social interactions with athletes and therefore the coaching process (Potrac et al., 2002; Jones et al., 2004; Cushion & Jones, 2006; Potrac & Jones, 2009).
4.2 Emotional labour in coaching

All the coaches involved would not present the team until 40-60 minutes prior to the game following a similar process. The reasoning identified by the coaches for this was to keep the players focused on the game in hand. An example of this can be seen from Tom;

Tom: “the starting line-up shouldn’t really know they are starting until [close to] the beginning of the game so everybody is on their toes and everybody is ready to start the game. I feel if you know you’re starting or know you’re on the bench you may have a different frame of mind moving into the game.”

However, how the coaches chose to tell their athletes of their exclusion varied. Joe spoke to those excluded as a group prior to the game. Adam and Tom would text or ring those excluded from the squad and not speak to those not playing on the day. Finally, Jack would speak to those not playing individually before or after the game. Within the transcripts, the coaches provided evidence for this variation in methods and why they chose them, for example;

Joe: “I start to think how I would feel if I was hearing the news, and then I try to think of ways that I would want to hear it… to the point and don’t want them blabbering on and going round the house, so I try and do it that way”
Tom: “I think it’s the best way, probably from experience as well of me being excluded from squads… I replicate what other people have done to me in a good way… So from my experience I’ve taken snippets from different managers, put them all together and made my own manager.”

Jack: “it’s only fair you do it face to face, from prior experience… Prior experience from the career I had, managers would choose not to say anything then come at a later date or in fact you would have to go see the manager, but no not interested [the manager]… I think about how I wanted to be treated as a player, some excuses managers gave me as to why I wasn’t playing were not honest and there was no attachment”

The evidence clearly illuminates that the coaches chose their precise method to exclude athletes based on experience and what they received as athletes themselves. Thus, the coaches used experience and observation of other coaches to build upon their practice. This has previously been recognised as a primary source of knowledge for coaches and coaching (Gilbert & Trudel, 2001; Gould, Gianinni, Krane & Hodge, 1990). Indeed, Lyle (1999) identified that inherent within this process of learning how to coach is the interpretation of “how things should be done”. In conjunction, Cushion, Armour and Jones (2003) recognised that lessons learned as a performer shapes the practice of a coach. Tom agreed with this when stating “I’ve taken snippets from different managers, put them all together and made my own
manager. This was a belief which was very apparent among the coaches and helps explain how they had chosen to exclude players.

In addition to offering reasons for their methods of excluding or deselecting athletes, the transcripts also indicated that the coaches saw the preparation of their performance in doing so to be imperative:

Joe: “I'll get it into my head what I'm going to say and try and stick to it. A sort of plan, a mental plan of it.”

Adam: “I kind of prepare my discourse, how I am going to display the team talk. Maybe I could add some reasoning…I'll kind of put subtle or even obvious hints in as to why my decisions have been structured on the strengths of the 11 there rather than the strengths or weaknesses of the subs excluded.”

Tom: “I think sometimes you’ve got to prepare that you’ve got to speak to them...you have to prepare yourself for what questions they may ask and your reasoning why”

Such an emphasis on preparation for the performance can be inferred as a way of managing emotions and performance. A particular example was when Adam stated “I kind of prepare my discourse, how I am going to display the team talk”. Interlinking with Adam’s awareness of his performance as the coach, he prepared his discourse, or language-in-use, in order to manage the performance and emotional labour he utilised whilst excluding or deselecting athletes. Thus, indicating that this was an important coping mechanism for the coaches in dealing with the pressure to get the performance correct.
Furthermore, when asked about the process they go through when excluding athletes a common theme appeared was that related to the use of assistant coaches. For example;

Jack: “I do go through it at home, I’ll talk to other coaches at length, I’ll speak to my wife, I’ll speak to myself, is it right? Am I doing the right thing?”

Adam: “in that situation the use of an assistant manager or other coaches is important so you can bounce ideas off each other so it’s not just your point of view”

Tom: “I have a squad meeting prior to every game; we will talk through what the first team squad will be”

This occurrence of assistant managers can be seen as a method of coping with the emotional labour involved in excluding athletes. Despite the assistant coaches not directly engaging with the emotional labour involved, they nevertheless had a large part to play within the preparation of the (deselection) performance. However, it must be noted that in spite of the coaches utilising other coaches within their practice, it was clear that the coaches all appreciated the final decision concerning the exclusion of their athletes rested with them. For instance:

Jack: “I make sure that I chat with people, senior people, chat with players, chat with members of staff in the team but ultimately the decision is left with me”

Isenbarger and Zembylas (2006) recognised that Hochschild’s emotional labour theory neglects the fact that some workers may embrace emotional labour as
rewarding. This is particularly relevant when an individual such as a coach considers their role to provide opportunities to improve. This can be applied to Jack’s practice:

Jack: “I’m here for the players and give them back something I had and possibly more because I didn’t have the support the players have here”

The evidence supports the notion provided by Isenbarger and Zembylas (2006) that coaches find the job rewarding because their job role includes an opportunity to develop and improve the performances of their athletes. Joe provides a further example as he felt that his practice has ‘changed the way he’s [the athlete] played or the way he’s trained’.

Furthermore, Joe provides a further example of how he views the exclusion his athletes as a positive rather than a negative:

Joe: “I think that I’ve coped with it well because I’ve seen some good effects from me dropping players.”

Here, Joe does not speak of emotional labour directly, but instead refers to the process of exclusion which includes emotional labour as previously established. The reason for the ‘good effects’ may be the influence the decision of exclusion has on the athletes. For example, the athletes will behave and respond to the decision in a way to please the coach in order to play again. This is a situation very similar to that of Cushion and Jones (2006) where the young players adhere to the coaches in order to raise their capital and increase their chances of playing and potentially a professional contract. As a result, the coaches view their decision and involvement in emotional labour during exclusion as influencing the performance of the athletes.
A further explanation of the coaches utilising emotional labour as a part of exclusion can be seen when the coaches delay their announcement of the team until 40-60 minutes prior to the match. Tom established this is done so that ‘everybody is on their toes and everybody is ready to start the game’. Jones et al. (2004) suggests athletes must be made to feel a little insecure and cannot be rooted in comfort zones, thus delaying the team announcement allows the athletes to remain focused. This increases the opportunity of a better performance and further relates to the coaches improving and developing the athletes. Again, adding to the complexity involved in the coaching process as the coaches manage their emotions in order to keep the players ‘on side’ whilst identifying that they may utilise exclusion in order to improve a player’s performance.

Isenbarger and Zembylas (2006) also suggest individuals may find influencing the experience and lives of others as rewarding rather than the emotional labour involved as negative. Jack, as a coach, supports this concept when he speaks of providing his athletes with something he had as a professional. As a result, the evidence here emphasises that Hochschild’s theory of emotional labour does not necessarily have to be negative, particularly in a coaching context.

### 4.3 Consequences of emotional labour

Hochschild (1983) identified that a consequence of emotional labour could lead to the person, in this case coaches, experiencing a subversion of their true selves, resulting in possible alienation and burnout. This consequence is something that could be applied to the coaches of this study given the negative language they used to describe their feelings before and after exclusion. For example, Jack identified exclusion as ‘draining’ and ‘not a nice feeling’.
Similarly, Hochschild (1983) suggested the air hostesses in her study became, to various degrees, lost or divided from themselves. The coaches in this study also expressed such sentiments:

Joe: “I always expect to do well and if I’m divided and I’ve got a divided view and I’m trying to hide something from a player, it makes you get annoyed and makes you think ‘well I’m feeling one thing and saying another’ so it’s quite hard, its make you feel quite tired at the end of the day”

Adam: “Divided definitely, the thoughts of shall I make the decision and how is that person going to react to that decision. So that might bring back those self-doubts and should I make that decision”

Tom: “If you do it [exclude] to a player you have an off the field and out of coach relationship with, I would say so yes [feels divided]…As a previous player of the same club, one of the lads socially is a very good friend of mine and I had to exclude him from the starting line-up, he was on the bench for X Y and Z, I never felt very good about it”

The coaches agreed that as a result of exclusion they become divided, a symptom recognised by Hochschild which leaves an individual vulnerable to stress and burnout. However, the examples and language used suggested the coaches were divided about decisions they are required to make rather than being divided with their true self and image. This differs from Hochschild's work as the flight
attendants division occurred when their own self had become inextricable from the company’s image they were trying to maintain. The reason for the coaches avoiding becoming lost with their image, which could potentially lead to alienation, may again be related to the previous notion that coaches accept their role as the coach. For example, Jack felt emotional labour was ‘a part of the job, it’s what we do’ thus accepting the decisions which accompany the position.

In addition, while examining the consequences of emotional labour, an important theme which arose concerned the attachment the coaches had with their athletes and the impact this had on the emotional labour they were involved in. Jack, in particular, spoke about the attachment he had with his athletes:

Jack: “there’s an attachment to the players, you can’t disregard the players like a piece of meat, you’re attached to that person so you want to make sure you do the best for that person and sometimes it’s just not enough.”

Jack’s ‘attachment’ to his athletes adds meaning to his coaching practice; for example:

Jack: “I’m here for the players and give them back something I had and possibly more because I didn’t have the support the players have here”

Given the attachment Jack assigns to his athletes, he can be seen to be caring for them. Cassidy et al. (2004) appreciate the coach is required to care for the athletes in and outside the sporting environment. This helps to understand why this particular attachment between the coach and athlete is formed. Similarly, the
participants from O’Connor’s (2008) work were emotionally engaged allowing the teachers to care for the students and, as a result, add integrity to their work. Jack spoke of an ‘honesty’ he used to base his decisions to exclude players. As a result, his performance integrated his honesty, allowing his performance of exclusion to include a sense of self. Thus, in turn, Jack’s true self was still extricable from his performance, allowing Jack to not become alienated through engaging in emotional labour. Therefore, it is important for coaches to establish and recognise a sense of self within their practice. Millar, Oldham and Donovan (2011) identified that within their study the coaches lacked self-awareness when providing feedback and instruction. As a consequence, when developing coaches, there should be a consideration to produce more self-aware practitioners who understand and can reflect upon their own practice, whether it is from an instructional point of view or reflecting upon the emotions felt within a situation. The result would reduce the chance of coaches becoming alienated, or lost from themselves when engaging in emotional labour, whilst improving coaches awareness in and of their practice.

4.4 Future impacts of emotional labour

It has been established that the coaches engage within a performance that requires them to suppress and express particular emotions to their athletes. However, the extent of how these feelings impact upon future coaching decisions is unclear. The coaches involved in the study identified that the outcome of their decisions triggered a reflection process, for example:

Joe: “If it was a bad decision, it would affect me negatively, it would make me question my decision and I would think about it a lot”
Adam: “Yeah the self-doubt goes away and just feel confident; it’s a source of confidence that I’ve made that decision to play those players in those areas”

The coaches identified how their emotions and opinion on the situation altered depending on the outcome of the situation. However, despite them identifying this change, there was no evidence from the coaches that their emotions and emotional labour they engage within during exclusion effects their future coaching decisions. However, it is important to note that all the coaches were adamant that within their practice they did not avoid any decisions. For instance:

Joe: “I don’t try and avoid making any decisions, I try and hit it head on, if I get it wrong I get it wrong, I take what I’ve learnt and use it in the next time I make a decision”

Tom: “Avoided the decision... No not avoided, but postponed it or suspended the decision”

Jack: “Avoided... good one... there was a potential conflict this weekend …but I wouldn’t have avoided it. I didn’t want the conversation...so you look for that avoidance from your own way of looking at things, you have to do it”

Even though the coaches may postpone decisions or their performance, it is clear they accepted their role in selecting the team. Again, this can be linked to the previous notion that the coaches accept their role as the coach and in doing so accept that exclusion is a part of their job. Thus, contributing further evidence to
ascertain that emotional labour may not be a negative to individuals such as coaches and as a result supporting Isenbarger and Zembylas (2006).
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION
5.1 Conclusion

This study aimed to enhance our appreciation of the social interactions which occur between coach and athlete, and thus contribute to our understanding of the complexity involved in coaching. Considering that the coaching context is ambiguous (Jones & Wallace, 2005), the work of Arlie Russell Hochschild on emotional labour was used to better understand practice. Specifically, such a theory was used to generate understanding about the social interaction involved when coaches exclude athletes, and the consequences of suppressing such emotions.

It was very apparent that the coaches in the study engaged with emotional labour, which was viewed as a performance. This was consciously done in order to keep athletes “on side” as they would be required at a later stage. In addition, central to Hochschild’s notion of emotional labour is an individual becoming alienated from their sense of self after engaging in such action. The coaches of this study described feelings which may be associated with alienation. However, for the most part, the results suggested that the coaches did not suffer from the detrimental or harmful consequences which Hochschild suggests. Instead, the coaches perceived emotional labour to be necessary and as a result embraced the opportunity to improve the performances of their athletes, coinciding with the work of Isenbarger and Zembylas (2006). In one notable example, a coach included the concept of honesty in their exclusion of athletes. This meant that a sense of self was retained when engaging in emotional labour allowing the coach to remain true to their sense of self and avoid alienation.

In light of the information unearthed, it can be suggested that alterations to coach education could allow for coaches to understand the emotional work they
engage with. This, in turn, could develop more self-aware coaches able to manage and negotiate their emotions in order to become more successful and insightful practitioners. Such awareness could also inhibit coaches from experiencing alienation when engaging in emotional labour, thus, limiting the chance of burnout.

The coaching process is contextually defined. Consequently, the results do not capture the entire coaching process or all that occurs within the differing levels of coaching, such as for professional coaches. The framework used recognised how coaches are required to manage the emotions displayed in order to keep players on side and create an appropriate efficient working environment. As a result, the findings from the study highlight the complexity involved in excluding athletes, and thus the coach-athlete relationship. In doing so, a more realistic picture of coaching has been portrayed through identifying that coaches are emotional phenomena who face tensions, challengers and dilemmas in their practice, as opposed to cognitive or social in nature.

The theoretical framework provided by Hochschild can offer researchers in this area with a set of tools to conduct future work. For example, to expand on this research Hochschild’s sensitive notions could be used to explore how athletes are required to engage in emotional labour whilst being excluded. As a result, such a study would build upon this project and further contribute to our understanding of the interactive dynamics endemic to the coach-athlete relationship. Therefore, in coincidence with Jones et al. (2010), the coaching community can benefit from constructing representations of coaching that are rich in emotions through engaging with Hochschild’s emotional perspective.


