

LATE SUBMISSION WITH PERMISSION

(MARK TO BE RECORDED AS FIRST ATTEMPT)

Student Name:

Joanna Baker

Student Number: St20003505

Programme: Sport PE

Year: 3

Term: 3

Module Number & Title:

SSP6050

Independent Project

Original Submission Date:

21 March 2014

Date extension requested:

13 March 2014

Programme Director:

Declan Connaughton

Date agreed by PD:

14 March 2014

New Submission Date:

28 March 2014

Note: A completed copy of this form must be attached to your dissertation. Both dissertation and form must be submitted by the 'new submission date'. Failure to do so will result in a maximum mark of 40% as a second attempt.

Cardiff School of Sport
DISSERTATION ASSESSMENT PROFORMA:
Empirical ¹

Student name: Joanna Baker		Student ID: st20003505	
Programme: Sport and Physical Education			
Dissertation title: Making Sense of Undergraduate Learning in Sport Related Degrees: A Foucauldian Examination			
Supervisor: Toby Nichols			
Comments	Section		
	Title and Abstract (5%)		
	Title to include: A concise indication of the research question/problem. Abstract to include: A concise summary of the empirical study undertaken.		
	Introduction and literature review (25%)		
	To include: outline of context (theoretical/conceptual/applied) for the question; analysis of findings of previous related research including gaps in the literature and relevant contributions; logical flow to, and clear presentation of the research problem/ question; an indication of any research expectations, (i.e., hypotheses if applicable).		
	Methods and Research Design (15%)		
	To include: details of the research design and justification for the methods applied; participant details; comprehensive replicable protocol.		
	Results and Analysis (15%) ²		
	To include: description and justification of data treatment/ data analysis procedures; appropriate presentation of analysed data within text and in tables or figures; description of critical findings.		
	Discussion and Conclusions (30%)		
	To include: collation of information and ideas and evaluation of those ideas relative to the extant literature/concept/theory and research question/problem; adoption of a personal position on the study by linking and combining different elements of the data reported; discussion of the real-life impact of your research findings for coaches and/or practitioners (i.e. practical implications); discussion of the limitations and a critical reflection of the approach/process adopted; and indication of potential improvements and future developments building on the study; and a conclusion which summarises the relationship between the research question and the major findings.		
	Presentation (10%)		
	To include: academic writing style; depth, scope and accuracy of referencing in the text and final reference list; clarity in organisation, formatting and visual presentation		

¹ This form should be used for both quantitative and qualitative dissertations. The descriptors associated with both quantitative and qualitative dissertations should be referred to by both students and markers.

**CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY
PRIFYSGOL FETROPOLITAN CAERDYDD**

CARDIFF SCHOOL OF SPORT

**DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE
(HONOURS)**

SPORT AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION

**MAKING SENSE OF UNDERGRADUATE LEARNING IN SPORT RELATED DEGREES: A
FOUCAULDIAN EXAMINATION.**

**Dissertation submitted under the discipline of
COACHING**

JOANNA BAKER

ST20003505

**MAKING SENSE OF UNDERGRADUATE LEARNING IN SPORT RELATED DEGREES: A
FOUCAULDIAN EXAMINATION.**

Cardiff Metropolitan University
Prifysgol Fetropolitian Caerdydd

Certificate of student

By submitting this document, I certify that the whole of this work is the result of my individual effort, that all quotations from books and journals have been acknowledged, and that the word count given below is a true and accurate record of the words contained (omitting contents pages, acknowledgements, indices, tables, figures, plates, reference list and appendices).

Word count: 11,346_____

Date: 27 March 2014

Certificate of Dissertation Supervisor responsible

I am satisfied that this work is the result of the student's own effort.

I have received a dissertation verification file from this student



Name: _____

Date: 27 March 2014

Notes:

The University owns the right to reprint all or part of this document.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS **i**

ABSTRACT **ii**

CHAPTER ONE

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction 1

1.2 Aims 3

CHAPTER TWO

2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Athlete Coach Learning 5

2.2 Coaching: A Social Endeavor

6

2.3 Social Theory: Power

8

2.4 Foucault: Disciplinary Power

9

CHAPTER THREE

3.0 METHODS

3.1 Adopting a Qualitative Approach 13

3.2 Participants 13

3.3 Procedure 14

3.4 Data Analysis 14

3.5 Trustworthiness

14

3.6 Ethical Issues and Limitations

15

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0 RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

18

4.2 Athlete Coach Learning

18

4.3 Coaching: A Social Endeavor

20

4.4 Social Theory: Power

22

4.5 Foucault: Disciplinary Power

25

CHAPTER FIVE

5.0 DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

28

5.2 Athlete Coach Learning

28

5.3 Coaching: A Social Endeavor

30

5.4 Social Theory: Power

31

5.5 Foucault: Disciplinary Power

33

5.6 Further Research

34

CHAPTER SIX

6.0 CONCLUSION

6.1 Conclusion

37

REFERENCE LIST

Reference List

APPENDICIES

Appendix A: Ethical Approval Form

A1

Appendix B: Participant Information Form

B1

Appendix C: Participant Consent Form

C1

Appendix D: Student Participant Interview Guide

D1

Appendix E: Staff Participant Interview Guide

E1

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my dissertation tutor Toby Nichols, for all the time and effort he has given me in guiding me through this study. Your knowledge and commitment has been highly appreciated.

A big thank you to all participants who have been involved in the study who volunteered their time to assist with my dissertation, without you completion would not have been possible.

Lastly I would like to thank family and friends for their constant encouragement and support throughout this project constantly motivating me, making the process more manageable.

Abstract

This study attempts to make sense of the learning environments situation within sporting degrees at Cardiff Metropolitan University using a theoretical lens. Using theories situated within learning and disciplinary power and attempt to make sense and understanding of the learning environments that are implemented. Semi-structured interviews were carried out in aid of gaining insight to staff and students within the sporting sector of the university. Six participants took part altogether; Three students on a sporting degree, and three staff members who have had experience in lecturing within different environments within the sports sector of the university. The discussion highlights work of Michel Foucault's (1997) key theoretical findings of disciplinary power in regards to the results found, and the effect that different learning environments have on students learning. The study concludes with new information and suggestions for furthering studies within this area..

CHAPTER ONE
Introduction

Barriers have been noticeable in relation to teaching and sports coaching. Coaching becoming identified with skill acquisition helping athletes to train to become more efficient, and teaching identified as aiding to better whole developments within learners (Jones 2006; Lee, 1988). Burns (1995, p.99) revealed that learning is 'A relatively permanent change in behaviour', and learning can take its course differently with each individual due to the process learning is situated and incorporating many different factors. Many theories have been produced in association with learning, a production of two main ideologies most commonly used to distinguish learning are; behaviourism and constructivism, although other theories have been introduced (Jarvis, 2009). Sfard's (1998) acquisition and performance had introduced a new ideology of learning implementing interaction and involvement with others.

Disciplinary Power a ideology thought by a sociologist Michel Foucault was most commonly noticed within the use of a panopticon within prisons within the last two centuries (Foucault 1997). The theory was based around the idea of surveillance and conforming to normal standards also through the use of examination and hierarchal observations (Foucault 1997). Surveillance, an important factor was implanted to develop well perceived behaviours from prisoners. Foucault believed that disciplinary power would help to change the lives of the prisoners transforming them to self-check behaviours, to pass examinations made by observations by the guards within the prisons; resulting in creating docile bodies easily manipulated and transformed (Denison and Scott-Thomas, 2011; Foucault, 1991). Coaches within sport have implemented these ideologies using them on athletes to help raise levels of performance.

This study will seek to look through a Foucauldian lens trying to make sense of learning environments within Cardiff Metropolitan University sport related degree. A Foucauldian theoretical lens is useful in attempting to understand the ways in which students and staff members find most beneficial within university. Use of previous research into learning and coaching entwined with social theories have helped allow an insight to be gained through the Foucauldian theories. Using this theory an attempt to gain an understanding of learning within a university setting will be undertaken, carried out by using Foucault's Disciplinary Power theory as a lens. The discussion demonstrates the findings of the study, and how these findings can be knowledgeable for devising and creating effective learning with positive and negatives of learning environments.

1.1 Aims:

Looking at the perception of social learning within higher education around a sports related degree.

Objectives:

- Making sense of learning through the lens of Michel Foucault.
- Identifying how different environments affect learning.
- Identifying the environment and making sense of the learning.

CHAPTER TWO
Literature Review

2.1 Athlete and Coach Learning.

For many years there has been a great divide between teaching and sports coaching, this is particularly identified as coaching was supposedly physical skill acquisition where sports coaches are training the learners this and teaching was identified as bettering the whole development of the learner (Jones, 2006, Lee, 1988). Many Learning theories attempt to explain how people learn, and with this theories aid the complex nature of the learning process with a range of theories (Cushion, Nelson, Armour, Lyle, Sandford and O'Callaghan, 2010) creating a base for learning. Oromod (1995) defined learning as a process that accumulates many factors which are emotional, cognitive, and environmental, these all having influencing factors on an individual to make a change to their knowledge, subject to why each individual will gain a different learning experience. 'A relatively permanent change in behaviour' is defined by Burns (1995, p.99). Learning theory has been explored by Merriam and Cafferella (1999) whereby the learning theory itself has been divided into sections behaviourism and constructivist.

Everyone learns in different ways and each person must gain a full understanding of what is being taught to gain and fully learn a concept (Jarvis, 2009). There have been two ideologies which are most commonly used when talking about and identifying the main issues within learning; behaviourism and constructivism. Both of these hold learning at the centre of their theories however behaviourism looks at the idea of good learning practice (Jarvis, 2004) that if a good behaviour is pursued learners will be awarded for their efforts, this having a positive effect most likely furthering positive behaviour looking onwards usually conducted in a progressive manor (Armitage, Bryant, Dunnill, Renwick, Hayes, Hudson, Kent and Lawes, 2003). The main focus of the behaviourism concept is that consequences are given for the actions that are made, it can also be suggested that it is an observation learning practice (Pritchard 2008). Constructivist theory takes the approach that learners gain from their experiences and move forward by using knowledge that they have previously gained (Asubel, 1963) to create their own learning (Moon, 1999) and to build knowledge to move forward, allowing for a full learning experience described by Jarvis (2009).

Sfard (1998) introduced a acquisition and performance metaphor into the line of learning, suggesting that acquisition is understood that learning is the basis of understanding basic knowledge. This can be identified as having a link towards behavioural learning, as learners take small progressions to learning new concepts (Tusting & Barton, 2006). Participation moves into interaction and the involvement of others, which is associated more to a cognitivist learning theory (Sfard, 1998). Situated learning theory has been seen as another way in which learning takes place. Lave and Wenger (1991) explored the influences that social systems have on learning and

point out that Communities of Practice have benefits and impacts learning relating back to the statement that of Oromod (1995) that learning is undertaken differently by each person.

Although learning has been identified and theories devised on learning, it does not eliminate the debate for learning to be understood (Hodkinson, Biesta and James, 2008). Learning in formal, informal and non-formal situations has been seen in relation to the learning theories above. Non-formal learning is identified where the learning can be organised and have objectives but simultaneously flexible for the learners ability. Informal learning addressed as unorganised has been identified to have a positive nature of learning, where learners develop knowledge through interaction (Cassidy et al, 2009), however this has been scrutinised as a method used by less knowledgeable others to help create learning opportunities as they lack knowledge themselves and the outcomes are very unpredictable (Cushion et al 2010, Hager, 1998). Attaining knowledge is a priority in formal learning, with much research developed providing information of formal learning being undoubtedly organised delivering an abundance of new knowledge, however lacking time, due to presentations having too much information to be gained and understood (Lemyre, Trudel, Durand-Bush, 2007, Gilbert & Trudel, 1999). Cushion et al., (2010) reiterates learning can be done in various ways, using wide varieties of sources, however coaches must recognise that the types of learning must be devised and used efficiently to aid development of learners interests.

2.2 Coaching: A Social Endeavour

Coaching is often referred to as a process which is systematic and dynamic (Lyle, 1993, Woodman, 1993, Cross and Lyle, 1999), as it requires moving through different steps to gain an outcome. Until recent work Cushion (2007) expressed that as coaches, little information is actually known about the coaching process. Unlike the coaching process, more solid research has been developed on subjects around coaching, such as coaching behaviour assessment and personality variables of coaches (Smith, Smoll and Hunt, 1977; Smith, Smoll, Barnett and Everett, 1993), however a lack in research when identifying the coaching process instead based upon the athlete's performances alone instead (Cross and Lyle, 2008). Researchers continue to argue on the prospect that the process has not been fully identified and the approaches that have been taken have been too simplistic and have not taken into account the full coaching dynamics (Cushion, Armour, and Jones, 2006; Jones, Armour and Potrac, 2002). Two main concepts have been developed as a result of a 'blank' spaces within the coaching process (Jones et al., 2005; Jones, Armour and Potrac, 2004).

Within the coaching context, there are two main meta theories (Benton and Craib, 2001), which differ and generate much debate. The theories are relational and stand against each other and are built upon beliefs and phenomenon. Positivism and Interpretivism are the two theories that have been built within coaching, leading to a spread spectrum of beliefs from main theorists. Positivism firstly, has been identified as having the name 'scientism' (Baars,1986) as it looks through the aspects of scientific knowledges to think about the general concepts that coaching brings. Within this theory information for coaching has been seen to be gained through quantitative data analysis, such as observations and experiments, this can suggest where the name scientism has come from as the results that are gained are produced by generalising and combining to gain results. Due to the quantitative sight into coaching that this meta theory devises, it is possible for results and to be predicted, leading into the production of models. Lyle (2002) designed a model to consider the coaching process, this providing a sense of control with how they would devise their roles as coaches (Valentine, 1982). This take on coaching is a rationalistic view, where measuring occurs in relation to performance, simplifying the ability to be identified (Csikszentmihalyi, Rathunde and Whalen 1993). Benefits of these models have brought about usefulness for new coaches and help to work in a systematic way, bringing about confidence to the coaches (Puddifoot, 2000). However there has been a strong argument that the rationalistic views for the coaching process is not realistic to real life due to the ever changing nature of coaching , resulting in models having to be approached differently from a system concept, as coaching is ambiguous and ultimately unpredictable (Jacobsen, 2000, Suary and Durand, 1998)

At the other end of the spectrum interpretivism lies. This is produced in relation to social theoretical development. Unlike the positivism meta-theory which contributes knowledge by combining results, interpretivism views results taking account of individuals (North, 2013). Every person gains experiences of their own, whereby if these are consolidated into large groups these variables lose their sense of deep meaning. As there is no constraint in the information developed (Stones, 1996), it allows for meaningful knowledge to be produced and a way of making sense of the issues developed. The theory here is qualitative and allows for understanding to be created, where only numerical data is collected within the positivism theory.

The social context within this theory has been adopted by Jones in particular who argues that coaching is highly complex and cannot be predicted. Jones et al., (2005) firmly protested against the rationalistic scientism ideology, suggesting coaching cannot be seen in a rationalistic manor as the issues coaches deal with are too complicated to divide or organise to incorporate into such a model structure. Leaving results of the models limiting to fulfilling potential of new coaches and their understanding, as coaches cannot fully grasp or manage (Jones et al., 2005) the coaching process and the core elements that are essential (Cassidy, Jones and Potrac, 2004., Jones, Armour and Potrac, 2003). A vast number of dynamic situational factors (Jones et al., 2003) work

against coaches taking their sessions, whereby decisions need to be made resulting in coaches needing the ability to adapt (Nash and Collins, 2006) continuously (Cushion and Jones, 2006) to all environments and conditions that they are faced with.

More recent research work developed by Jones, Bowes and Kingston (2010) have further commented on the 'hollowness' attached to the complexities of coaching. Although ideas have been based on the thought that underlining the coaching role (Jones, 2006), is that coach teaching and athlete learning is at the core of coaching situations. Jones (2006) continues suggesting that within the problems and complexities generated in routines that are created is where the coaching process really situates. Essentially labelling coaches as educators and coaching as a complex pedagogical process (Jones, 2013). Coaching essentially is a dynamic social activity where coaches must adapt to the high variable engagement that coaches have between themselves and their athletes (Cushion, Armour, and Jones, 2006, 2004). Producing the ideology of coaching and its process have lead to researchers looking further into the sociological interpretive nature of the coaching process (Jones, Potrac, Cushion and Ronglan, 2011).

2.3 Social Theory: Power

Jones et al., (2004) have produced research suggesting that at the centre of coaching lies a concept of social interaction, due to the ever-changing and unpredictable situations where the coach's role is to enhance the performance of athletes to an improved level (Bullock and Wikeley, 2004). Identifying this, coaches have become recognised for their ability to adapt to variable engagement levels, therefore coaching has been associated as a dynamic social activity (Cushion, Armour and Jones, 2004, 2006, Knyzeva, 2001). Although there are still gaps in the socialised theory within sports, literature suggests that it is an important factor as it is implemented at the heart of coaching, where a great amount of time (Cushion and Jones, 2001) is spent by coaches interacting dynamically (Cote, Salmela and Russell, 1995) with others (coaches, athletes, parents and officials) (Cushion et al., 2006). Squires (1999) comments, coaches must deal with high amounts of sociological elements resulting to a consideration created for coaches to be aware and have consider those who they communicate and come into contact with. As a result of the highly social interactions that the coaching process lies upon tensions and misunderstandings can arise complicating the social interactions further, some researchers have suggested that actives that are situated within the social environment should be examined for good practice, (Armour and Fernandez- Balboa, 2000) this being a major matter to conceptualise reverting back towards the idea that the coaching process is complex (Jones, Armour and Potrac, 2001, Cross and Lyle, 1999).

Power has been identified as a way of making sense of the identified complexities within sport, and initially viewed in a structural hierarchical order. Foucault (2011) regarded power as a series of relationships with others. Within coaching coaches can never have full control of the athletes attending sessions, for example before sessions start athletes have the ability to gain control, it is up to them if they turn up to the session, coaches have to adjust to how many athletes initially turn up (Jones et al, 2005).

Foucault (1983) comments that power is dependent on relationships, therefore being relational. Here Foucault is suggesting that a build-up of relationships with athletes can produce power, however every interaction movement can cause power to incline and decline. An example of this is taking the relationships as magnets and each magnet will have force vectors upon another magnet, if magnets are repositioned different forces will be accustomed, transforming the dynamics of the relational power, reflecting the statement 'Power is a set of actions upon other actions' (Foucault, 1997). Relationships are adaptable and can be adjusted depending on the power forces that are being interacted with, coaches must consistently consider these relationship situations. 'Omnipresent' has been used to discuss the power (Johns et al., 2000) that is present in today's social life, and it has an impact not only on thoughts, but what we do and how we do certain things, including how interactions are made between people.

2.4 Foucault: Disciplinary Power

The way in which people speak was an aspect in which Foucault explained the term discourse (1972). Foucault stated that everyone sits inside a discourse, determining how and what people say and actions that are made. More specifically people can experience a range of discourses and this helps to navigate (Pringle, 2007) and move forward in life. Prain and Hickey, (1995) state that bodies can be seen as machines. This is noticeable within the discourses that we are involved in, and further research has been developed specifically viewing the human body and disciplinary techniques to control individuals (Jones et al., 2011).

Sociologist Michel Foucault, created an ideology involving disciplinary power. Although Foucault's work was never designed to be entwined with sport, other theorists believed that the idea would work and be useful amongst sporting principles, (Markula and Pringle, 2006; Johns et al., 2000), and a belief that power could control, judge and normalise behaviour are all factors that interested Foucault (1997). Over the last two centuries disciplinary techniques have been introduced in aid of modernising society, one of these methods was disciplinary power first identified in action through the use of the panopticon within prisons (Foucault, 1995). Cassidy et al., (2004) description of the prison, stated the specific need of a watch tower at the centre of the enclosure. The positioning of the tower provided on-going observations of the prisoners who were situated around the outside,

generating positive behaviours, as prisoners presumed they were constantly watched. A self-disciplinary method was taken on by inmates, conforming and reflecting on their actions (Denison and Scott-Thomas, 2011). The panopticon was implemented with the intention of 'transforming individuals' (Foucault, 1977, p233), mainly through the use of surveillance. Although Lang (2010) commented on subjects knowing a watchful gaze on them and when it is not, creating dependable behaviour in relation to acceptable standards.

Surveillance; the term for the watchful gaze used by the guards created a compliance from the inmates at the prisons (Denison et al., 2011). Sporting contexts have embraced this technique and have gained results of positive behaviour throughout training regimes with athletes. Gymnasts for example are constantly viewing and analysing their own bodies as there is a specific amount of flexibility that they should attain, creating a constant need to observe and check their behaviours of training to fulfil this criterion (Johns 1998). Webb, McCaughy and McDonald (2004) comment that the gaze that is utilised throughout the surveillance of the sports and within the prison created a self-correction and regulatory of their own behaviours resulting in disciplinary techniques being highly powerful. Hierarchical observation another term used throughout disciplinary punishment was used to describe the control and power that was put upon the prisoners (Foucault, 1997; Sargiacomo, 2009). The guards within the circumference of the prison had complete control distributing the gazes upon prisoners, surveying their movements and making decisions on acceptable behaviours according to standards of normalisation .

Creating a self-check and an awareness for athletes to understand their behaviours relates to the idea of normalising judgement. Behaviours and actions produced by humans are constantly being monitored or surveyed in one way or another, whether this being within social environments or sporting ones. The monitoring of behaviours is determined and in appropriateness by comparing against certain standards (Sargiacomo, 2009). Inside the prison this was carried out; hierarchical observations taking place would gaze over the prisoners marking their behaviours against a standard of normalisation that would have been shown to them. A combination of surveillance alongside the normalised judgements within the prison produced a procedure called examination throughout.(Foucault 1997; Sargiacomo, 2009) Examinations produced through the gaze of the guards identified behaviours not deemed matching standards and would result in punishments for the prisoners, reminding them that conforming to behaviour was important, remembering it is for this reason of rebelling that prisoners have been situated within the prison (Danaher, Schirato and Webb, 2000).

Docility has been identified as a by-product of the disciplinary power that had been enforced upon the inmates within the prison and carried out efficiently through sport within today's societies (Denison,2007). Docile bodies stated by Foucault (1991) can be produced, used and transformed

throughout the mean of manipulation. Prisoners held had their behaviours transformed as there was an expectancy to maintain the normalised standard, resulting in conforming to preferred behaviours. Self-discipline was part of the process leading to docility as inmates had to check their own behaviours, transforming themselves to pass examinations carried out by guards (Denison, 2007; Foucault 1997). Sport has seen the use of Foucault's (1991) disciplinary power through weight management, training regimes and throughout competitions entered (Chapman, 1997; Markula, 1995 and Heikkala, 1993). Athletes have been identified as docile due to the styles of coaching that have been lent to them, coaches take responsibility for the athletes and make decisions on skills that are needed to be learnt, furthering telling the athletes the ways and means of which practices should be done to become better to achieve success (Denison, 2007). The intense observations that are held over athletes produces disciplined athletes when these skills are performed, however this style of coaching can be productive within training sessions but can be detrimental to athletes when entering competition (Shogan, 1999). Athletes experiencing this type of coaching become passive due to a lack of thinking that must be done for themselves, and are shaped into winning athletes but can not always make decisions when left unaccompanied (Markula et al., 2006). Although creating docile bodies has been known to be detrimental to athletes, there numerous positives. Through organisation of training regimes and skills acquisition, restrictions are built and athletes moving through this process are 'well-disciplined, economically efficient and obedient' (p.74), implementing characteristics that are commendable within sporting athletes (Bale, 2004).

CHAPTER THREE

METHODS

3.1 Adopting a Qualitative approach

A qualitative research method was undertaken, being the best way to gain high information and deep, full understanding from participants (Patton, 2002). Due to epistemology beliefs using qualitative methods will gain information that is truth, from participants generating knowledge for researchers to gain understanding. Researchers have seen an uprise in the use of qualitative research as it aids the ability for the participants to share their opinions on learning environments (Gibson, Timlin, Curran and Wattis, 2004 and Dale 1996), which can lend information for the future of university education. However qualitative data is not always identified as the most accurate way of collecting data, as information distributed by participants might be drawn from memory instead of fresh incidents, and can be altered by feelings and emotions (Brace, 2008). The aim of using qualitative data collection method is to capture the quality of information instead of the quantity that could have been gained, resulting in an insight to thoughts, feelings and especially experiences (Gratton and Jones, 2010).

Dale (1996) states a too rigid interview can cease to allow for researcher to gain a full understanding of experiences. Therefore semi-structured interviews were carried out as a way of capturing the qualitative data, allowing for freedom for the participant to express their thoughts, (Scanlan, Rivizza and Stein, 1989). Semi-structuring questions allow for the use of probes to be used to encourage information from participants, gaining further exploration into information that they might not voice without them, they also give a sense of consistency throughout all of the interviews as each participant will be asked the same questions following with probes (Brace, 2008).

3.2 Participants

A total of six participant were interviewed to aid data collection within the study. Participants that were used for the study were students and lecturers from Cardiff Metropolitan University (previously UWIC). These participants also had to be studying or lecturing within the Sport sector of the University, this being a minimum requirement. Students taking part were all within their third year and lecturers were required to have had experience within taking lectures and seminar based learning. This population was specifically chosen as they were the most ideal to draw information from due to their experience and knowledge about learning environments within Sports related degrees. This type of participation collection is more commonly known as convenience sampling, and was secondly used due to the time restrictions that the study must be completed by (Bowling, 2002), however participants were chosen specifically for the information that they attain, being involved in education and studying/ lecturing within the sporting field at Cardiff Metropolitan, this sampling acknowledged as key informant technique (Gratton et al, 2010).

3.3 Procedure

Semi-structured interviews will be used for the study, predominantly using open-ended questions to facilitate the answers from the participants however, the openness of the questions allows for participants to express opinions and experiences they might have encountered. This type of interview is centred around a pre-planned interview guide making sure that the same topic questions are asked within each and every interview, directing the interaction (Sparkes & Smith, 2014). Questions were devised using theoretical based information, which have been identified within the literature review. Overall two sets of interview guides were produced (Appendix D, E), one for students and one for staff from the university. Both asking similar questions, however staff questions being altered slightly to fit with their involvement within the education of the students.

Once questions had been finalised two pilot studies were carried out. One with a staff member and another with a student both within the School of Sport at Cardiff Metropolitan University. From carrying out the pilot studies, it was apparent that as interviewer the need to give examples of situations according to the questions that were being asked. Adding examples into the questions to give the participant direct idea of what the question was asking for. After amending the issues apparent within the pilot studies, six interviews were carried out.

A recording of every interview was taken using a SONY Dictaphone (Model ICD-MX20), the recommended recording tool by Cardiff Metropolitan University, supplied by Biomechanics. The dictaphone was placed on a flat surface at the beginning of the interviews maximising voice sound. Soon after the interviews had taken place, transcripts of each interview were produced, using the recordings that had been made. Transcripts were read through helping to recall the interviews which had taken place (Guion, Diehl and McDonald, 2001).

3.4 Data Analysis

Interviews conducted were listened to and transferred into transcripts, including the questions and answers that each individual was asked, this done quickly to emphasise and enhance data analysis with the use of tone of voice and speed of answers. (Sparkes et al., 2014) Coding was completed by selecting appropriate sections of the data and labelling them according to the information that the section of data held (Saldana, 2011). Full statements will be coded (appendix) rather than individual words, allowing for more sense to be made, raw quotations will also be used to report findings (Page number and time will be shown when putting forward raw quotes) within the results and discussion sections of the study. A pilot run of the data analysis was done, working

out a coding theme scheme, this aiming to prepare for the real transcripts to make sure no errors are created, and more trustworthy coding is conducted. Real transcripts were then used, picking out key themes relevant to theoretical underpinnings mentioned previously. A category table was devised to help code data from the labelled transcripts to help produce results. The table consisted of three columns; quotes/codes, category and theme. Coding key themes within the transcripts were developed through a system of conventional content analysis (inductive), followed by direct content analysis (deductive). Inductive analysis will first be undertaken, analysing the transcripts coding all of the data that relates to any theoretical themes. Deductive analysis will be followed to allow for any new themes to bring to light, to add to further research already published. Transcripts will be read multiple times to draw out all relevant information and to allow for consistency (Guion et al., 2001).

3.5 Trustworthiness

Various procedures have been implemented to increase the trustworthiness of the study. The purpose of the study is to make sense of learning environments within Cardiff Metropolitan University; doing this using a social theory produced by Michael Foucault. Guba's Model (1985) suggested that to make a study trustworthy a number of steps should be introduced, for the purposes of this study credibility, confirmability, dependability and transferability have been implemented.

To ensure that the study is credible, transcripts from each interview were e-mailed back to the individual. The individuals then gain a chance to check transcripts and agree that the transcript fully portrays what they have said within the interview. All participants agreed that the transcripts were correct, and mirrored what had been discussed within the interviews. The transcripts are credible, forth bringing information on participants experiences, analysing each one individually (Guba, 1981). Confirmability was ensured when raw data quotes were used to produce and discuss results that they have been directly quoted, referenced and also labelled with a time detailing the time that it was spoken within the interview. This method results in reader's being able to return to the transcripts identifying where each quotes have come from. Dependability will be identified within the study, providing consistency throughout the transcripts and coding, transcripts will be analysed deductively and inductively repeated so information of results is consistent (Guba, 1981). Transferability will be identified throughout the results and discussions. Rich descriptions of how results can benefit and help to provide knowledge will be evident, allowing for researchers to use information described for further research within the sporting field to help develop information.

3.6 Ethical Issues and limitations

To conform with ethics, before starting this study an ethics approval form was completed whereby Cardiff Metropolitan Ethical Committee approved that the research could take place (Appendix A). Subsequently participants were contacted, inviting them to participate in the study. Participant information forms (Appendix B) were received alongside a consent document (Appendix C) to initial that they accepted the terms within the study (Sparkes, 2014). An important factor was highlighted that participants could resign from the study if they felt insecure about the study. Anonymity was a major factor within the study. Interviews and transcripts have remained anonymous, and replaced with Interview No 1, No 2, No 3, No 4, No 5 and No 6 (Walford, 2005). Kasier (2009) assures that anonymity should be carried forward as a prevention of the participants getting harmed on behalf of the information that has been gained from the individual. For the duration of the study contact details for myself and dissertation tutor are also provided on information sheets to allow participants to ask any questions about the study that they were unsure of.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

4.1 Introduction

The aim of the study is to gain an insight to the learning environments within Cardiff Metropolitan University paying detail to the sports degrees and the natures that they are situated. Michael Foucault's Theory of disciplinary power has been used as a lens within the study, to make sense of the learning that occurs. A deductive content analysis procedure was implemented to devise results. In light of this the latter are results that have become of the data giving an insight to the findings holding an interpretive nature.

4.2 Athlete-Coach Learning

An alteration of behaviour has been identified throughout all interviews, when entering university. Both students and staff members conveyed different environments are exposed to different behaviours mainly influenced by the unknowing of how to act. Initial thoughts involving Lecture theatre environments propose a lack in knowledge by students on knowing how to behave, causing a slump in engagement. Participant number 6, a lecturer says:

'I think we need to make more of an effort to train people in how to behave and what's expected, and how to get the most of the lead lecture environment.' (Participant 6:42:00/P15)

Lecturers expressed their ability to identify patterns of behaviours within lectures and feel students could benefit from being shown how to fully engage, and how to allow the delivery to impact their knowledge. Students highlighted their experiences through education, situated in small classroom environments that only certain behaviours were acceptable. These behaviours continuously adapted in knowledge that a teacher or lecturer are in close proximity.

'you can get away with it in a lecture but obviously the seminar is a lot closer. And then you also you interact in it more and you're engaging for the full hour. In a lecture it's very easy to switch off.' (Participant 4: 23:20/P12)

'all your life you've been told to do things in a certain way and you almost adhere to it because it is a social norm. All your life you've been told to do things in a certain way and you almost adhere to it because it is a social norm.' (Participant 5:33:10/P13)

Participants 4 and 5 take a stance that seminars are a higher controlled environment resulting in students performing known behaviours and engagement levels within a classroom.

Seminar settings have been described by Participant 1 (26:40/P11) as *'where real learning can occur, because you can really interact'*. A result of the feedback and personal interactions that lecturers build. Participant 1 describes the atmosphere created, echoing thoughts of other participants:

'They are under the spotlight, but I think, again, it's trying to create an environment which is relatively energetic and safe, so they're naturally more engaged.' (29:25/P12)

All participants have described seminar environments most beneficial, and feel more inclined to express their opinions. Students comment feeling less intimidated by the environment. Creating safe environments also promoted and influenced behaviours of the students involving them sharing opinions.

'even some of the quiet students are starting to reply, which is great.' (Participant 1:25:10/P11)

A picture was painted, identifying learning throughout the university environments are different in nature. The difference occurring in the size of environment, number of attendance and the interactions wants and need of the students. Participant 1 illustrates below, commenting that the seminar is structured to end up at a certain place, but it is dependant on students understanding in achieving the goal.

'the thing about seminars is that you can take your own group on a different journey, so you have the structure of where you are in a seminar and you might end up going somewhere slightly different depending on their needs.' (participant 1:26:40/P11)

Seminar environments are less structured however, fundamental for students to gain more in-depth and real meaning to understanding theories that are presented within lecture environments. Lectures are accommodating for all students and devised by setting information that needs to be delivered by a lecturer throughout the sessions, leaving less time and flexibility to attend to individual needs.

'in lectures you soon realise that a lecture is there just to give you the content and you have to go away and do other stuff anyway, so it is there for you to actually interact with. But it's quite difficult sometimes when it's just someone who's reading it to you.' (participant 4:24:45/P12)

Above participant 4 commented on their feelings towards lead lectures, also voicing the opinion of the other students. Participant 6, was asked what their session would look like and what content was implemented;

'now it's always trying to squeeze stuff in and having to cut stuff out, because you've got more than enough material to be able to keep people entertained for an hour. It's a choice now of which bits are most important and which bits do you put in.' (participant 6:2:13/P1)

The description here, creates an idea that students have to sit and listen throughout the session, taking notes and understanding theories, there is a lot less discussion due to lack of time that is given for these sessions as certain criteria needs to be met.

4.3 Coaching : A Social Endeavor

Research throughout coaching has been looked through two meta theories, these differing in styles due to the phenomenons that they are built around (Benton and Craib, 2001), Positivism and interpretivism (Baars,1986) are the aspects that coaching has been built. Positivism specifically drawn to scientism and what can be seen as facts. Observations and experiments where data is collated and combined together to devise results. Interpretivism pinpointing individual accounts, identifying individuals views are of importance.

All participants indicated the feeling of being identified as an individual is important to their learning needs, stressing that the individuality is seen more when situated in a seminar environment. Within seminars lecturers and students interact, investing time with one another, student to student but also student to lecturer.

'from what I've seen in some of the feedback, they tend to like small groups, seminar-based sessions. I guess they feel they get more out of it because there is some kind of relationship there, you can then differentiate to their individual needs. And you can then really scaffold the learning so you can challenge the top-end guys' (participant 1: 5:00/P2)

'But with the coaching seminar, they actually talk to you and interact with you and come and sit next to you. It's not like someone at the top talking.' (participant 4: 22:05/P11)

Participant 4, stresses the interaction that they receive with the lecturer is good, allowing for relationships to form, as lectures allow time to take account to see students as individuals. The set up brings an element of help to provide for every need, rather than treating the class as a whole group, something highlighted as an important factor throughout all interviews.

'Buy-in' has also been a term used numerous times, speaking about the students having an un-written contract with the students. The students and lecturers create a level of trust where students can understand what the lecturer is trying to deliver to the class, the trust is furthered by implementing examples of real experiences showing how a theoretical issue can be used within society. This creates and ultimately develops the students learning, where they can fully understand and attempt to use their experiences to interpret theoretical underpinnings to develop their understanding and push the knowledge further.

'I think there's possibly some sort of credence with the information you give them so do the students trust what I'm saying is right? And if I can demonstrate that actually it's been used in practice, or this is how it's impacted on what I do, then I think it generates that trust and that buy-in.' (participant 2:5:20/P3)

The time that is given to the students by lecturers help to create a 'buy-in', where the students have expressed the term to be identified helps the engagement, creating more willingness to achieve and work.

'personally, if you have a good relationship with someone it's going to help, you're going to work harder for them and they're going to work harder for you, things like that' (participant 4: 10:45/P6)

'putting them at the centre of the learning environment.' (participant 1:1:05/P1)

Participant 1, sums up the thoughts of the three lecturers involved with the process commenting that students should be the focus within learning throughout, again inferring the need to see students for individuals rather than as a group to aid sufficient learning.

4.4 Social Theory and Foucault

Interactions and relationships that alter throughout daily activities is the basis of social theory. Peoples involvements with others cause shifts in interactions and relationships. Staff who took part in the study have all shared views of empowering students within learning environments, finding within seminar environments students are normally reluctant to take a forward role as they are not used to this idea. Resistance has been built within previous learning experiences where students are told what they should do, and there is no freedom of choice. Participant 1 specifically recalls an incident whereby they gave students the opportunity to express themselves and their opinions.

'When you try to really empower them and give them some responsibility for it, there is always some resistance and at times there can be a lack of buy-in, because they feel you're not doing what you say you should be doing.' (12:05/P5)

In agreement with this Participant 6 continues to express the same opinion expressing concerns that students do not feel that they can show their views fully due to expectancy that the lecturer might have.

'isn't it because what you're thinking then is, it's not real empowerment because you're not really doing what you want to do, you're still thinking even though you've been given that empowerment, 'What is it that they want us to do?' which I think really illustrates the type of dynamic which exists in any learning space, when the lecturer or coach is the person who people think should decide what's right' (participant 6:14:00/P5)

Echoing the participants words showing the dynamics that are within sessions, whereby the students don't always know how to take on control within learning environments as its not a factor they are accustomed to, leading to students trying to guess what the lecturer expects them to do. In contrast participant 6 continues to reveal the engagement of students where empowerment was given, expressing the validity of the students thoughts to reach an outcome whereby the students empowered each other to gain results.

'they get given the London tube mat and you don't really provide any boundaries for them so it's exploring how they engage with the task, and I absolutely loved the session I did last year, because they took it on, they sort of completed the task but they probably empowered each other because people were chucking in additional ideas and they'd say 'OK, let's do it.' (participant 6:13:13/P4)

The contrast suggests the empowerment of students and their 'buy-into' sessions, is dependent on their experiences and expectancy for the lecturer to provide all information. Suggesting the issue that students do not know how to act or react to this type of working environment, where lecturers are not providing all information, highlighting the complex and rationalistic sides of coaching that have been identified. In relation to the fore, all participants expressed opinions, highlighting the importance on interaction within the university learning environment facilitating engagement. Staff and students have indicated that the seminar sessions are where they believe most learning occurs. Engagement and interaction with people a common cause, as time is provided to individuals, instead of being identified as a collective group. Participant 5 shares the opinion of all students;

'i feel that people would be likely to engage more in seminars and actually learn more in the small classroom environment and actually take in what the lecturer says, instead of just being in a big old lecture theatre' (participant 5: 35:12/P14)

The lecture theatre environment holds many students, making interaction difficult. The set up is different to a classroom based lesson where a seminar is held. One lecturer expressed how they bring forward the idea of implementing the idea of interaction to lectures, commonly experienced within seminars;

'I try to interact with them at the door, to get them going I normally divide it up so there are two or three breaks in there for about 5 minutes, because they're warm and people can't keep going for an hour' (participant 1:21:20/P8)

Greeting students at the door helps provide interaction with students to make them feel like individuals and welcome. Lecture sessions are devised into smaller sections throughout the hour, due to the distractions. According to lecturers the stand and deliver sessions are not the most appropriate within the lectures within sport, instead trying to focus on moving around the lecture theatre and involving students one participant stated that the sessions become '...impersonal'

(35:55/P14) relaying this back to intently trying to engage with students throughout sessions to enhance the learning.

'in seminars it's stop/start; stop/start, so it is quite interactive.' (participant 3:24:53/P14)

'I seem to learn more because there is that chance of interaction which is obviously where I learn the most. And it's a lot more visual and there are things up on the board which you can see a lot more clearly than in a lecture, where it's miles away. In a seminar it's just everything's a lot closer and a lot easier and you can work in a little group, things like that'

The statements above from participants 3 and 4, take on the same thoughts of the other participants. Students feel lecturers come down to their level communicating with them forming relationships , feeling valued.

'in seminars I find it a lot easier to just open up and talk because it's bringing you back to that sort of classroom base which you've known for so many years at school and it comforts you a little bit; (participant 421:28/P11)

Here Participant 4 relates their learning environment back to previous experiences, this place being somewhere that aided their learning and helped them to develop. The seminar environment described, echoes experiences that the student has had.

4.5 Foucauldian: Disciplinary Power

Throughout all learning environments lecturers and students encounter there is always expectancy in the way people behave and act around one another. Both, students and lecturers, although viewing learning environments from different angles agree different behaviours are seen or adapted when in opposed learning environments. When asked about behaviours recognised in lecture environments the views suggest that behaviour is not a factor that is worried about by students.

'I'm definitely a culprit of being on my phone in a lecture or using my laptop and going onto a website, because if it's a boring topic or you're not really getting engaged in it, then it just happens because you have the opportunity there.'
(participant 4:23:00/P11)

'because you can get away with it in a lecture but obviously the seminar is a lot closer. And then you also you interact in it more and you're engaging for the full hour. In a lecture it's very easy to switch off.' (participant 4:23:20/P12)

Participant 4 explains their reasons for the lack of respectful behaviour when attending lectures expressing his feelings. Sessions are easier to divert from as there are no reins to hold onto to keep consistency of engagement. In discussion regarding seminar environments participant 1 (a lecturer) and participant 3 (a student) were harmonious in their thoughts;

'I think they've probably realised that they can't hide away. They are under the spotlight, but I think, again, it's trying to create an environment which is relatively energetic and safe, so they're naturally more engaged.' (participant 1:29:25/P12)

'I just think it's generally a smaller environment and the teacher or lecturer can see everywhere.' (participant 3:31:20/P17)

A smaller classroom environment creates a sense for students and lecturers that there is more scope to be acknowledged due smaller attendance, resulting in behaviour having to be more appropriate. Students feel more involved within sessions, feeling that their view and opinions are taken into account. Seminar environments situated in a classroom, much like a school environment forms a sense of normality where students feel they know how to behave. Students are

expected to be engaged during classes at school and feel an ease of familiarity during seminars.

'it's a smaller class, you're used to a similar classroom environment and everyone's experienced a classroom environment, so people are probably more relaxed being in a smaller area' (participant 5:31:45/P12)

In comparison to this participant 5 continued to discuss why seminar sessions are easy to adapt to within university learning however, the same could not be said for the lecture environments. If asked a question in a seminar situation, participant 5 expressed that the opportune would help him to further learning, but the same situation in a lecture environment was not inviting.

'if I knew the answer, especially in first year, I wouldn't put my hand up and give the answer, even if I did know it, because it was so different. I didn't know anyone; it was just so foreign to me.' (participant 5:32:10/P13)

The overall learning experience for the student was different due to the learning natures that they had already been accustomed to.

CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

5.1 Introduction

The aim of the study was to view learning environments throughout sporting degrees within the university and through the lens of Foucault, to gain an understanding of the learning environments. The study explored undergraduate learning environments within sport related degrees, examining the results through a Foucauldian lens. The results identify that seminar learning environments and lecture environments can be differentiated. Lecturers have the ability to identify different behaviours within the two sessions and can relate to the differences notified. Likewise students can identify reasons as to why their behaviours may be mixed within different environments; the main reasons relating to previous experience and a notion of surveillance upon them to conform to certain behaviours and interactions made with others identifying a better learning practice for students as well as lecturers.

5.1 Athlete and Coach Learning:

Oromod (1995) distinguished learning as an element that can be undertaken in various ways and is differently grasped by each individual, however certain strategies have been implemented within Cardiff Metropolitan University that have been noticeable when depicting results. Good learning practice described by Jarvis (2004) illustrates a state in which learners are able gain benefits such as rewards for good behaviour that is seen. Seminar sessions within the university copy the image of classroom lessons within schools and colleges. Having recognition of environment setting, students are accustomed to the environment, knowing that they have had achievements and success to have entry into the university. This is identified whereby students have shared their opinions, providing knowledge that they know how to behave within classroom environments, because students are used to and are aware of how they need to behave and act to gain good results. In schooling environments punishments would have been given for poor or unacceptable behaviour moulding the students to conform (Pritchard 2008). Similarity in the learning at the university to previous experiences have allowed for students to continue with good practice learning, this particularly in SLE's.

On the contrary less knowledge is identified with students in knowing how to behave and how they can take advantage of lecture environments that are implemented into the

university learning framework to feed information to the students, allowing them to further their knowledge by reading around subjects delivered. To increase the behaviour within, a belief of an action plan to train students how they should act and how they can take full advantage of information being shared should be implemented. Helping to aid students in how they should behave in lectures could help to improve the consumption of knowledge that is taken in within. Students currently do not believe the lectures are helpful to them, however students do not feel the need to conform and behave within the lectures as there is no punishment or downside to not listening although it could prove to have an impact on positive learning practice (Pritchard, 2008; Jarvis, 2004).

The constructivist approach to learning have also been positioned within the universities learning framework. SLE's have been built into the learning structure, to aid students to discuss and speak of their experiences in relation to theories and to produce clusters of knowledge from real situations (Asubel, 1963). A sense that students construct their own learning driving them forward has been created, allowing students to have fuller and deeper understandings of topics throughout the academic year.

SLE's have helped to give real meaning to students as a structure has not been fully implemented. Certain criterion is set but a higher degree of emphasis is set on student centred sessions and continually constructing a safe environment for students, helping them to feel safe and have a sense of belonging so they might share their experiences interacting with one another. As a result, more in-depth learning is produced as students are able to interact with others (lecturers and peers) sharing information and knowledge from their experiences (Cassidy et al., 2009). The environment is inclusive and students are viewed as individuals, this being beneficial for the students. Cushion et al., (2010) state the importance of recognising the impact SLE sessions on students in helping development, in agreement lecturers feel that results that are being received in sessions considerably positive.

Lectures have proven to have a set structure that are opposed to being learner centred, however are a way of delivering vast amounts of information to the students within the sporting courses. However these sessions has been distinguished through theorist as being too much information is expected to be consumed (Lemyre, Trudel, Durand-Bush, 2007; Gilbert & Trudel, 1999). The certain strategies carried out by lecturers have tried to impact on this thought by greeting students as they enter lectures to cross the barrier of

this overall grouping of the students and identifying individuals instead, and by incorporating SLE elements into lecture sessions. Oromod (1995) and Lave et al., (1991) identified social systems to be beneficial and having positive effects on the learning that takes place.

Coaching : A Social Endeavor

The concept of individuality is an overlapping factor within the study and the want for the students to be addressed individually by staff embraces the ideology that coaching can be identified as a complex issue and is not as rational as assumed. However the varying environments put forward a hold for both meta theories of the coaching process. SLE can be identified through an complex or interpretive lens due to the discussion and debate setting that is built up specifically to get students interacting with one another and the staff members endearing to be unpredictable (Cushion et al., 2010). On the contrary lecture settings have provided evidence that they are more rationalistic and a set sequence occurs whereby information is given and students are to sit and listen, again witnessing the formal learning regime.

Having an identity as an individual is important as coaches within SLE sessions have become aware of, as students each come from different backgrounds and have experiences with them that can contribute to learning throughout the interpretivism spectrum (North, 2013). An array of experiences can further the meaningful discussions where information can be developed throughout the sessions, whereas if consolidated into groups the depth of the information ready to share can be lost (Stones, 1996). Granting students to share their experiences to make sense of the theories that are being taught throughout the sequence of learning has an effect on the staff within the sessions. Due to the complexity and the unknowing of the discussions and where they may lead linking back to in-formal learning structure according to interactions (Cassidy et al., 2009), creates a sense that the staff members cannot think in a rationalistic manor as predictions can not be made. Nash et al., (2006) states the ability to work making decisions quickly and being able to adapt sessions to deal with the situations that they are placed in, this being a crucial factor for the staff members needing to be efficient and knowledgable. The SLE environments are created within the university to be ran this way and the staff confirm that the discussion and depth of information that is attained by the students is worthwhile

and that by using their experiences the students are challenged to try to understand theories and put them into their situations to unfold what is really happening within the experiences that they have had.

A clear understanding is made by the lecturers within the sports related degrees that learning must be centred around the students whom they come into contact with. However lecturers having a full understanding that this idea is complex and not always possible (Jones, 2013). The situations that lecturers are situated in strive to incorporate students in regards to their abilities levels of knowledge, albeit not always easily done due to the environments that are provided for the learning to take place due to availability of interaction with students (Cushion, Armour, and Jones, 2006, 2004).

Lecture environments are where this notion in more traditional teaching methods would view the dynamic of teaching and being able to conceptualise the learner centred initiative. Down to the vast amounts of information that is given and the layout of the environment; rows of chairs filling the room, it would not be possible to provide each student with the exact information that they need to be able to further develop. SLE environments have accustomed to the learner centred theory and are contrasting to the lecture set up with tables and chairs set in groups resulting in room for lecturers to walk around the room steering the learning and orchestrating direction of students thought processes. The complex dynamics that are held in these environments are more difficult to manage for the lecturer, however it allows for different levels of engagement creating the safe and secure environment that the lectures have commented on. Students feel comfortable and valued within the sessions.

Social Theory and Foucault

Recent research has formed information that within coaching social interaction is a key factor, the result within this study also provided evidence of the expectation of social interactions between lecturers and students in particular (Jones et al., 2004). SLE's were identified overall as the most beneficial learning environment, purely because of links that are formed within. Time throughout the sessions allows for relationships to build, and lecturers can interact dynamically throughout the time that is allocated (Cote et al., 2006). A result of the time that is spent with students by the lecturers, allows students to engage fully and recognise that the lecturers care about their beliefs and values suggestions and

opinions that they might have, leaving a satisfaction within the student to take part and take advantage of the learning environment. To create sessions that gain interaction and co-operation the lecturers must take into account and consider each individual as interactions can become misinterpreted and misunderstood, ultimately creating problems within the environment because of the close proximities where interactions occur (Armour et al., 2000). Complications such as the fore are less common within lecture environments whereby lecturers have expressed less interaction is formed, due to the set up of the environment. A lack of interaction and build up of relations could also cause a damaging effect on the learning taking place. In an environment that has a large capacity and is directed to deliver information directly to students, leaving little time for lecturers to interact with students; a contrast of learning environment here arguably is leaning away from the research that has been done to support the importance of interaction, but slight adjustments are being developed by lecturers to increase interactions within the lecture theatre environments within the sport related degrees (Cote et al., 1995).

Whilst interaction and relationships are being developed within sessions lecturers have experimented with trying to deal with the dynamic complexities that they are situated amongst by manipulating power within the sessions (Foucault, 2011). Foucault's (2011) theory expressed lecturers would never have full control of their sessions due to human interactions, using this idea to give students within SLE environments the option to do what ever they wanted. Trialling the theory brought about different results, and arguments can be made as to whether this is beneficial to students learning or detrimental. Lecturers and students alike were involved in both outcomes, but the power that was given to students as essentially not theirs as students automatically try to carry out the task how their lecturer thinks they should proving that power is 'omnipresent' (Johns et al., 2000). However it is problematic as previous experiences could be the cause for the unwillingness to perform without the worry what is expected. Learning environments within schools and colleges provide students with the necessary information for success, where this is different within SLE environments as interactions and empowerment is given to ell provide or develop their knowledge. Lecture environments do not see this problem of empowerment as a stand and deliver take on learning is created, much like that of school/college, never the less its the students who have commented on preferring the SLE over lectures.

Foucauldian Theory: Disciplinary Power

Michel Foucault's (1997) concept of disciplinary power, has been recognised throughout the sporting field and can now also be seen within learning environments throughout the university within the sporting sector. Surveillance a term which has been used to gain control over prisoners has been used in the same likeness to have a watchful gaze over the students in both learning environments, although having different effects. Lecture environments are lead from the front by a lecture who can view all students within the room (Denison et al., 2011). These environments are carried out to inform and deliver information to students, however the surveillance carried out by the lecture can be manipulated by students who do not wish to conform to engaging. Student have identified that they have an awareness to identify that they can be off task within these sessions, showing that self-check and self awareness is present, although students still opt to disengage. SLE's were identified holding different behaviours within the sessions. Students and staff, recognised the physical difference in size and amount of students has an effect on the level of surveillance that is seen. Within the smaller environment students can be seen at all times causing a shift in behaviour. Prison cells that were created within the panoptican were small, and light would shine within the cell to allow for surveillance to be carried out at all times, this very much reflecting the environment created in SLE. A gaze can be produced by the lecturer and students feel a conformity due to the hierarchal observations which are surrounding them (Foucault, 1997; Sargiacomo, 2009).

Normalising judgement was another factor which was important in deploying disciplinary techniques (Sargiacomo, 2009). Experiences have proven to help gain control within the SLE, due to recognising the learning environment, resulting in the students conforming to expected behaviours. The conformity would have been crucial in previous learning situations and has produced a known behaviour, making the behaviour that is experienced within the SLE normalised. However, lecture environments have not witnessed the same conformity due to the new experienced of the environment causing an unsettled atmosphere. Teaching the students how to behave and get the most out of sessions has also been thought about and students could then adapt and regulate their behaviours to conform two the certain standards that are expected of them (Webb et al.,2004). Students could then feel that these environments would be as helpful for their learning as they would be within the SLE's creating engagement throughout all sessions.

Lecturers within University can be identified as holding the part distributing the hierarchal observations. Observations, alongside surveillance of the normalised judgements that are

created within specific environments can lead to examinations. However this is a factor of Foucault's (1997) Theory that is not implemented fully. Lecturers have not been identified to punish students who are adopting unpleasing behaviours, within both SLE's and Lecture theatre settings. Despite the lack of examination viewed within the learning environments it is clear that different types of examination is introduced, such as checking on information learned, by asking questions of the students instead. Examination was a specific part to the structure of the Foucauldian theory, but the university lecturers do not introduce the method of examining students and creating a punishment (Danaher et al., 2000). Punishments however could be incorporated in other aspects that we have not looked deeper into.

New Information and Further Research

In carrying out this study, there is evidence of disciplinary power methods being used throughout learning environments within the sport related degrees. Although the use of the Foucauldian lens has enhanced the ability to create an understanding of the learning environments, it is noticeable that some environments show greater use of the theory than another. The study allowed for much information to be gained and for an insight to be given throughout the learning environments, however there are factors that could be altered to gain further information if further studies were to be carried out.

'Buy-in' a spoken factor that lecturers believe is an important factor within the learning environments that they are situated within. A creation of building relationships and interacting with students has been described to bring about a 'buy-in' to the sessions. This is new information that has been identified to stand out from information from Michel Foucault's Theory of disciplinary power as there was no expectancy for prisoners to buy-into the current forms that were being carried out throughout the prisons. However this is a factor that could be implemented for a new study of research aiming to create an understanding of buy-in within learning environments, in accordance to staff and their behaviours.

Only sport students and staff were used within the study and this could have a limiting factor. Further research could look at a mixture of students and staff throughout the university and not seclude just sport degree related participants as this may alter findings, as sport students may be more inclined to be interactive due to their association within sport and working as part of a team or with others to help them become successful. This study idea along with the implementation of a theory such as Michel Foucault's

disciplinary power could give a focus to the study to gain understanding of the learning environments that university staff and students are situated within.

CHAPTER SIX
CONCLUSION

The aim of the study was to look at the perception of social learning within higher education around a sports related degree using a Foucauldian lens to gain an understanding within the environments. The environments that were specifically looked at were lecture environments and SLE's two differing environments that are used regularly within the university's programme for learning. Within the study it was noticeable that there was a favoured learning environment with the staff and the students. Within SLE's students believed that they would learn more due to higher interaction levels with both peers and their lecturer. Lecturers agreed, valuing the set up of the SLE setting, as there was scope to survey students, which had a bigger impact and created better opportunities for students to focus on the session and to become involved (Denison et al., 2011).

Lecture environments also saw use, providing a way in which vast amounts of information to be delivered to students within the sporting field, however lacked interaction, causing students to become less focused and interest within. Surveillance in this environments was pronounced and students believed that there was less self check in terms of behaviour and conformity that would have been produced within SLE environments. This was proven to be a factor that students had been in similar environments in previous stages of learning and would have been examined for their behaviours and punished if conformity was not undertaken, causing self check and more appropriate behaviour within these environments (Foucault 1997; Sargiacomo, 2009). The use of the Foucauldian theory allowed for a filtering of rests to be created and to be able to build up an understudying of the social learning that is carried out within the learning environments within the university. Further research would look at the similarities or differences that occur within the other schools within the university and could compare to the learning environments within the sporting sector. Alternatively a study could look at a varied range of students and staff from the whole of the university where a more diverse range of learning environments may be used.

REFERENCE LIST

- Andrew, A & Collins, D (2011): Taking the Next Step: Ways Forward for Coaching Science, *Quest*, 63:4, 366-384
- Armitage, A, Bryant, R, Dunnill, R, Renwick, M., Hayes, D, Hudson, A, Kent, J, & Lawes, S. (2003) *Teaching and training in post-compulsory education* 2nd edition, Buckingham, Open University Press
- Armour, K.M., & Fernandez-Balboa, J.M. (2000). Connections, pedagogy and professional teaming. Paper presented at CEDAR 8th International Conference, University of Warwick, England, 20-22 March.
- Ausubel, D.P. *The psychology of meaningful verbal learning: an introduction to school learning* New York, Grune & Stratton.
- Bale, J. (2004) *Running Cultures, Racing in Time and Space*. London: Routledge
- Bowling, A (2002). *Research Methods in Health: Investigating health and health services*. 2nd ed. Maidenhead: Open University Press. 163-214.
- Brace, I (2008) *Questionnaire Design; How to plan, structure and write survey material for effective market research*. 2nd ed. Great Britain: Kogan Page Limited.
- Cassidy, T., Jones, R. L and Potrac, P. (2004) *Understanding sports coaching: The social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice*, New York: Routledge.
- Cote, J., Samela, J., Trudel, P., Baria, A. and Russell, S. (1995a) 'The Coaching Model: A Grounded Assessment of Expert Gymnastics Coaches' Knowledge', *Journal of sport and exercise psychology*, 17(1): 1-17

- Cross, N. & Lyle, J. (1999) *The Coaching Process*. PrinCote, J., Salmela, J.H., Trudel, P., Baria, A., & Russell, S. (1995). The coaching model: A grounded assessment of expert gymnastic coaches' knowledge. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 17(1), 1-17.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M., Rathunde, K., & Whalen, S. (1993). *Talented teenagers: The roots of success and failure*. New York: Cambridge.
- Cushion, C. J., Armour, K. M. and Jones, R. L., (2006) *Locating the Coaching Process in Practice: Models 'for' and 'of' Coaching*, *Physical Education and Sport Pedagogy*, 11(1), 1-17.
- Cushion, C. (2007) *Modelling the complexity of the coaching process*, *international journal of sports science and coaching*. Volume 2 number 4
- Cushion, C.J. & Jones, R.L. (2006) *Power, discourse and symbolic violence in professional youth soccer: The case of Albion FC*, *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 23(2), 142-161.
- Cushion, C. J., Armour, K. M. and Jones, R. L. (2006) *Locating the Coaching Process in practice models 'for' and 'of' coaching*, *physical education and sports pedagogy* 11(1), 1-17
- Chan, S. (2001). *Complex adaptive systems*. Paper presented at the Research Seminar in Engineering Systems, October 31st-November, 6th. Massachusetts Institute of Technology Cambridge, MA
- Chapman, G.E. (1997) *Making Weight: Lightweight Rowing, Technologies of Power, and Technologies of the Self*, *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 14, 205-223.

- Cross, N. and Lyle, J. (2008). *The Coaching Process: principles and practice for sport*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann: Elsevier.
- Danaher, G., Schirato, T. and Webb, J. (2000) *Understanding Foucault*. London: Sage.
- Denison, J. and Scott-Thomas, D. (2011) Michel Foucault: Power and discourse, The loaded language of coaching. In *the sociology of sports coaching*. New York: Routledge.
- Denison, J. (2007). 'Social Theory for Coaches: A Foucauldian Reading of Athlete's Poor Performance,' *International Journal of Sport Science and Coaching*. 2(4) pp. 369-383.
- Dale, G.A. (1996). Existential phenomenology: emphasising the experience of the athlete in sport psychology research. *The Sport Psychologist*, 10, 307- 321.
- Fairs, J. (1987) *The coaching process: The essence of coaching sports coach* 11(1): 1-17
- Foucault, M. (1977) *Discipline and Punish: the birth of the prison*, New York: Pantheon Books
- Gagné, R.M. (1985) *The conditions of learning* 4th edition (New York, Holt: Rinehart & Winston.
- Gratton, C and Jones, I (2010) *Research Methods for Sports Studies*. 2nd Ed. London: Routledge

- Guba, E. G. (1981) Criteria for Assessing the Trustworthiness of Natural Inquiries.
Educational Resources Information Centre Annual Review Paper, 29, 75-91
- Guion, L. A., Deihl, D.C. and McDonald, D. (2001) Conducting an In-depth Interview.
Department of Family, Youth and Community Sciences, University of Florida,
FCS6012: 1-3
- Hager, P. (1998), "Understanding workplace learning: general perspectives", in Boud, D.
(Ed.), Current Issues and New Agendas in Workplace Learning, NCVET,
Springfield, VA, pp. 30-42.
- Heikkala, J. (1993) Discipline and Excel: Techniques of the Self and Body and the Logic of
Competing, *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 10, 397-412.
- Hodkinson, P., Biesta, G. and James, D (2008) 'Understanding learning culturally:
Overcoming the dualism between social and individual views of learning',
Vocations and Learning, 1 (1): 27-47.
- Jacobson, M, J. (2000). Butterflies, traffic jams and cheetahs: Problem solving and
complex systems. Paper presented at American Educational Research
Assosiation. New Orleans, Louisiana, USA
- Jarvis, P. (2004) *Adult education and lifelong learning: Theory and practice* 3rd edition,
London: Routledge.
- Johns, D.P. and Johns (1998) 'Fasting and feasting: Paradoxes of the sport ethic',
Sociology of sport journal 15:41-63

- Johns, D. P and Johns, J. (2000) 'Surveillance, subjectivism and technologies of power: an analysis of the discursive practice of high-performance sport', *International review for the sociology of sport*, 35:219-234
- Jones, R. L., Armour, K. M. and Potrac, P. (2002) Understanding the coaching process: a framework for social analysis. *Quest* 54, 34-48
- Jones, R. L., Armour, K. M. and Potrac, P. (2004) *Sports Coaching Cultures: from practice to theory*. London: Routledge
- Jones, R. L., (2006) How can Educational Concepts Inform Sports Coaching? in: Jones, R.L., ed., *The Sports Coach as Educator: Re-Conceptualising Sports Coaching*, Routledge, London, 3-13.
- Jones, R.L and Wallace, M. (2005). Another bad day at the training ground: coping with ambiguity in the coaching context. *Sport, Education and Society*. Vol 10, No. 1, 119-134
- Jones, R.L., Armour, K.M. & Potrac, P. (2003) Constructing expert knowledge: a case study of a top-level professional soccer coach, *Sport, Education and Society*, 8(2), 213-229.
- Jones, R. L., Armour, K. M and Potrac, P. (2004) *Sports coaching cultures: From practice to theory*, London: Routledge.
- Kaiser, K. (2009) Protecting Respondent Confidentiality in Qualitative Research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 19:1632-1641

- Knyazeva H. (2001). The self as a nonlinear dynamical structure-process. *Dialectic, Cosmos and Society*, 14, Retrieved February 28, 2006 from <http://www.geocities.com/diacos-mos/dcs14/dcs14knyazeva.html>.
- Lemyre, F., Trduel, P. and Durand-Bush. N. (2007) 'How youth-sport coaches learn to coach'. *The Journal of Coaching Science*, 1 (1) 17-34.
- Lyle, J. (2002) *A coaching process. Sports Coaching Concepts, A framework for coach's behaviour*. London: Routledge
- Lyle, J.W.B. (1993). Towards a comparative study of the coaching process. *Journal of processes. Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 30(1), 79-97.
- Markula, P. (1995) Firm but Shapely, Fit but Sexy, Strong but Thin: The Postmodern Aerobicizing Female Body, *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 12, 424-453.
- Markula, P & Pingle, R. (2006) *Foucault, Sport and Exercise: Power Knowledge and Transforming the self*, London: Routledge
- Merriam, S.B. & Caffarella, R.S. (1999) *Learning in adulthood 2nd ed*, San Francisco,: Jossey-Bass.
- Moon, J.A. (2001) *Reflection in Learning and Professional Development: Theory and Practice*, London:Kogan Page.
- North, J. (2013) Philosophical Underpinnings of Coaching Practice Research, *Quest*, 65:3, 278-299

Ormrod, J (2012). Human learning (6th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Pavlov, I.P. (1927) Conditioned reflexes, New York: Oxford University Press

Potrac, P., Brewer, C., Jones, R.L., Armour, K. & Hoff, J. (2000) Towards an holistic understanding of the coaching process, *Quest*, 52(2), 189-199.

Pritchard, A. (2008) *Ways of learning: Learning theories and learning styles in the classroom*, US: Taylor and Francis

Puddifoot, J. (2000). Some problems and possibilities in the study of dynamical social processes. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 30(1), 79-97

Saldana, J. (2011) *The coding manual for qualitative research*. London: Sage

Sargiacomo, M. (2009) *Overviews and reviews: Michel Foucault, Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Springer Science+Business Media, LLC.

Scanlan, T.K., Ravizza, K. and Stein, G.L. (1989). An in-depth study of former elite skaters: I. Introduction to the project. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11, 54-64.

Sfard, A. (1998) 'On two metaphors of learning and the dangers of choosing just one', *Educational Researcher*, 27(2): 4-13.

Shogan, D. (1999) *The Making of High Performance Athletes: Discipline, Diversity and Ethics*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press

Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. and Hunt, E. A. (1977) System for Behaviourist Assessment of Athletic Coaches, *Research Quarterly* 48, 401-407

Smoll, F. L., Smith, R. E., Barnett, N. P. and Everett, J. J. (1993) Enhancement of Children's Self-esteem through social support training for youth sport coaches, *Journal of applied psychology*, 78, 602-610

Sparkes, C. & Smith, B. (2014) *Qualitative Research Methods in Sport, Exercise and Health, From process to product*. USA: Routledge

Squires, G. (1999). *Teaching as a professional discipline*. London: Falmer Press

Thorndike, E.L. (1928) *Adult learning*, New York: Macmillan.

Tusting, K. & Barton, D. (2006) *Models of adult learning: A literature review*, Leicester, UK:NIACE.

Walford, G. (2005) *Research Ethical Guidelines and Anonymity*. *International Journal of Research and Method in Education*, 28:83-93

Woodman, L. (1993). *Coaching: A science, an art, an emerging profession*. *Sport Science Review*, 2(2), 1-13.

Webb, L., McCaughy, N. and Macdonald, D. (2004). *Surveillance as a Technique of Power in Physical Education*. *Sport, Education and Society*. 9(2) pp. 207-222.

APPENDICIES

APPENDIX A



Cardiff
Metropolitan
University

Prifysgol
Metropolitan
Caerdydd

Date: 08/03/2014

To: Joanna Baker

Project reference number: 13/05/017U

Your project was recommended for approval by myself as supervisor and formally approved at the Cardiff School of Sport Research Ethics Committee meeting of 27th November 2013.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. Baker'.

Supervisor

APPENDIX B



Participant Information Sheet
Making Sense of Undergraduate Learning in Sport Related Degrees: A Foucauldian Examination

1) Background and aims of the research:

Coaching research has been identified as oversimplifying the complex human interaction that lies at the heart. Over the past decade, sociological theory has been adopted as means of trying to make sense of the coaching environment rather than trying to quantify human interaction. The work of Foucault emanates from social power. Power is defined as 'having the ability to get others to do what you want them to do'. The interactions we have with one another is where this 'power' can be used or manipulated, this can be often seen in learning environments. Learning is at the centre of coaching and a way of looking at this is through Michael Foucault's theory, where the ideas of discipline and behaviour have been linked. My research will be trying to make sense of the ways in which people learn within Cardiff Metropolitan University, specifically looking at the Sporting staff and students.

2) My role as the researcher:

This project involves me (Joanna Baker) the researcher, interviewing you using a semi-structured interview guide. Other students and staff within Cardiff Metropolitan University who are also on a sport related degree course will also be interviewed, however at different times. During this project I will be supervised by Toby Nichols, who is my tutor at Cardiff Metropolitan University.

3) Your role as a participant:

Your role is to complete the interview with honesty, and to not give answers which you think I might want to hear. The best results are gained when participants are honest so that true results become of this and new research can be gained. Questions within the semi structured interview will relate to learning, behaviour, responsibilities, coaching and surveillance. You have the ability sustain from taking part if you do not wish to and have the right to decline any participation in the research project.

4) Benefits of taking part:

The results of this particular study may inform university directors about where effective learning takes place and where students and lecturers feel learning is best carried out. This may aid future teaching within the university depending on results that are gained, as we will have feedback on individuals and how they feel about environments and

teaching/learning times. I will be happy to share all information with you as participant of the study.

5) How interviews will be carried out:

The interviews will be carried out individually, and will be recorded so transcribing may be done to be able to start creating results.

6) How the data will be used:

In agreeing as a voluntary participant, after the interview process, your comments and answers will be analysed and compared to other participants responses. Identity will be kept confidential at all times throughout the process, including answers that are given where names have been used.

7) Your rights:

Your right as a voluntary participant means that you can sustain your involvement within the research at any point. You are also in control of answers and responses that you give in aid of helping the research and must express what you wish.

8) Protection to privacy:

All efforts will be made to hide your identity when analysing your interview transcripts and any of the research findings. All personal information will remain completely confidential according to the guidelines of the Data Protection Act (1998)

9) Contact

For any queries that you might have about the information displayed above feel free to contact me or my supervisor on the details that are listed below.

Joanna Baker
Cardiff School of Sport
Cardiff Metropolitan University
Email: st20003505@outlook.uwic.ac.uk
Tel: 07894498156

Toby Nichols
Cardiff School of Sport,
Cardiff Metropolitan University,
Email: tnichols@cardiffmet.ac.uk
Tel: 02920415816

APPENDIX C



Participant Consent Form

Title of Project: Making sense of undergraduate learning in Sport related degrees: A Foucauldian examination

Name of Researcher: Joanna Baker

Participant to complete: Please initial each box.

I have been informed of and understand the information sheet that has been provided.

I have been given an opportunity to consider the information presented and to ask any questions about the study and have had these answered.

I understand that participating in this study is voluntary and understand that I can withdraw at any time without prejudice

Any information which might potentially identify me will not be used in published material

I agree to participate in the study as outlined to me

Name of participant.....

Date.....

Appendix D

STUDENT INTERVIEW GUIDE

During your time at Cardiff Met I am sure that you have many experiences, can you talk me through some experiences you have had. For example Good/bad or what you have enjoyed or what hasn't been so enjoyable.

- Barriers
- Lecturers- are there any you look up to who think are good, why is this?
- Lessons- back to when you were in university/ which lessons did you enjoy most and why?

During your education you will have probably come across what we call 'types of learner'. Can you talk to me about the things you like and what you do not like as much?

- Experimenting- can you talk to me about what happens in these situations?
- If you have produced a good answer or not such a good answer how would you like lecturers to react to this?
- Individual/ group work- experiences of carrying out tasks. What are the outcomes. what is the environment like?

Can you tell me about some of the lessons you may have had, if you liked them or if you didn't like them and why that might have been?

- interaction- do they talk to you?
- relationship- do they take an interest in you as a person?
- what did they do to make you enjoy lessons?
- why did you not enjoy other lessons as much?

Can you now talk to me about group work and individual working, which would you prefer and why might that be?

- how do you feel when working as a group?
- do people always pull their weight?
- how do you feel working individually?
- do you find it easier working individually or in groups? sharing information?

Now we are going to talk about your interests in sport and your learning situations within lessons. You have probably had a lot of experience and interactions with coaches and lecturers- can you tell me about any examples that have stood out in your mind about interaction- who you have the best interactions with and why?

- Do you think that it is important to interact with others? why?
- do you think you work harder if there is interaction?

During your education, can you tell me if there have been times when you've been given responsibility and how did you react to that?

- were you more confident?
- did you feel good about this?
- was there more pressure put upon you?

- how did you deal with the responsibility given to you?

Can you talk to me about whether there are certain people who you think should have more authority over others, or do you think everyone should be equal?

- In university setting do you think it's right that lectures have more authority over you?
- should they be equal?

Going back to talking about when you have had responsibilities (e.g. captaincy) did you think it was important that you would or should have an influence on others? For example that people would look up to you?

- what would that do for your confidence?
- who gave you the responsibility?
- why do you think that came about?

In university, how do you feel about the idea of being 'picked upon'? can you tell me more about where this might happen?

- how would this make you feel?
- are there certain people who get picked?
- is this for a reason?

Do you find that sometimes in lectures people don't behave as well as they should, or that they don't interact?

- why do you think this might be?
- do lecturers do anything about this?

Do you find that some people might like not to be picked on in a lecture situation because of the size of the environment, because there is generally more people?

- do you think there is a fear of speaking out?
- what happens if someone doesn't give a correct answer?
- social aspect to interaction?

Earlier in this conversation you mentioned your education and how you like to learn. Can you now tell me about your behaviours in a lecture and how they might differ from a seminar environment, can you tell me about a lecture first?

- do the staff have an effect?
- social impact?
- size of session?
- interaction?

In a seminar environment do you think you are expected to behave in any kind of way? I know you have been to school and college and I guess you sat in these kinds of environments, does this have an effect on your behaviour?

- similarities?
- know the environment
- know how you are expected to behave?

Can you talk to me about which environment you actually prefer and why this might be?

- Discussion
- interaction
- lecturer
- social impact
- size of group

Finally, if you had a chance to chose between going to lectures or seminars; or if you wanted to go to both or just the one which would you chose?

Appendix E

STAFF INTERVIEW GUIDE

During your time at Cardiff Met I am sure that you have many experiences, can you talk me through some experiences you have had. For example Good/bad or what you have enjoyed or what hasn't been so enjoyable.

- Barriers
- Lecturers- are there any you look up to who think are good, why is this?
- Lessons- back to when you were in university/ which lessons did you enjoy most and why?

During your education and teaching/lecturing you will have probably come across what we call 'types of learner'. Can you talk to me about the things you think students at the university like and what they might not like as much?

- Experimenting- can you talk to me about what happens in these situations?
- If a student has produced a good answer or not such a good answer how would you go about reacting to this?
- Individual/ group work- experiences of setting tasks. What are the outcomes. what is the environment like?

From your learning experiences, Do you try to incorporate learning styles that you used to like, why do you deliver the way you do, can you talk to me more about this?

- Teachers who used to teach you, methods worked well?
- You have experience and know how students react?
- What factors do you take into consideration, knowledge, year, time?

During your time as lecturer can you talk to me about the relationships you might have built with students, i know you are also a coach, how might these relationships differ from pitch to classroom?

- relationships in teaching time
- relationships in coaching time
- if you had time, what relationships would you try and build?

Within your time as a lecturer can you talk to me and give me an inside in relation to responsibility, for example what responsibilities did you have as a student, and expanding on to what your relationships are now as a lecturer?

- How do others enforce responsibility upon you?
- Do you like having responsibility?
- Do you give responsibility to students?

You must come into contact with a number of students within your job and your coaching, can you talk to me about whether you would give responsibility to people and why you might do that

- What situations might you give responsibility?
- What factors does it depend on?

If you have given responsibility to students how do you think the students react to this, can you talk to me about some reactions that you might have seen?

- Bring more confidence?
- Impact on friendships?
- How do they then react to you as a teacher?

Looking towards lectures now, when you are taking lectures in a lecture theatre, talk to me about how you would conduct a lecture.

- How would you gain information from students?
- How do you interact with the students?
- How do you feel about the lecture environment?

And can you now explain or share your thoughts on how you might conduct a seminar group and what might be different between these sessions compared with the lectures?

From talking about a lecture theatre environment previously , can you now talk to me about your feelings towards seminars and lectures, what are the similarities/differences, is there a reason that you like one more than the rest, talk to me about your thoughts

- Environment
- Classrooms size
- Students feelings
- Knowledge and understanding

During earlier conversation you have given some good answers about learning styles and how you think the students like to or prefer not to learn. Can you now talk to me about the behaviors that you might come across where and when you teach.

- Environment
- Social Aspect
- Is there an expected way that they should behave? do they think they should behave in a certain way?

We have spoken there about learning environment and how they might actually have an impact on the students, and maybe how they learn or interact, Can you talk to me about which environment you might prefer to teach in and give me some examples of why this might be?

- Room size/ class size
- interactions
- control

If you had the choice about how learning takes place within university, can you describe to me how you would set up how students would be able to learn, and why you think this?

- Environments
- Size of class groups
- Times of sessions
- sharing knowledge