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Abstract
Although previous research has acknowledged power within the coach-athlete relationship as important, there is limited research regarding social power and influences associated within a volunteer role. Therefore the present study aimed to address this oversight by exploring the role of a volunteer coach within academy football, with regards to French and Ravens (1959) typology of power. Participants comprised of head coaches (N=2) and volunteer coaches (N=2) who engaged in a focus group. This qualitative method was employed to help develop a further understanding of power using both head and volunteer coach’s perceptions within a coaching environment. From the raw data, results were presented in the form of a narrative which identified six main themes; namely legitimate power, expert power, volunteers: a coach’s perspective, volunteers: a volunteer’s perspective, bridging the gap and finally volunteer effectiveness. The discussion of the results acknowledged that volunteers perceive themselves to be susceptible to negative perceptions from head coaches and participants. Consequently, resulting in difficulties exerting power within the coaching environment. Furthermore, findings suggest possible interventions which may reduce negative perceptions by engaging and being actively involved within coaching sessions. Future qualitative research could incorporate athletes’ perceptions of volunteers and how they perceive the role of a volunteer coach.
CHAPER ONE: INTRODUCTION
1.0 Introduction to the Study

The term ‘coaching’, for many years relates to sporting activities with the collective aim of developing individuals or teams technically to maximise success in their respective sports (Fairs, 1987). This outlook on coaching would consider the task a relatively straightforward practice. Interestingly in-line with this viewpoint a rationalistic conceptualisation of the coaching process has been highlighted in recent literature within the sport domain (Jones & Wallace, 2005). This rationalistic approach aims to identify and express the coaching process in the form of models. John Lyle, an advocate of the rationalistic viewpoint suggested that the coaching process is rather sequential in nature (Lyle, 2002). This suggests that the models produced follow a step-by-step method to coaching that is followed to be effective within a coaching environment. An example of this would be to consider the objectives model of Fairs (1987). The model follows 5 steps, consisting of data collection, diagnosis, action planning, implementation of plan and evaluation. According to Lyle’s (2002) perspective these 5 steps will be followed until the end where the process will start over again. Cushion, Armour and Jones (2003) reinforce Lyle’s (2002) statement by suggesting the systematic approach as a continuous repeated process, allowing for constant assessment and revision.

However, recent literature has suggested this approach fails to highlight important aspects therefore being too simplistic (Cushion et al., 2003). Jones and Wallace (2005) argue that the process is inherently ambiguous in nature. Recent literature has identified the flaws of the rationalistic conceptualisation and identified the aspects that make the coaching process so complex (Cushion, 2007; Jones, Armour & Potrac, 2004; Lyle, 2002). An important aspect that considers the multifaceted nature of the process is social interaction. Power dynamics is a main component of social interaction which manifests itself within the environment (Potrac, Jones & Armour, 2002; Purdy, Potrac and Jones, 2008). Potrac and Jones (2009) suggest power is used to influence participants and those around them to achieve aims and goals. A common typology exercised in recent history is the work of French and Raven’s (1959) 5 bases of power. The bases of power include, legitimate, expert, reward, referent and coercive. These power bases are omnipresent within the environment and hold the potential to influence participants. However, the coach is not in full control of power as assumed but it is known to be shared within the environment. Tauber (1985) suggested “power is something in the hands of the person on whom power is being wielded, not in the hands of the presumed” (p, 7). This would indicate a coach
never has full power. Interestingly, Tauber (1985) also suggested “people [athletes] … must consent to power being used on them before such power can be effective” (p, 7).

Therefore the purpose of this study is to understand how volunteer coaches exert French and Raven’s (1959) typology of power within their respective environments. The overall aims of the study are as followed

a) How do volunteers exert power within the coaching environment?
b) How do volunteers perceive themselves within the coaching environment?
c) Does the term ‘volunteer’ have a consequence on the overall effectiveness of coaching sessions?
d) How do you negate the negative perceptions volunteers develop to increase the amount of influence they have within a session?

1.1 Rationale

Literature suggests the coaching process is dynamic and messy in nature in particular the social interaction between coach and athlete (Jones and Wallace, 2005). However a gap remains in the literature of how effective a volunteer is within a coaching setting. According to Warburton, Paynter and Petriwskyi (2007) the term volunteer comes with negative perceptions therefore affecting the social interaction they have within the coaching process. Some participants may feel that volunteers have limited knowledge therefore not allowing them to assume power in that particular interaction which effects the influence they can have in the coaching environment.

This work looks to widen the knowledge of the effects volunteers can have in terms of influence and power while also identifying potentially solutions to reducing the negative perceptions received from head coaches and volunteers.
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW
2.0 Introduction
The following chapter will look to give an insight into the current literature that surrounds coaching. A traditional coaching perspective will be highlighted, progressing onto the current conceptualisation of coaching. Furthermore, social power will be considered in relation to the role of a volunteer coach within the coaching environment.

2.1 Traditional coaching perspective
It has been proposed that sports’ coaching facilitates an athlete’s development; through performance, sporting ability and achievement of goals (Lyle, 2002). Cote and Gilbert (2009) defined coaching effectiveness as “the consistent application of integrated professional, interpersonal, and intrapersonal knowledge to improve athletes’ competence, confidence, connection and character” (p. 316). Additionally, a coach can develop the athlete’s self-esteem and self-understanding by encouraging the transfer of life skills (Jones, Hughes & Kingston, 2008). Despite this aforementioned literature underpinning coaching, Jones (2006) suggested coaching is an under theorised field, with no conceptual framework to understand the complexities of coaching. Furthermore, research conducted by scholars tends to be “sparse unfocused and subjective” (LeUnes, 2007, p. 403). Over recent years, coaching has become increasingly acknowledged as a process.

“The coaching process is the contract/agreement between athlete and coach and the operationalisation consists of the purposeful, direct and indirect, formal and informal series of activities and interventions designed to improve competition performance. The most evident part of the process is normally planned, co-ordinated and integrated programme of preparation and competition” (Lyle, 2002, p. 40).

This current notion is under much examination and has been given much attention within coaching research. Lyle (2002) suggested that the coaching process is rationalistic, therefore, aimed to develop a conceptual framework to underpin coaching, by identifying the critical foundations of the coaching process.
2.2 Nature of the Coaching Process

Several researchers have tried to capture the coaching process through the development of models, however, disregarding the complex nature of coaching (Cushion, Armour and Jones, 2006). The aspiration to develop a conceptual framework stemmed from Cross and Ellice’s (1997) work, which suggested that effective coaching can be achieved through identifying, analysing and controlling variables that effect performance. There are three models cited frequently throughout the literature that attempt to conceptualise the coaching process. These are the work of Fairs (1987); Franks, Sinclair, Thomson, and Goodman (1986); and Lyle (2002). Fairs (1987) attempted to conceptualise the coaching process by creating a sport specific five-step model. The steps comprise data collection, diagnosis, action planning, implementation of plan, and evaluation. The conceptualisation gives a simplistic and systematic view of what a coaching session might encompass (Cushion et al., 2006). The model appears coherent on the eye, however a number of criticisms have been highlighted by Lyle (2002). Lyle (2002) suggested that the model failed to highlight what might be considered the most important aspect of coaching, namely interpersonal nature of relationships. Another model cited frequently within literature is that of Franks et al. (1986). This model tended to lean towards coaching expertise. Lyle (2002) proposed that it should be viewed as more of an instructional model rather than coaching, due to the hypothesis that coaching can be theorised as a teaching episode. Although Frank et al’s (1986) model facilitated the understanding of player performance, similar criticism to other conceptualisations of the coaching process were identified. Lyle (2002) suggested that adopting an instructional approach oversimplified the coaching process. Similarly, as stated previously, the conceptualisation also ignores interpersonal social relationships within the coaching process.

The aforementioned models tend to oversimplify the coaching process and forget the embrace the complexities of coaching and the critical elements of effective practice (Mathers, 1997). Although models contribute to knowledge and understanding of the coaching process, Cushion et al. (2006) suggested that inadequate consideration has been made to the perspective of coaching. Considering the deficiency of the social nature within models, Lyle (2002) attempted to re-conceptualise the coaching process. Lyle (2002) based his model upon a set of building blocks which include coaching expertise, analysis of performance, goal setting and regulation procedures amongst some others. It has been suggested by Cushion et al. (2006), that the model represents coaching as a “holistic, interdependent and interrelated enterprise” (p. 87). More importantly, it captures
the social dimension of the coaching process whereas the other two models lack such mechanism. The re-conceptualisation identifies the coaching process as a set of social relationships, subject to contextual influences within sports coaching culture (Lyle, 2002). This conceptualisation of the model takes into account the social complexities within coaching, however Cushion et al. (2006) suggested that Lyle’s (2002) model is untested within the sports domain, therefore it would be interesting to see if it achieves its aim of dealing with complexity in practice.

With the exception of Lyle’s (2002) unverified model of the coaching process, research has failed to identify the complexities of the process, however they should not totally be eradicated within the coaching domain. Bowes & Jones (2006) stated that conceptualised models have made a significant contribution to understanding the foundations of coaching. Coach education courses are developed on such teachings, giving coaches the knowledge to coach in the real world. However, in recent years it has been suggested that this approach to coach education is unrealistic (Jones and Wallace, 2005). Cushion et al. (2003) suggested coach education courses are fine in theory, however detached from reality. Subsequently, following a rationalistic assumption of the coaching process does not provide coaches with the tools to coach effectively. Cushion (2001) supported this statement by suggesting that coach education programmes have a limited impact on ones learning of the coaching process. Coach education programmes follow rationalistic lines and do not develop what is considered necessary for an effective coach. They fail to incorporate problem thinking and creative thinking skills which will occur within a coaching environment (Jones, 2006). Therefore, coach education programs should move away from such rationalistic teachings and move towards a more complex understanding so coaches can better deal with the realistic nature of coaching Jones (2006).

2.3 Ambiguity in the Coaching Process

Contemporary research has begun to lean away from rationalistic and simplistic approaches (Lyle, 2002). Coaching has been viewed as a manageable and sequential process due to the development of conceptual frameworks. However, Saury and Durand (1998) proposed that although coaching within a theory context is detailed and knowledgeable, this may not be the case in reality. This statement proposed that following a rationalistic approach helps inform coaching practice, however it does not prepare one for the complex nature of the process (Cassidy, Jones & Potrac, 2004). Similarly, Jones and Wallace (2005) argued the process is inherently ambiguous in reality. This is because
coaching is multifaceted in nature and requires continuous “planning, observation, evaluation and reaction” (Bowes & Jones, 2006, p. 235). The limitations of the traditional approach to coaching has led to a more complex view of the coaching process in recent years (Cushion, 2007; Jones et al., 2002). Cushion (2007) considered the coaching process to be a multifaceted social endeavour. It is considered a reciprocal process with much attention given to the complex scopes of the coach-athlete relationship (Jones, Armour & Potrac, 2004). Due to contemporary research focusing greatly on complex coach-athlete relationships, the coaching process in recent years has been considered more of a social process (D’Arripe-Longeuville, Saury, Fournier and Durand, 2001; Potrac et al., 2002). However, this consideration of the coaching process lacks depth due to the gaps in existing literature concerning social dynamics (Cushion et al., 2006). Interestingly, Lyle (2002) stated that the depth of literature is of concern, considering the amount of time coaches and athletes spend together. However, theories have been developed which attempt to close the gap that currently exists within the domain. Such theories that embrace complexity include reflective practice (Schon, 1983), the more capable other (Vygotsky, 1978), orchestration (Jones and Wallace, 2006), shared leadership (Jones and Standage, 2006) communities of practice (Wenger, 1998), exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and theories of social power (Bourdieu, 1986; French & Raven, 1959). However, social power, a theory that embraces complexity is considered to have been ignored within coaching literature (Johns & Johns, 2000)

2.4 Social Power
Social power is arguably a complex notion within the coaching process. It has been suggested that power within a coaching environment is a dynamic, social process which affects behaviour either positively or negatively (Hardy, 1995). Laios, Theodorakis and Gargalianos (2003) proposed that power is an important tool to become an effective coach, therefore should occur in the coaching environment. However, it is worth mentioning that power is always present between coach and athlete, consciously or subconscious. It is also noted that absolute power can never be achieved. According to Gidden’s (1984), everyone that is involved within a social structure has the power to change the worlds they reside in. There are many typologies of power; some typologies include French and Raven’s social bases of power (1959), Kelman’s (1958) framework entailing compliance, identification and internalization and finally Yukl and Falbe’s (1991) typology, comprising of two forms of interpersonal power, personal and position. The latter two typologies consist of a number of interpersonal powers respectively, embracing all five
social bases of power created by French and Raven (1959). The bases of power include legitimate, coercive, reward, referent and expert. Wann, Metcalf, Brewer and Whiteside (2000) suggested that French and Raven's (1959) social bases of power is accepted as the foremost method of understanding interpersonal power.

Although French and Raven (1959) provided a basis for social power, there have been questions raised on the usefulness of the framework, in a sporting context. A number of studies have related the framework to a working environment. For example, the effectiveness of management and perceptions of employees (Yukl & Falbe, 1991) and management styles (Frost & Stahelski, 1988). In terms of sports coaching, there is limited literature to support that this framework can be used to enhance the understanding of social power, as there have been few studies that investigate power in a sporting context. It was highlighted by Slack (1997), that no sporting implications associated with this framework have been identified in the research however Potrac et al. (2002) conducted a study on the coaching behaviours of a soccer coach. Potrac et al. (2002) found through an analysis of data collection, behaviours showed the use of social power to influence athletes.

Due to the limited research into power, Wann et al., (2000) aimed to identify the usefulness of power through coaches and athletes perceptions. They developed a questionnaire which incorporates the effectiveness of one’s own power and perception of power from others. Wann et al. (2000) found that head coaches perceived to have more legitimate and expert power than assistant coaches perceptions. Furthermore, both coaches perceived to have similar levels of reward and referent power at hand. However, this study focused solely on head coaches of an American football team in college. Therefore, this study does not give an insight into other head coaches and coaches at different levels. A head coach’s perceived power status could vary between amateur and professional coaches for example. Wann et al. (2000) reported that coercive power is associated frequently to the level of sport being played, relating to the latter limitation and highlighting that individual differences may come into consideration, depending on the level of coaching.

As mentioned above, legitimate and expert power was a salient type of power used by a head coach. Legitimate power refers to power gained from the position a person/coach has within a structure or organisation (Slack, 1997). This power is given to the coach
rather than a power that he/she beholds. It is suggested, that coaches cannot rely solely on legitimate power, but must be backed up with other powers to enhance initial power (Potrac et al., 2002). As for Brian in Potrac et al.’s. (2002) study, he relies on expert power to have an influence over his athletes. The initial study completed by Potrac et al. (2002) aimed to build on existing literature of coaching behaviours by looking at roles, interaction and power. This is one of the first studies to look into coaching behaviours from a single person perspective and managed to bring to the light the independent, however, inter-linked relationships of coaching milieu. The study looked at one professional top ‘flight’ coach therefore the findings and discussion is based around that person. Although the results gained are reliable, it would strengthen the discussion to include other professional coaches or volunteers within the coaching environment to understand their behaviours within the process.

2.5 The Value of Volunteers

In relation to legitimate and expert power cited above, amateur coaches may not have expert power at their disposal. It is suggested by Cuskelley, Hoye and Auld (2006), that amateur coaches tend to begin as volunteers to gain experience to become coaches. Cnaan (1996) referred to volunteering as a non-profit range of activities that benefits oneself or others at free will. As volunteers tend to be younger, experience in coached sports is little therefore issues in the usefulness of expert power are raised. It was also suggested by Cuskelley et al. (2006), that trained coaches have more influence in terms of social cohesion and enjoyment. This is a problem for volunteer coaches as perceptions of volunteering are negative. This statement is supported by Warburton et al. (2007), who suggest that negative perceptions are one of many barriers that volunteers face in sport. As previously mentioned, volunteers or assistant coaches face a difficult task to influence participants with the use of power, particularly in terms of expert and legitimate power. Volunteers now play a big part in sport, particularly youth sport and clearly, it is difficult for them to have power within a coaching environment due to experience and the role they have. According to Wann et al. (2000), head coaches perceive to have more legitimate and expert power than assistant coaches, however, both coaches perceive to have similar levels of referent and reward power. Following on from this statement, Warburton et al. (2007) suggested volunteers are vulnerable to negative perceptions from coaches and in particular, participants. This is due to the role that is given and can be more of a problem when working with a coach that is hierarchically advanced than them. Previous research
has tended to focus on power associated with the coach and how this affects the coach-athlete relationship (Potrac et al., 2002; Purdy et al., 2008). Research has tended to look at volunteers roles within the work environment, however limited research has been conducted on perceived power of volunteers when coaching. Therefore, this study will aim to address this oversight in literature.
CHAPER THREE: METHODOLOGY
3.0 Introduction
This chapter will outline the methodological procedures undertaken within this study. Firstly, the reasoning why a qualitative approach was most suited for the thesis will be discussed. The research design will then be discussed paying particular attention to the procedures undertaken within the study. Following this, the rationale behind the method of data collection, namely focus groups will be highlighted. Subsequently, issues related to trustworthiness and how the data will be presented will then be explored. The concluding section outlines the ethical considerations associated with the study and how they will be addressed.

3.1 Qualitative approach
In order to answer the question set out in this study, it was deemed that a qualitative approach was most suitable. This is because feelings and emotions were analysed and interpreted so that the intended nature of the study could be addressed. Numerical data was not being analysed, therefore a qualitative approach was taken rather than a quantitative research design. According to Gratton and Jones (2010), it is difficult to put descriptive information into numbers, therefore the focus on interpreting words into a relevant discussion and analysis was the emphasis of the study. A similar study conducted by Wiersma and Sherman (2013) followed a qualitative approach by developing several focus groups to gather data. This approach helped guide their discussion by reviewing information in the form of direct quotations, raised in focus groups. From using this method, an in depth analysis was given by drawing out information gathered.

3.2 Procedures
Before collecting data for the study, procedures were outlined so a precise plan could be followed. St. Julian’s City academy has five head coaches and six volunteers, consequently only a small population was accessible which met the criteria for the study. Due to the small sample size, the final selection of candidates was based on collection of informed consent forms (see appendix C). Participant information forms (see appendix B); which entailed a detailed overview of the study (i.e. nature of study, what is expected, why the individual has been selected and what the results will be used for) and informed consent forms were administered to all coaches and volunteers. According to McNamee, Olivier and Wainwright (2007) many informed consent forms fail to meet necessary requirements in terms of actual procedures of study and what is expected. By having a detailed overview of the study, participants were given the option to make a fully informed
decision to take part. Once consent forms were collected, emails were sent with a date and location for the focus group to be conducted. Indeed, the location is an important factor for the collection of data. According to Gratton and Jones (2010), the participants need to feel comfortable when conducting a focus group. To ensure this, a private room was selected in an area with no background noise. By ensuring all participants were comfortable, relevant information could be gained. Boyce and Neale (2006) reinforced the previous statement by suggesting the interviewee must feel comfortable to give detailed, rich information. If they were uncomfortable, the likelihood of receiving important information would be restricted. Once a suitable place and time was decided the focus group was conducted. In order to gather and record the conversation of the focus group, a dictaphone was used. This ensured that the data could be transcribed. Once transcribed, the interviews were returned to the participants so that they could read what had been said, thus ensuring trustworthiness of data.

3.3 Participants
The study involved four participants; two coaches and two volunteer coaches. The participants had various coaching experience, ranging between one and three years. In terms of coaching qualifications, all four have completed their UEFA C License Certificate. All participants have similar levels of coaching experience, ranging from two to five years and currently coach in youth football. This will narrow the focus of the study, which will allow for better results. To improve findings further, a variation in selection of participants was chosen (i.e. two coaches and two volunteers). Maykut and Morehouse (1994) proposed a variation approach assists in gaining different experiences/opinions of the same phenomenon. The coaches and volunteers all currently work for St Julian’s City football academy. In order to maintain participant confidentiality, all participants were given pseudonyms to protect their identity.

Participant A known as Jake (pseudonym) has two years coaching experience. He began as a volunteer however has recently become a lead coach, coaching under 13’s and 15’s at St Julian’s City.

Participant B known as Sean (pseudonym) has five years coaching experience. He began as a volunteer however has recently become a lead coach within the last six months.
Participant C known as Ben (pseudonym) has between four and five years coaching experience. He is currently a volunteer and has been with St Julian’s City Academy for six months.

Participant D known as Alex (pseudonym) has between three and four years coaching experience. He is currently a volunteer and has been with St Julian’s Academy for four months.

3.4 Qualitative Methodology - Focus Group

A focus group was used as the method of data collection. According to Gratton and Jones (2010), focus groups are similar to interviews however, consist of a small number of participants. This was not the intended method to begin with; the initial idea was to use questionnaires to gain relevant data for the study. However, Gratton and Jones (2010) suggested that there is “no opportunity to probe” deeper into the answers given (p. 129). This is an obvious problem when looking to study perceptions of individuals. The quality of information received will create better outcomes and a reliable discussion. As a result of this, a focus group was the adopted method of data collection. According to Patton (2002), this allows for a specific framework of questions to be used with an opportunity to probe deeper to the responses given. Indeed, May (2001) considered this procedure will help aid the researcher by engaging with participants, learning there understanding of behaviours and events in the context that it occurred. Furthermore, Gratton and Jones (2010) supported this statement by suggesting a focus group will ensure greater depth of discussion and allow “richer” information to be gathered (p.155).

3.5 Trustworthiness

To ensure trustworthiness Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed four principles: creditability, transferability, dependability and confirmability. The term creditability refers to the “adequate representation of the constructions of the social world under study” (Bradley, 1993, p. 436). A way to improve creditability is to ensure member checking is completed after gathering of raw data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Member checking is a form of feedback received from participants to ensure data collected is true. This process was adopted to improve trustworthiness of study. Transferability is the capacity to provide sufficient theory that can be transferred over into another context (Shenton, 2004). However, according to Zhang & Wildemuth (2009) the researcher does not provide transferability, but allows for transferability within the information of the study. The current
thesis provides a great detail of information in relation to procedures, methods of collection and analysis strategies. This will ensure the likeliness of transferability in different contexts. Dependability refers to the reliability of the study and can be addressed by ensuring that the study can be repeated in the same context with the same participants and methodological procedures, similar if not the same results would be achieved (Shenton, 2004). To ensure this the process of the study will be given in detail to allow for other researchers to conduct the study. Confirmability relates to the ability to maintain objective in the study. Miles and Huberman (1994) suggested that confirmability can be achieved by admitting the researcher’s preconceptions. This is because it is difficult to remain objective as data collection methods are designed coherent with researcher’s predispositions (Patton, 1990). Due to this admission of predispositions was conveyed using questions to guide discussion in focus group.

With regards to the nature of the study, trustworthiness was maintained via member checking. This is an efficient way of improving the credibility, accuracy and validity of findings (Barbour, 2001; Doyle, 2007).

3.6 Data representation
Qualitative content analysis was used to represent the data. This technique involves systematic procedures for processing data (Zhang & Wildemuth, 2009). The overall idea is to condense raw data into data that can be used to answer the aims of the study. To do this an inductive and deductive approach was utilized. Once data was prepared, coding categories were developed, initially based on theory studied prior to data collection. Through analysing the data new themes emerged, which were then related back to existing theory to assist the phenomenon being studied. When themes were identified, the text was fully coded. An important aspect in content analysis is to effectively draw conclusions from the categories identified. Bradley (1993) stated that this process in the analysis will look to identify relationships between categories, codes and themes. This method was followed to develop overall conclusions of the data. The final part of the analysis discussed and explained the results that were found. One way to represent findings is to use quotations (Schilling, 2006). There are other ways to represent data e.g. graphs and charts (Miles & Huberman, 1994), however, Patton (2002) advocated that findings should be represented in line with research goals. Therefore, the use of quotations was used as they were best suited to the study.
3.7 Ethical Considerations

According to Guillemin & Gillam (2004), an important part of completing a study is considering the sensitive aspect of ethical issues. Therefore, some ethical considerations were put in place. Firstly, participants were given informed consent forms. The form consisted of an insight to the full study and what the information gathered will be used for. This allowed them to make a full decision whether to participate in the study. By agreeing to participate in the study through a consent form, the participants agreed to keep their identity protected. Throughout data analysis and discussion, anonymity will be given to the participants. The participants were given pseudonyms so the real identity of the participant was unknown. These pseudonyms were then used to reference direct quotes from the data collection within the discussion and analysis. Additionally, the football academy will also be given a pseudonym for easy reference in text, while keeping confidentiality of the actual football academy. Additionally, confidentiality is another ethical consideration. All transcribed findings from the focus group were held privately and was only used by the researcher and participants. The participants were the only individuals to receive the findings. This helped keep findings confidential between the researcher and participants. In terms of ethical consideration the whole study was based around commitment to the Cardiff Metropolitan University ethical code of conduct.
CHAPER FOUR: RESULTS
4.0 Introduction

The findings from the present study are presented in this section. The process of content analysis developed 6 general themes from the study. These themes include, legitimate power, expert power, volunteers: a coaches perspective, volunteers: a volunteers perspective, bridging the gap and finally volunteer effectiveness. The presentation of the themes followed a narrative approach. A narrative approach is one of many interpreting processes however most beneficial for this thesis as it will “capture the rich data within stories” (Mitchell & Egudo, 2003, p. 2) The narrative contained direct quotes that were generated from the focus group. This allows for a greater understanding of coaches views and perceptions of the thesis.

4.1 Legitimate Power

At the start of the focus group participants were asked to give an insight to how power manifests itself within their coaching environments relating to French and Ravens (1959) typology of social power. Volunteer 1 and 2 shared an example from their own coaching experiences highlighting the problems they encountered from a lack of legitimate power. Volunteers 1 stated;

“Obviously at first they see the head coach, that’s where they see the power and authority. So my example may be similar to yours, at first doing warm-ups, you’re doing a drill where it’s not a very difficult drill and they’re not putting as much effort, and the head coach is overseeing something else. Then, like you said, when the head coach comes over then they see the power and authority coming back into the session and if they make a comment like ‘This is the warm-up so show respect to the volunteer’, almost, then yes, I’ve experienced the same thing, where they put more effort in and pay a bit more respect when they head coach is there.” (Ben)

Similarly, volunteer 2 shared an interesting point of view relevant to the discussion and also highlighted the difference between legitimate power between head coach and volunteer;

“I think it’s quite hard to possess legitimate power if you’re a volunteer, because there’s this sort of aura about the head coach, when he walks around, you know, the kids aren’t going to start talking. Because it’s their opinion that the kids are looking for; as a volunteer it may not be that important to them.” (Alex)

Volunteer 2 also gives an example from previous coaching experience and the problem legitimate power caused in that particular situation;

“His [participant] attitude was gone and because I was taking the session he would show it. Whereas if the head coach was taking the session I think it would be kept inside him and he wouldn’t say anything.” (Alex)
Interestingly, coach 2 revealed the omnipresent nature of legitimate power within the coaching field;

“Legitimate power for the head coach probably comes without saying, because it’s within a social structure. Although on coaching terms we’re equal but within the structure of the academy has given us, we are the head coaches and they’re the volunteer coaches, so that sort of power is always going to be there for the kids, because we’re always going to have legitimate power, because we are in a higher position.” (Sean)

4.2 Expert Power

The participants of the study were asked to give their opinions on the following statement “head coaches are perceived to have more legitimate and expert power than assistants and volunteers” (Wann et al. 2000). Coach 2 disagreed with the literature by suggesting there is no difference in expert power between volunteers and coaches and just the notion of legitimate power remains the difference between the two roles, for instance;

“Whereas expert power, probably isn’t quite as relevant, because just because they’re a volunteer coach doesn’t mean they’re not as good a coach. Because the expert power says that someone has special knowledge or skills, but just because we’re the head coach doesn’t mean we’re a better coach or we have more skills or more knowledge than the other person. It’s just the position we hold. So maybe legitimate power does exist within our situation but maybe not expert power.” (Sean)

Alternatively, Volunteer 1 contradicts the above statement by suggesting expert power can be effective in influencing participants;

“If you’re a volunteer or if you’re a coach, if you can demonstrate a drill or do something with good quality I think that’s quite an easy way to gain respect and power from the group, because if you can demonstrate that you do it, they almost perceive you ‘Right he can do that drill; he can do that with quality.’ Whereas if you go in there, like you said, and you can’t actually demonstrate yourself or you make a mistake or you misplace a pass, then they start to look at you and think ‘If he can’t do it, how can expect us to do it?’ So if you can actually go in there and demonstrate something with quality where they can see you as a role model, then obviously trying to do that, is a good way of gaining respect and power from the group as well.” (Ben)

The previous narrative gave an insight into demonstrations and how demonstrations can be an important factor in influencing participants. The following questions were then guided around the importance of demonstrations, how often and who demonstrates in the environment. For instance, coach 1 likes to incorporate demonstrations into his session as well as allowing volunteers to demonstrate also;
“Yes, they [demonstrations] happen all the time. Sometimes I get the other lads to try to do it, or I’ll try to do it, so yes, just trying to make things to get everyone to understand.” (Jake)

Additionally coach 2 stated an example of a demonstration not going to plan and how he deals with the damage that this can potential cause in relation to expert power;

“If I do a demonstration and it goes wrong, I try to make a joke and have a bit of a laugh about it. There was a demonstration yesterday, where it was in a space near the goal and I was saying to one lad ‘What could you do in this situation?’ He said ‘I’d probably shoot.’ ‘Well, there you go – shoot!’ And I skied it over the crossbar! So I had a bit of a laugh about it but they know I can play. But they all have a laugh.” (Jake)

Following the previous statement, volunteer 2 highlighted the noticeable difference in expert power influences between coach and volunteer;

“It is obvious that that coach has more experience than all of us and he’s played the game longer and coached at a higher level and that can be obvious.” (Alex)

Similarly, volunteer 1 stated the perceptions volunteers may face from participants in relation to expert power;

“They might not perceive the volunteer to be qualified in the same way a coach would be. Because they might think ‘Oh, it’s just someone who’s come in to help out. He might enjoy it but he might not have any expertise in the area…you don’t have that expert power.” (Ben).

Coach 2 disputes the previous comment by stating the fact that this social power does not have an effect on his group of players because they are unaware of the qualities that either coach or volunteer may possess;

“I think all the kids or the players ever see is the term ‘volunteer’ and they have no idea how qualified Ben and I are. They probably don’t know we both have the exact same coaching qualifications…all they know is that term [volunteer].” (Sean)

In the following sub section a coaches perceptions of a volunteer will be explored. This will give insight to how coaches perceive volunteers and how they work together within the academy.

4.3 Volunteers: A Coach’s Perspective

Warburton et al. (2007) suggested volunteers are vulnerable to negative perceptions particularly from coaches therefore this theme was generated in line with the coach’s responses and existing literature. The responses given coincided the existing literature as
the coaches highlighted the negative perceptions that participants can receive. Coach 2 gives emphasis to the potential problems faced if a volunteer is coaching for the first time;

“When you do have the chance and the volunteer wants to take the session, if they haven’t ever had a session with them before, they might not get any respect or any control over the players” (Sean)

He also mentions the term ‘volunteer’ has the potential to have consequences when volunteers are coaching;

“I don’t know if they know he’s a volunteer but they know I’m the head coach. If they knew that maybe he had more experience or he had a better qualification they might see things differently in terms of influence effectiveness; but all they’re ever made aware of is that I’m the head coach”. (Sean)

Likewise, coach 1 identified;

“I would never ever call them a volunteer because maybe then that’s where the respect starts to diminish – like I said – the people who volunteer with me, everyone has the same qualifications. If not, some people have more experience than me, it’s just because I’ve been given that power they think I’ve had years of experience coaching but they don’t know. Some people might have more experience than me. So, yes, I’d never ever use the term ‘volunteer’ in my coaching sessions because the kids might lose respect for the coaches and that’s not what I want.” (Jake)

Interestingly, Coach 1 adopts a different approach by means of alternating how much responsibility he gives but remains in control of sessions so participants understand who the head coach is and who has the most influence in terms of power;

“Because I have three volunteers, if I started to give responsibility to all my volunteers, I think people would start to question me as a coach, because they might see me as a lazy coach.” (Jake)

In a similar manner the following sub section will consider the views of the volunteer and how they perceive themselves in their current coaching environments.

4.4 Volunteers: A Volunteer Perspective

Warburton et al. (2007) suggested volunteers are vulnerable to negative perceptions particularly from coaches and participants. The volunteers highlighted the little influence they can have when coaching because of the perceived role of a volunteer. For example Volunteer 2 stated;

“The perception they [participants] can have of you as a volunteer can be very, very distorted, in the sense that they’re ‘not going to enjoy your session because you’re just volunteering; you haven’t got that much power (Alex)

Additionally, volunteer 1 had a similar point of view:
“Being entitled a volunteer is something where you don’t always get respect from the kids, because they just see you as someone who’s just helping out. You don’t have that power… the volunteer is just the person who’s there, he sets things up but he never really gets involved.” (Ben)

Following this statement volunteer 2 added to Ben’s previous response;

“I completely agree. As you said, it’s unpaid, it could be deemed therefore that you’re inexperienced, lacking qualifications. Again that role in society is probably seen as inferior to one which is paid and the holder is qualified…from that point of view, it’s hard to get immediate respect from any of the kids if you’re in that kind of less superior role.” (Alex)

Interestingly, Volunteer 1 specified how he feels there are no negative perceptions received, particularly from a coach’s point of view;

“I wouldn’t say in the head coaches that I’ve experienced negative perceptions. I think between the head coaches and volunteers, obviously there’s a mutual respect and they see you as just another coach really. I don’t think there’s a negative perception, no. Obviously the head coaches do have that bit more authority and respect from the group, but I don’t feel I would really agree with that statement in terms of what I’ve experienced.” (Ben)

However, volunteer 1 did mention the limited power they may have if they coach irregularly;

“if you’re someone who’s just going to turn up, stand there, watch a session for say 3 or 4 weeks and then the coach says to you ‘Do you mind taking the warm-up or do you mind taking that session?’ If you jump in then and try to take the session the kids will be looking at you like ‘You haven’t really got any power, you haven’t done anything for the last three or four weeks’, and you’re trying to jump in and grab respect.” (Ben)

The volunteers were asked of their opinions on the age gap between coach and volunteers and whether this was an influence on the negative perceptions they could receive from coaches. Interestingly volunteer 1 agreed with this statement;

“I think if I was working with a head coach who is a bit older and more experienced, then he feels that maybe it’s his way and that’s the only way to go about it and this is the session we’re going to do. Then I think, yes, obviously I haven’t experienced that, but I do think that’s how it might work if I was working with an older coach.” (Ben)

4.5 Bridging the Gap

The volunteers are aware of the negative perceptions they are at risk of therefore they attempt to negate these perceptions by increasing the responsibility they have within a session. Not only do they look to gain responsibility within a session but are also given responsibility by the head coaches. Volunteer 1 was asked about his roles within a typical hour session. His response was;
“I’m expected to help out as in the power we share between the group and I’m expected to take part in the session and actually put my viewpoint across as well as the head coach…he’ll give me an overview of what he wants doing, but at the same time it’s flexible in terms of, ‘if you want to progress it [training session], how will you progress it then?…there’s never a week when I just turn up and stand there watching.”

(Ben)

Similarly volunteer 2 stated;

“If the head coach asks me to do something I go and do that, so whether it’s taking half, whether it’s setting something up for him…it allows me to have a better chance at coaching and to get my viewpoint across and obviously we’re going to have different ideas and different opinions. So it was nice and yes, I get a huge chance to coach”

(Alex)

The volunteers are given a lot of opportunities to coach therefore having a lot of responsibility within their respective coaching environments. To reinforce the previous statement coach 1 stated;

“If I didn’t tell them [participants] at the start of the season they might think we’re all head coaches, so nobody volunteers. So that’s, like I said before, why I try to give everybody the ability to coach and it’s what I try to do in my coaching sessions.” (Jake)

Similarly, volunteer 1 stated;

“I think they share the responsibility…he [head coach] feels that if he hadn’t told them he was head coach, they probably wouldn’t know, because everybody generally does have a say and we all take different parts of the session anyway.” (Ben)

Likewise, volunteer 2 had a similar viewpoint;

“I completely agree, it’s not like the sessions are completely dictated, the responsibility is pretty much shared with all the coaches, especially in our group. So there could be 4 coaches, who could be deemed head coach at any time, because of the shared responsibility, because of the input they make to the session…with the responsibility being shared between us all, it’s hard to work out who could be head coach as well, so yes.” (Alex)

Throughout the focus group participants reinforced the need to be actively involved within coaching sessions to negate the perceptions of athletes and coaches and to increase influential status. Volunteer 2 suggests;

“I think it’s a lot about, as a volunteer if you’re just going to go there and stand on the side and do absolutely nothing, the kids are going to perceive you in a bad way. If you go and you get involved, there will be opportunities to coach and opportunities to take sessions, so I think it’s a lot about whether you’re going to get actively involved, can you get the opportunity yourself?” (Alex)

Similarly, Volunteer 1 highlighted;
“It depends on how much you get involved in the sessions. Like you said, if you’re someone who’s just going to turn up, stand there, watch a session for say 3 or 4 weeks and then the coach says to you ‘Do you mind taking the warm-up or do you mind taking that session?’ If you jump in then and try to take the session the kids will be looking at you like ‘You haven’t really got any power, you haven’t done anything for the last three or four weeks’, and you’re trying to jump in and grab respect. And get them to listen to what you’re doing so I think if you are quite active generally, as a volunteer, I’d say coaches will give you responsibility. I think that perception of you being a volunteer then is almost forgotten by the kids.

Coach 1 importantly shared an example of a volunteer who does not do a lot in terms of coaching;

“He just stands there, doesn’t really do a lot and they just gazed at him when he took the only warm-up he actually did.” (Jake)

The participants were probed further by suggesting the volunteers have to gain initial power and retain that power to be able to influence participants in further sessions. Volunteer 1 suggested;

“First you’ve almost got to gain that power and if you sit back and don’t get involved they’re just going to perceive you as having no power at all…So I think you should get yourself involved and like you said, hold on to that power or else the kids will perceive you to have a lack of power if you’re not getting yourself involved. And that’s when you don’t get the respect.” (Ben)

Towards the final stages of the focus group it was suggested that an introduction of yourself could potentially negate the negative perceptions volunteers can receive therefore increase the chance of exerting power within the coaching environment. Volunteer 1 suggested;

“I think looking back that might be quite important, the head coach or the head of the academy, will generally come in and say ‘I’m going to be the head coach this year. I have this experience or whatever.’ As a volunteer, I think that’s quite a good point actually…that might be quite an important point in terms of if you make the kids aware that you’re not just a volunteer coming to help you. Actually you’re also pretty much a coach because you have the same qualification and you’ve also got experience. Then I think that might take away that perception of a volunteer not being as qualified or as experienced” (Ben)

Controversially, volunteer 2 had an interesting point to add;

“if you put the work in; if you look active, it’ll make the session really, really easy and I think being deemed a volunteer going in and saying ‘Yes, I have done this and I’ve done this and this’ maybe that could seem arrogant. Saying ‘I’ve worked with these guys and I’ve done this and I’ve done all that.’ It can be perceived as quite cocky by some of the kids and they’d be like who does he think he is? Or they’ll take it differently, and say ‘Great: this guy’s done all this, fantastic! What can I do to please him? What can I do to make him think I’m a better player?” (Alex)
4.6 Volunteer Effectiveness

The participants were asked to give their overall opinions on whether they believe a volunteer can be effective in terms of influencing participants and utilising different types of social power. Coach 1 suggested;

*I think (1) you’re enthusiastic, (2) you’re getting down to a level and (3) you know the players, you can’t go far wrong. If you, as a volunteer, take the time to get to know the players, I think they realise that ‘they know my ability’ and they might not know if he’s a volunteer or not”. (Jake)*

Similarly, volunteer 2 stated;

*“Your actions and the things you do are held in much higher regard than any sort of position. If they can see you’re a good coach and they’re enjoying your session and having a really good time, then they’re not going to worry if you’re a volunteer or anything.” (Ben)*

Interestingly, volunteer 2 advocated the usefulness of demonstrations to contradict the negative perceptions received;

*“If you can actually go in there and demonstrate something with quality where they can see you as a role model, then obviously trying to do that, is a good way of gaining respect and power from the group as well.” (Ben)*

Similarly, volunteer 2 suggested;

*“If you can show what you can do, you’re going to get more respect.” (Alex)*

Throughout the focus group it was suggested that age and more importantly the experience of a coach can play an important role in the overall effectiveness of a volunteer. For example, coach 1 stated;

*I think the higher you go with your badges the term ‘volunteer’ might become more evident in the sessions, and that’s quite annoying to be fair.” (Jake)*

Finally, volunteer 1 stated the greater the age of a coach the more they like to have full control of the coaching session giving little responsibilities to the volunteers;

*I think the way we look at him coaching is he coaches, he’s the head coach and he has all the power…there’s no flexibility within the session and the volunteer probably doesn’t get much opportunity to jump in and say ‘OK, I’m going to do this part.’ And even if he did, the respect the kids would give him would be nowhere near the same respect as they give head coaches who are bit older.” (Ben)*
CHAPER FIVE: DISCUSSION
5.0 Introduction

The following section will draw upon and discuss the results from the present study. Each of the six themes identified will be studied drawing upon existing literature to reinforce findings and attempt to address the main aims of the thesis.

5.1 Legitimate

Legitimate power can be defined as power that originates from an individual’s particular social structure (French and Raven, 1959). Interestingly, this social power has no relation to the skills and/or qualifications a particular person may have or achieved respectively. Thomson (1998) suggests occupying the role of a coach can solely give you a significant amount of legitimate power. Therefore, a volunteer coach who is hierarchically inferior within the field should have limited if not no legitimate power influence. Interestingly, a key finding was that volunteers have difficulty wielding legitimate power within their respective coaching environments. This finding coincides with the work of Wann et al. (2000) who suggested head coaches have more legitimate power than assistants or volunteers. The volunteers suggested that power always resides with the head coach because that’s where the participants “see the power and authority”. Additionally, they shared coaching experiences where they have encountered a lack of engagement from participants which had been interpreted as a lack of legitimate power. The experiences shared were those of a volunteer coach and the lack of engagement however, when the head coach would observe the coaching session an increase in engagement would occur. This evidently demonstrates the difference in legitimate power between a coach and volunteer. Additionally, the example shows the participants attempting to alter the power balance of the developing relationship because of the potential predispositions towards volunteers (Layder, 1996). Ashour (1973) acknowledges there has to be trust between coach and athlete to be able to exert influence. Due to the perceptions volunteers are susceptible to, trust is difficult to achieve from a volunteers perspective, therefore affecting the influence one can have in the coach-athlete relationship.

Results showed that coaches understood the difference in influence and legitimate power because of the social structure they reside in. During the focus group coach 2 stated;

“Legitimate power for the head coach probably comes without saying, because it’s within a social structure. Although on coaching terms we’re equal but within the structure of the academy has given us, we are the head coaches and they’re the volunteer coaches, so that sort of power is always going to be there for the kids,
because we’re always going to have legitimate power, because we are in a higher position.” (Sean)

The recognition of legitimate power dissimilarities affected how the head coaches developed their sessions. They liked to include the volunteers in terms of coaching responsibilities to potentially reduce power differences. This, in turn will alter the power balance within the respective environment leading to an increase in influence and respect.

5.2 Expert Power

Expert power relates to a particular set of skills or knowledge that a person possesses (Slack, 1997). Potrac et al. (2002) suggested power can be gained and lost through knowledge, demonstrations of technique and reputation. This social power is effectively the perceptions a participant has of the coach, rather than their exact qualities. This is highlighted by Johns and Johns (2000) by suggesting athletes comply with a coach according to the perceptions they have of their expertise. The aim of a volunteer is to gain experience to potentially become a coach (Cuskerly et al., 2006), however they also tend to be of a younger age, which raises issues with exercising expert power. In relation to this study, volunteers perceived themselves to have a limited influence in terms of expert power. They suggested that they are understood to have limited knowledge, hence no expertise in the field of coaching. The negative perception of volunteers being young, inexperienced and unpaid results in the loss of respect and influence which in turn will have a consequence on the effectiveness of a volunteer coach.

Wann et al. (2000) also suggested expert power is greater in coaches than assistants and volunteers. However, views from the participants of the study contradict the existing literature by suggesting legitimate power is the only difference between coaches and volunteers. The volunteers suggested that if they are able to demonstrate technical skills or practices effectively then participants will see them as a “role model” and therefore have “more respect” for the coach; whereas if a demonstration is executed poorly then a decline in trust will occur, affecting the power that volunteers can exert. This concurs with Thompson (1998), who suggested the amount of power exercised within an environment is determined by the choices made by the coach. Interestingly, coaches would allow the volunteers to demonstrate frequently in sessions, allowing the volunteers to exert a certain amount of expert power. This exertion of power is dependent on the quality of demonstrations. Tauber (1985) proposed athletes must consent to power being exerted on
them for it to be effective therefore once athletes allow the volunteer to exert power within the environment it is important to embrace that power to remain influential and effective.

Another finding of the study gives an insight into how the coaches perceive the participants view of volunteers and coaches. The coaches felt that the participants only seen the term ‘volunteer’, rather than acknowledging any experience or qualifications gained. This finding suggests coaches and volunteers are equally influential in terms of expert power. Additionally, it emphasises the negative predispositions that a volunteer coach may receive raising concerns for a lack of legitimate power within a social structure.

The findings of the study focused mainly on the exertion of legitimate and expert power, hence only two power variables of French and Ravens (1959) typology of power were discussed. It is important to note that highlighting further social bases of power would widen the results gained and add depth to current conclusions.

5.3 Volunteers: A Coach’s Perspective
To achieve the aims of the present study a decision was made to identify coach’s perceptions regarding a volunteer coach. Warburton et al. (2007) suggested that volunteers are susceptible to negative perceptions from a coach. Interestingly, key findings coincided with literature as coaches identified how volunteers may be viewed negatively within the coaching environment. Coaches suggest volunteers who coach for the first time are exposed to the predispositions of participants therefore not being able to get “respect” or “control” within the environment.

Findings also showed that the term ‘volunteer’ can have a detrimental effect for volunteers and the ability to exert power successfully. For example coach 1 stated;

“In my sessions, any sessions that I use …. Not one time… I’d never ever say, I’ve never called anyone a volunteer, ever. I either call them by their name or I call them my assistant. I would never ever call them a volunteer because maybe then that’s where the respect starts to diminish – like I said – the people who volunteer with me, everyone has the same qualifications. If not, some people have more experience than me, it’s just because I’ve been given that power they think I’ve had years of experience coaching but they don’t know. Some people might have more experience than me. So, yes, I’d never ever use the term ‘volunteer’ in my coaching sessions because the kids might lose respect for the coaches and that’s not what I want.” (Jake)

The perceptions of volunteers are emphasised in the previous narrative. This finding suggests volunteers are viewed negatively within the coaching environment, particularly
working with a head coach as they are perceived to have all the power. Potrac et al. (2002) suggested coaches need to put on a “front or image” to allow participants to consent to the exertion of power (p. 195). From the findings it would appear that volunteers are unable to do so, therefore unable to exert power within the environment. Additionally, coaches need to be able to exert power themselves in order to have an influence, therefore they tend to control the responsibilities given to volunteers. For example;

“If I started to give responsibility to all my volunteers, I think people would start to question me as a coach.” (Jake)

This corresponds with the work of Potrac et al. (2002), who suggested coaches tend to be in full control because they are most accountable. If coaches are in full control, they are likely to have more influence, however if they are giving greater responsibilities to volunteers then exerting power could become a problem in future coaching sessions.

5.4 Volunteers: A Volunteer Perspective

The following theme will build on the knowledge gained from the previous section by discussing a volunteer’s perception of themselves within their respective coaching environments. As previously stated, Warburton et al. (2007) suggested volunteers receive negative perceptions from coach and participants. Interestingly, the volunteers disagreed with this statement by proposing there are no negative perceptions. The volunteers perceive themselves to have “mutual respect” as well as considering themselves as just another coach. However, findings suggest volunteers still perceive themselves to have limited influence when coaching. The volunteers stated that the role doesn’t give you the “respect” needed to be influential to learning, however head coaches have respect thus are able to exert power. Furthermore, Volunteer 2 had an interesting viewpoint to share in relation to the volunteer’s role in society;

“It’s unpaid, it could be deemed therefore that you’re inexperienced, lacking qualifications. Again that role in society is probably seen as inferior to one which is paid and the holder is qualified...from that point of view, it’s hard to get immediate respect from any of the kids if you’re in that kind of less superior role.” (Alex)

It is apparent that the volunteers perceive themselves to have limited power within the environment, which affects their overall influence within a session. Most coaches tend to start as volunteers (Nash & Sproul, 2012) and if they are experiencing such problems then retention of volunteers will diminish, resulting in less accredited coaches.
Findings also show that volunteers perceived themselves to have little influence coaching if they coached irregularly. Additionally, the volunteers added if you coach every 3-4 weeks the participants are likely to refute and give you no respect because of the lack of coaching. According to Potrac et al. (2002), you are always in a state of “proving yourself” and when you are coaching irregularly this is a difficult notion to address (p. 195). This closely follows the work of Tauber (1985), who suggested “power is something in the hands of the person on whom power is being wielded, not in the hands of the presumed power wielder” (p. 7). This literature suggests that by proving yourself, participants will increasingly allow you to exert power over them.

5.5 Bridging the Gap
Throughout the collection of results, ideas were highlighted that could potentially breakdown the barrier of not being able to exert power within the coaching environment. One finding suggested that having a certain amount of responsibility within the session helped break down the negative perceptions of a volunteer coach. The volunteers are allowed to coach consistently within their environment, whether it is on their own or shared with the head coach. As previously mentioned, this allows the volunteers to constantly prove themselves to gain respect, which in turn will improve how much power they can exert. Not only does this improve the power influences of the volunteer but also shows that head coaches within this environment utilise the positives volunteers can transfer to the coaching at the academy. Though coaches have their predispositions, they are constantly trying to improve the effectiveness of a volunteer coach in this respective environment. This undoubtedly will be of great benefit for volunteers as they are able to learn and develop their own coaching philosophies. A similar finding suggested the consideration of being actively involved within the environment. It was proposed by the volunteers that even if you are not coaching regularly, by providing pieces of information to individuals throughout can still influence and build respect that may not be there. Specifically, volunteer 1 stated;

“I think that’s how you gain power, by being involved and not standing around and watching, you have to keep yourself involved and you have to show the kids and demonstrate that you have a knowledge.” (Ben)

Likewise, another finding to potentially negate the problems with the exertion of power would be to retain social power once the athletes allow the volunteer to exert it. The responsibility of the volunteer as well as being actively involved, will have an overall impact
on this notion. Previous suggestions highlighted the importance of proving yourself. If volunteers are responsible and actively involved they have a greater chance of proving themselves in the eyes of participants and even head coaches. Once volunteers are able to influence participants, they have the opportunity to retain power according to their future actions. Future actions are important concepts to consider because simply failing to provide a correct demonstration of a skill can result in a loss of respect particular expert power (Cassidy et al., 2009).

The final finding in relation to this theme was the notion of introducing yourself to participants and coaches, before starting a first coaching session. This concept was highlighted to gain an understanding on whether this idea would help erase the negative perceptions towards a volunteer coach. The idea was appreciated in the fact that it could increase how much power a volunteer could exert within a coaching session. By identifying qualifications gained or playing experience would help develop an image of themselves, which is identified by Potrac et al. (2002). However volunteer 1 suggested this notion could have adverse effects because participants can judge it as being “cocky”, therefore not allowing volunteers to exert power in that sense.

5.6 Volunteer Effectiveness
The study looked to identify whether the term ‘volunteer’ had an impact on the overall effectiveness of coaching sessions. Coach effectiveness is a highly contested notion within existing literature. Côté and Gilbert (2009) suggested there are many definitions of coaching effectiveness. For example, some define effectiveness by win-loss percentages, while others define coaching effectiveness by the experience of a coach (Côté & Gilbert, 2009). For this study, coaching effectiveness will follow the work of Horn (2008). Horn (2008) defined coaching effectiveness by

“Results in either successful performance outcomes (measured either in terms of win-loss percentages, individual player development, or success at the national or international level) or positive psychological responses on the part of the athletes (e.g. high perceived ability, high self-esteem, intrinsic motivational orientation, or high level of sport enjoyment and satisfaction).” (p. 240)

This definition will be used to understand coaching effectiveness. In relation to this study, a key finding suggested volunteers can become effective if they are “enthusiastic” and “know the player” then you can exert power thus becoming an effective coach. Likewise, it was
suggested that “actions” are held in higher regard than any form of “position”. This suggests that to become an effective coach then actions and motives are more important.

Another key finding of the study was to perform successful demonstrations to gain respect and exert expert power as a volunteer coach. This in turn will help to develop an effective coach, as you are able to influence participants to improve technically, tactically and psychologically.

The final finding of the study suggested volunteers could become ineffective if working with a head coach that has more experience and qualifications. The participants suggested the responsibilities given to volunteers are little, because older coaches tend to be in full control. This is a potential problem for volunteers as they are unable to gain experience, which will cause problems in future sessions in relation to gaining respect and being able to exert power within the environment.
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSION
6.0 Conclusion

This study aimed to consider current knowledge of social power and the perceptions of volunteers to help develop an understanding of the role of a volunteer coach using French and Ravens (1959) typology of power. The key finding of the study coincided with the views of Warburton et al. (2007) who suggested volunteers are prone to negative perceptions from head coaches and participants. Results indicated coaches had negative predispositions towards volunteers. Furthermore, volunteers perceived themselves as negative within the environment, particularly in the eyes of participants. In relation to power, results indicated that volunteers perceived themselves to have limited power within the coaching environment therefore effecting the overall influence they have. If volunteers are unable to exert power then participants are unlikely to improve technically, tactically and psychologically when coaching. The question of volunteer effectiveness is then raised. Another key finding of the study found that the amount of responsibility given within a session is perceived to be a solution to the negative perceptions received. If you are actively involved and able to show you qualities as a coach then you can gain respect and the ability to exert power within the coaching environment.

Considering the findings, it is important for coaches who work with volunteers to consider the influence they can have on a session. Following strictly with findings, volunteers will have limited influence which will have a negative impact on coaching sessions. Therefore coaches need to consider how they can integrate volunteers into a session to maximise the potential of power they could exert. By doing this, volunteers could have a similar impact as head coaches by influencing participants to do what they believe is best within the setting. Likewise, if coaches give little responsibly to volunteers then they are unlikely to gain experience and be able to exert power when coaching irregularly. The two coaches of the study understood the limited power of volunteer coaches, therefore integrated the volunteers regularly which increased the amount of power volunteers could exert over the time of their placements.

6.1 Limitations of the study

It would be naive to assume that the findings of the study would coincide with every coaches and volunteers perceptions of the role of a volunteer coach. Therefore, the sample size is a potential limitation of the study. The study consisted of two coaches and two volunteers so an increase in sample size would give greater information, resulting in better results for the overall study. Furthermore, the study followed the perceptions of head
coaches and volunteers without consideration to participant’s perspectives of the role of a volunteer coach. Volunteers perceived to receive negative perceptions from participants, but their actual views were not identified. If the study would have identified the viewpoints of participants then this could have improved on the results gained.

6.2 Recommendation for Future Research
Future research should strive to include more coaches and volunteers and to introduce athletes to compare and contrast findings. These findings could give a more comprehensive view of the role of a volunteer coach. Throughout data collection only legitimate and expert power were identified therefore future studies could identify how volunteers attempt to exert all of French and Ravens (1959) bases of power.
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APPENDIX B

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION FORM
Title of Project: To explore the role of a Volunteer Coach within Academy Football by using French and Raven's Typology of Power

Participant Information Sheet

Background
The purpose of this study is to investigate social power, using your perceptions on your role in the coach-athlete relationship. Through doing this, a better understanding of how power is utilized by a volunteer sports coach, can be gained. This study will take place at Cardiff Metropolitan University by an undergraduate student.

Your participation in the research project

Why you have been asked?
You have been asked to participate in this study because you are a volunteer coach at Cardiff Metropolitan University. You have also been coaching youth football for a maximum of two years, between grass roots and academy level.

What would happen if you agree to participate?
If you agree to participate, there are two main things that will happen.
1. You'll be asked to sign the consent form, agreeing to participate in the study
2. You will then become part of a focus group, with three other volunteers. Within this group, you will be prompted by the researcher to reflect on your own personal perceptions of your role within the coach-athlete relationship.

Are there any risks?
We do not think there are any significant risks if you participate within this study.

Your rights
You will be told that you have the right to withdraw yourself and your data from the study at any time.

What happens to the results after the focus group?
All information gathered will be stored securely on a personal computer, where only my supervisor and I can access the data. Your real names will not be used within the discussion; therefore no personal data will need to be revealed.

Are there any benefits from taking part?
There are no benefits from taking part within the study.

What happens next?
With this letter there is a consent form which needs to be completed, giving your permission to participate. These should be completed as soon as you feel that you fully understand the study and any questions you may have, have been answered.

How we protect your privacy:
Your privacy will be respected throughout this study. Your names will not be used within the focus group, and you will be identified through another name.

All the information about you will be stored securely away from the consent and assent forms. All information gathered will be destroyed at the end of the study. We will only keep
the consent and assent forms with your name. We keep these for ten years as this is a necessity for Cardiff Metropolitan University.

**Further information**
If you have any questions about the research or how we intend to conduct the study, please contact us.

Warwick Drew  
Email: st20006214@outlook.cardiffmet.ac.uk
APPENDIX C

INFORMED CONSENT FORM
PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

Title of Project: To explore the role of a Volunteer Coach within Academy Football by using French and Raven's Typology of Power

Name of Researcher: Warwick Dew

Participant to complete this section: Please initial each box.

1. I confirm that I have read and understand the information given on the information sheet. I have had appropriate time to consider this and any question that I have, have been answered.

2. I understand that my participation is voluntary in this study and I have the right to withdraw at any time.

3. I also understand that if I do withdraw from the study, my relationship with the university will not be affected.

4. I agree to participate in this study.

Name of Participant ____________________________ Date __________

Signature of Participant ____________________________ Date __________

Name of Person taking consent ____________________________ Date __________
APPENDIX D

FOCUS GROUP INTERVIEW GUIDE
Focus Group

Good morning and welcome to our session. Thanks for taking the time to help me with my study. Today we will be talking about the notion of power and in particular the perceptions of how a head coach and volunteer coach deal with this concept within the coaching environment. I will look to gain information from head coaches and volunteers to give me sufficient knowledge of power and this influences the coaching context.

You were invited to take part as you currently coach at an academy either as a head coach or a volunteer. There are no wrong answers but different points of view. I encourage you all to share your views even if it contrasts what others are saying. If there is anything negative to say then feel free as negative comments are just as interesting as the positive ones.

A lot of information will be shared today that is why it will be recorded. It will allow me to transcribe the findings effectively. Obviously you know each other’s names but just to assure you your real names will not be used in my study. Everything is kept completely confidential.

So could you tell me a little about yourself with regards your sporting background? So for instance, what sport do you play, how long have you been coaching/volunteering within that sport and what qualifications do you have? tell me about yourself…

Ok, Thanks for that.

To begin, I would like to give you some insight into the intended nature of the thesis. The purpose of this study is to investigate French and Ravens (1959) bases of social power, using your perceptions on your role in the coach-athlete relationship. Through doing this, a better understanding of how power is utilized by a head coach and volunteer sports coach, can be gained. With regards to this Potrac and Jones (2010) considered power as an omnipresent feature in social life as well as sports coaching; indeed Tauber (1985) suggested ‘power is something in the hands of the person on whom power is being wielded, not in the hands of the presumed’

1. **(All)** So considering such a notion how does this manifest itself within your coaching/volunteering environment?

   **Probes**
   - Do you understand the notion of power?
   - Do you use it?
   - How do you use it

   Thank you for giving me your understanding of how you feel power permeates itself in your respective environments.

2. **(All)** Could you now tell me your role within your related areas and what is expected of you within them roles?
3. **(Volunteers)** Do you have the opportunity to coach within sessions? If yes, why, If not, why?

4. **(Volunteers)** Does the head coach give you responsibility within a session?

   **Probes**
   - Can you plan and complete a session
   - Can you suggest ideas
   - Coercive power
   - Reward power

Some coaches like to have full control within an environment. I understand that you coach within an academy setup however Potrac, Jones and Armour (2002) noted coaches tend to be in full control of participants and coaching situations because they are most accountable.

5. **(Head Coaches)** With this statement in mind is this something you agree with? Why?

6. **(Head Coaches)** Does this affect the overall responsibility you give to volunteers?

7. **(Volunteers)** Can you think back to a time when an athlete(s) have challenged you in a coaching environment? (Provide own example to give insight to what is being asked).

   **Probes**
   - Misbehaving
   - No co-operation
   - Visual differences between head coach co-operation with athletes compared to own.

8. **(Volunteers)** According to Warburton et al. (2000) volunteers receive negative perceptions from head coaches. Is this something you agree with? Why?

9. **(All)** Moving on from the previous question, according to Wann, Metcalf, Brewer and Whiteside (2000) head coaches perceive to have more legitimate and expert power than assistants/volunteers? Would you agree with this statement, why?

10. **(Volunteers)** In relation to the previous question and French and Ravens (1959) bases of power do you think as a volunteer, others perceive you to have limited power within the coaching environment? Why?

    **Probes**
    - Athletes
    - Coaches
11. *(All)* Do you think this is because of the term ‘volunteer’ and its perceived role in society?  

**Probes**  
- Unpaid  
- Inexperience  
- Lack of qualifications

12. *(All)* Relating back to Warburton’s (2000) statement and question 11, do you think the term ‘volunteer’ effects how effective one can be in the coaching environment?

Thankyou for taking part in my study, is there anything that you would like to add that may not have been covered within the interview? Ok, once the interview has transcribed I will send all of you a copy so that you can check that the views that you have expressed are reflected in the final transcription.

END OF FOCUS GROUP.