

Cardiff School of Sport
DISSERTATION ASSESSMENT PROFORMA:
 Empirical ¹

Student name:	THOMAS DAVIES	Student ID:	ST20034769
Programme:	SC		
Dissertation title:	AN INVESTIGATION INTO HOW PANOPTICISM AND COACH DISCOURSE INTERACT WHEN EMPOWERMENT IS UTILISED AS A COACHING METHOD.		
Supervisor:	KERRY HARRIS		
Comments	Section		
	<p>Title and Abstract (5%)</p> <p>Title to include: A concise indication of the research question/problem. Abstract to include: A concise summary of the empirical study undertaken.</p>		
	<p>Introduction and literature review (25%)</p> <p>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).</p>		
	<p>Methods and Research Design (15%)</p> <p>To include: details of the research design and justification for the methods applied; participant details; comprehensive replicable protocol.</p>		
	<p>Results and Analysis (15%) ²</p> <p>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.</p>		
	<p>Discussion and Conclusions (30%) ²</p> <p>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.</p>		
	<p>Presentation (10%)</p> <p>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</p>		

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.

² There is scope within qualitative dissertations for the RESULTS and DISCUSSION sections to be presented as a combined section followed by an appropriate CONCLUSION. The mark distribution and criteria across these two sections should be aggregated in those circumstances.

CARDIFF METROPOLITAN UNIVERSITY
Prifysgol Fetropolitan Caerdydd

CARDIFF SCHOOL OF SPORT

DEGREE OF BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (HONOURS)

SPORT COACHING

2014-15

**AN INVESTIGATION INTO HOW PANOPTICISM AND
COACH DISCOURSE INTERACT WHEN
EMPOWERMENT IS UTILISED AS A COACHING
METHOD.**

(Dissertation submitted under the COACHING area)

THOMAS DAVIES

ST20034769

**AN INVESTIGATION INTO HOW PANOPTICISM AND
COACH DISCOURSE INTERACT WHEN
EMPOWERMENT IS UTILISED AS A COACHING
METHOD.**

Cardiff Metropolitan University
Prifysgol Fetropolitán 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). I further certify that the work was either deemed to not need ethical approval or was entirely within the ethical approval granted under the code entered below.

Ethical approval code: 14/5/76U

Word count: 11999

Name: Thomas Davies

Date: 18/03/15

Certificate of Dissertation Supervisor responsible

I am satisfied that this work is the result of the student's own effort and was either deemed to not need ethical approval (as indicated by 'exempt' above) or was entirely within the ethical approval granted under the code entered above.

I have received dissertation verification information from this student

Name: _____

Date: _____

Notes:

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	i
CHAPTER ONE	
INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Introduction	1
CHAPTER TWO	
LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Empowerment	6
2.3 Panopticism	9
2.4 Discourse	12
CHAPTER THREE	
METHODOLOGY	
3.1 Introduction	15
3.2 Rationale	15
3.3 Procedures	17
3.4 Data Analysis	19
3.5 Issues of Validity, Reliability and Trustworthiness	19
3.6 Issues and Ethical Considerations	20
CHAPTER FOUR	
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	
4.1 Keeping Up Appearances	22
4.2 Instilling Normal Through Discourse	25
4.3 Contesting Panopticism and Creating Docile Bodies	30

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

1.1	Summary	35
1.2	Strengths and Limitations	36
1.3	Future Research Recommendations	36
	REFERENCE LIST	38

Abstract

This study set out to investigate how Panopticism and discourse influence the utilisation of empowerment as a coaching method. Further to this, how Panopticism and discourse impact upon the actions of the athlete during empowerment. The study specifically looks at the behaviours of the athlete during empowerment, and the coach discourse that creates this normative behaviour. Using non-participant observation and unobtrusive recordings, in line with grounded theory, allowed for discourse analysis and an understanding of the nature of interactions which occur. The study found that athletes have their experiences and choices framed by their coaches. It was discussed that the athletes undertake normative behaviours as a result of coach discourse as well as the operating of Panopticism, in some cases rendering them docile. The study discovered that Panopticism is a transient and contested notion, and that disciplinary power is inherent with the hierarchical structure. Future research can be geared towards investigating the notion of electronic Panopticism and the interaction occurring through technology.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Sport regularly acts as a reflection of society. Throughout history it can be seen that sport acts as a looking glass into the social climate. Consider the following example: Mob-football, a Nineteenth Century working class game characterised by violence. This was a reflection of the harsh lifestyle of the working classes (Guttman, 2004). This clearly illustrates how sport can reflect social climate. At present Britain is in a post-modern era, defined by democracy and equality (Denham, 2000). This democracy is reflected in sport through the use of empowerment and other methods, whereby the roles of the coach and athlete are shifted (Jones, 2006).

Empowerment is a widely promoted approach to coaching (Kidman, 2001), based around the notion that it is advantageous for athletes to be actively involved in the decision making process and to be given responsibility for their own learning. For this to occur, the coach must give power to the athlete, it must be noted that this power cannot be assumed but must be granted by the higher authority of the coach as empowerment is based around working collectively (Jones, 2006). Rogers (1983) suggested that empowerment, or as he termed it, 'a person-centred approach', better facilitates learning when compared to the more prescriptive style of teaching, citing the German educational systems. The German education system follows a constructivist philosophy which allows the learners to construct their own knowledge, much like the empowerment approach to coaching. This constructivist approach to learning in Germany has been seen to improve examination results compared to the prescriptive approach (Kunter & Baumert, 2006). This constructivist approach originated in education, and sport has been comparatively slow in adopting this approach despite its multiple advantages.

The advantages of empowerment were highlighted by Kidman (2001), amongst others (e.g. Jones, 2006, Jones & Standage, 2006). These include: higher levels of intrinsic motivation, skill retention and understanding. These are thought to be a consequence of athletes having greater involvement in their own development. Furthermore, an athlete taking an active role in their learning is thought to promote self-sufficiency, self-awareness and decision making (Kidman, 2001).

It has been argued that empowerment has multiple advantages. However, it appears many coaches are hesitant to employ empowerment and the traditional approach to coaching (or prescriptive approach) is still widely used and accepted (Jones, 2006). Potrac and Jones (2009) contend that coaching is inherently power-laden and empowerment requires a reorganisation of power hierarchy. This reorganisation may become easier with the progressively increasing inclusion of empowerment in coach education. This means that

more coaches are educated upon the benefits of empowerment, making this reorganisation of hierarchy more likely. It is assumed that coaches who employ empowerment as a coaching method entrust their athletes with more responsibility and grant decision making powers (Kidman, 2001). However Jones, Armour and Potrac (2004) suggested that coaches do not fully entrust athletes with these responsibilities and that it is merely an 'illusion'. This 'illusion' is shaped by the athlete's fear of being subjected to disciplinary power by figures in a more powerful hierarchical position (Jones et al, 2004). This fear of disciplinary power and the conformist behaviours produced are akin to Michel Foucault's (1979) concept of Panopticism.

Panopticism, in brief, is the idea that athletes wish to be seen as being compliant to the unwritten contextual 'rules' which are often dictated by the coach and, although empowered, the idea of self-surveillance supersedes the wish to be viewed as non-deviant (Foucault, 1979). There is little in the area of coaching which links these concepts together, though they seem interlinked. In both, empowerment and Panopticism, the coach remains seen as the figure in a superior hierarchical position and therefore capable of employing disciplinary power to achieve the desired behaviours. Athletes do not wish to be disciplined and will behave in a manner which avoids such a consequence (Foucault, 1979). A clear example is highlighted by Johns and Johns (2000) whereby elite gymnasts control their own nutritional intake. The coach scrutinises the gymnasts body shapes and weight thus promoting self-surveillance, mainly through extreme dieting. This exemplifies how the coach dictates what is deemed 'normal', as shown through their discourse, as such, athletes comply with practices which ensure they adhere to these norms to avoid further discipline.

It has been noted throughout literature that coaches struggle with the 'giving away' of power, it may be viewed that this makes their own position redundant (Jones, 2006). Therefore, rather than empowering athletes, coaches create a context more akin to the 'illusion' of empowerment (Jones et al, 2004). Kidman (2001) suggests that empowerment does not make coaches redundant but involves a transition in their role. Instead of being viewed as the sole source of knowledge they become a facilitator of learning. This would suggest that coaches are still the main stakeholder of power in the coach-athlete relationship and that their role is now to create an environment and provide resources allowing the athlete to feel comfortable in making decisions without prejudice (Kidman, 2001).

Denison and Scott-Thomas (2011) suggest that coaches are viewed as 'agents of normalisation' and that the practices which coaches carry out are viewed as normal whereas alternative styles of practice would be seen as deviant. Foucault (1979) suggests that the notion of surveillance causes a 'normalisation' of behaviour due to the fear of being exposed to disciplinary power if they express anything other than conformist behaviours. This, again, shows the link between both empowerment and Panopticism as the conformist behaviours that occur during empowerment derive from the fear of disciplinary power.

This is a qualitative study following Sparkes and Smith's (2014) protocol for 'complete observation'. It was researched from an *etic* position, meaning that the researcher is not immersed within that culture (Sparkes & Smith, 2014). Once the data is gathered it was analysed using Elo and Kyngas' (2008) model for deductive content analysis, meaning patterns were discovered and separated into sub-themes whereby links were evident. The participants of the study were contained with Barchester Football Academy or Hockey Club.

This study is concerned with how Foucault's (1979) notion of Panopticism influences the utilisation of empowerment as a coaching method. Furthermore, how it impacts upon the actions of the athlete when empowered. This study aims to answer this research question through answering a series of sub-questions, as follows:

- To identify whether coaches use empowerment and how they do so.
- The extent to which coaches impact on athletes behaviours during empowerment.
- The degree to which coaches use empowerment and the extent to which athletes are actually empowered.
- Examine the types of discourse used to empower athletes.
- Why the players take this responsibility – because of the benefits of empowerment or issues to do with Panopticism?

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

The coaching process is argued to be complex and ambiguous as many facets make up its overall composition. These facets include the unpredictable nature of social interaction as one context will almost certainly never be replicated exactly, reinforcing the notion that coaching is complex (Cushion, 2007).

This, in part, is due to the nature of the balance of power within the coach-athlete relationship. Power is the capacity to act or influence actions (Collins Dictionaries, 2012) hence it can be inferred that coaches have only partial control. Athletes always have the capacity to withdraw from the coaching context (Markula & Pringle, 2006) which consequently impacts upon coaches' actions. Hence, it cannot be suggested that coaching is rationalistic and sequential when this power construct is so transient. An equifinality approach to coaching should be adopted; meaning coaches should accept there is a multiplicity of methods to achieve goals (Jones, Edwards, & Irineu, In Press). This concurs with the belief of ambiguity in coaching and how interpretations of information can alter between athletes (Jones & Wallace, 2005).

Empowerment

Empowerment has become a much debated coaching method with multiple authors claiming its advantages as well as stating its limitations. Kidman (2001) has become, possibly, one of the most prominent authors in this area. She defines it as a coaching style in which the emphasis is on the athlete as a constructor of knowledge and for them to take responsibility for their choices. Theodore (1985) suggests that empowerment is the process of "owning the capacity to act, rather than be acted on" (p.161). This means that being empowered denotes the transfer of power to the athlete. Transferring power to the athlete requires a change in role for the coach. They must now view their role as a facilitator of knowledge (Kidman, 2001). It must be noted that this transfer of power can make coaches feel redundant (Jones, 2006); similarly athletes may view empowerment with hostility as it can be perceived as the coach being uncertain and unknowledgeable (Kidman & Lombard, 2010).

It is widely highlighted that coaching is in a period of transition from the traditional prescriptive approach towards a more democratic approach (Kidman, 2001). This may

cause a dilemma for coaches, as literature highlights advantages and limitations for both coaching styles. Jones and Standage (2006) highlighted that coaching remains prescriptive. Denison and Mills (2014) note an imbalance in coaching in favour of control and conformity rather than the creation of thinking bodies. It could be argued that coach education may be responsible for this imbalance. Jones (2001) suggesting that, until recently, coach education promoted this more prescriptive approach to coaching, whereby the coach was viewed as the sole source of knowledge and power in the coaching context causing the traditional, prescriptive, approach to coaching, to resonate.

Denison (2007) suggests that coaching using this prescriptive method creates docile bodies. This style of coaching views the body as the sole target of power and coaches exercise this power accordingly. Denison (2007) states that when coaches prescribe training plans, which control every aspect of practice, this creates a docile body which removes the athlete from 'being' and creates an embodiment of an athlete who is subject to the coach. Empowerment seeks to move away from this view of athletes as docile 'machine-like' bodies. Downing (2001, cited in Lyle & Cushion, 2010) stated that coaches can remain invested in athlete's development whilst allowing athletes to construct their own knowledge. Denison (2007) noted that his omission of empowering his athletes led them to become docile bodies.

The advantages of empowerment have been noted throughout literature. It has been suggested that empowerment causes athletes to experience higher intrinsic motivation which is linked with the experiencing of higher ownership of practices (Kidman & Lombard, 2010). This higher intrinsic motivation is thought to increase enjoyment in practice due to increased self-investment (Kidman, 2001). It also increases understanding and retention of knowledge, as this knowledge is self-generated and so more meaningful to the participant (Kidman, 2001). Kidman and Lombard (2010) suggest that in the long-term the empowerment approach to coaching maximises performance; this is thought to link with the nature of practices during empowerment. They are akin to the games for understanding approach (Butler, 2005), whereby practices undertaken are thought to relate to game scenarios (Kidman & Lombard, 2010). Athletes can see the consequences of their actions and learn from their decisions thus improving their future decision-making skills (Smith, 2014). Lee, So-Hee Kim, and Kang (2013) highlight that empowerment increases feelings of self-sufficiency, self-determination and perceived competence in relation to those who were being coached through a prescriptive coaching style.

Roberts (2013) suggested that coaching style is context specific. He noted that, although he is a firm believer in the notion of empowerment, it may not always be the most effective or appropriate method. Kidman and Lombard (2010) suggested that in contexts where there are time-constraints empowerment may not be effective in facilitating learning as it can be a slow process. Bennie and O'Connor (2010) question empowerments use in performance-focus sports. The need to achieve can mean that coaches do not allow for empowerment as they do not wish abdicate responsibility as ultimately it is the coach who is responsible for results (Jones & Standage, 2006). Elite athletes are less willing to accept power as, traditionally, success has come from prescriptive coaching (Jones, 2001). This correlates with Kidman and Lombard's (2010) notion that empowerment can cause athletes to perceive their coaches as being uncertain and unknowledgeable. Contrastingly, Kevin Pieterse (2014) stated that "you have to know what works for you. If you need to find something out, you go and find out. If you want to be good you'll do that (p.213)." Therefore, he suggests that athletes need this autonomy to be successful. Jones (2006) suggested that empowerment within a group is constrained by micro-politics, whereby a natural leader will emerge. It is argued that the group will follow this natural leader's agenda. Jones and Standage (2006) suggest that there is a complex coexistence between those athletes who wish to have more power and those who do not. This is a reflection of the complex coexistence between those who wish to maintain the current traditional, prescriptive, approach and those who wish to change to a more democratic approach to coaching.

In recent years empowerment has been progressively included into coach education courses. It has been highlighted that for empowerment to be an increasingly utilised coaching method a re-examination of how to implement it and the benefits is required (Jones, 2001). The present coaching culture remains prescriptive (Jones & Standage, 2006); for learning to occur best then this culture needs to shift towards an empowerment approach. For an empowerment approach to be accepted the culture needs to be adapted (Kidman, 2001). Firstly, the culture within a coaching context is reflective of the coach's beliefs. Secondly, coaches must promote communication between athletes as well as between coach and athletes. (Ibid, 2001) Thirdly, creating a culture whereby athletes are involved in the decision-making process promotes holistic athlete development. Finally, a culture whereby athletes feel safe in making mistakes must be created and, as suggested by Steve Hansen, New Zealand Rugby Union Coach, the team must control the culture in order to feel safe in making mistakes.

It has been questioned throughout the rise in popularity of empowerment whether true empowerment is possible or viable. Lee et al (2013) suggest that coaches induce followers into following an unwritten framework to transform their vision into practice. Kirk (1992) similarly found that norms, attitudes, and beliefs are adopted by athletes due to the coach's superior hierarchical position. Potrac and Jones (2011) suggest that due to this perceived hierarchical superiority, the coach's discourse acts as a 'normalising gaze'. This leads to athlete self-surveillance as athletes wish to be viewed as 'normal'. Therefore, when empowered athletes act out behaviours they are expected to in order to avoid being viewed as deviant thus avoiding disciplinary power. This questions whether true empowerment is possible or whether it is always subject to some degree of Panopticism.

Panopticism

Foucault (1979) suggested that the human body is a site to be subjugated. It is this subjugation which led Foucault (1979) to establish the concept of Panopticism. This notion is based around Jeremy Bentham's architectural design to maximise disciplinary power with minimal observation (Jones, Potrac, Cushion & Tore-Ronglan, 2011). These designs consisted of prison cells facing inwards towards a central tower, however, inmates could not view into the central tower. This ensured that the inmates did not know whether they were being observed. This normalised behaviour for fear of disciplinary power (Jones et al, 2011). Foucault (1991) stated that the main aim of the Panopticon (the central tower) was to engender 'a state of consciousness and permanent visibility that assures automatic functioning of power' (p.201). This is the concept of 'invisible omniscience', whereby the disciplinarian can choose whether to be seen or remain invisible but - whether they are seen or unseen - the concept of surveillance and its ensuing enforcement of behaviours prevails (Adams, 2009). In the eyes of the inmate the tower is a visible representation of power and discipline though it is never known to the inmate whether the tower is manned. This enforces a self-policing of behaviours and it is this invisibility which maintains order (Foucault,1979). As Bentham said it is the 'power of mind over mind (of the inmates)'. This self-surveillance causes inmates to become conforming and docile (Jones et al, 2011).

Dobson and Fisher (2010) state that there are three stages of Panopticism. The first stage is the above example of architectural structure. The second stage is that of electronic Panopticism. It is noted that this electronic Panopticism stretches beyond public spaces and buildings. George Orwell named this concept "Big Brother" in his novel, 1984. This concept of "Big Brother" instilled fear in people that a totalitarian government could view

what people were doing in private and punish them accordingly (Orwell, 1950). One means of achieving this was through the use of closed circuit television cameras (CCTV) being used to monitor public spaces (Dobson & Fisher, 2010). They received a mixed reaction as they promoted normative behaviour but reduced crime rates.

The third stage of Panopticism is that of the surveillance society. This is the new breed of surveillance technology such as Global Positioning Systems (GPS) which allow for human tracking (Dobson & Fisher, 2010). The example highlighted by Dobson and Fisher (2010) was that of a delivery driver. Their lunch hours are measured exactly, as are the routes they take to ensure they are taking the quickest possible. The drivers know they are being monitored through this technology and conform accordingly. This third stage of Panopticism is openly obtrusive and openly accepted. This stage of Panopticism has been a result of, as well as a cause of, societal revolution which has accepted this Panopticism as commonplace (Dobson & Fisher, 2010); this societal revolution appears so insidious that it has gone unnoticed. This is the breeding ground of, seemingly, unidirectional power relationships between, for example, the employer and the employee such as the delivery driver, or more fittingly here, the coach and the athlete.

It is critical to note that Panopticism at no point involves the use of physical or verbal punishment but merely the self-policing for fear of such disciplinary power (Foucault, 1991, Denison, 2007). It has been noted by sport sociologists that sport encourages these normalising behaviours through the use of disciplinary power (Johns & Johns, 2000). In a sporting context this suggests that the coach acts as the Panopticon, with the athlete performing the 'inmate' role. It was suggested by Halas and Hansen (2001) that coaches are viewed as 'agents of normalisation'. Therefore, the coach creates the social norms of the group and dictates what is accepted. It is this 'normalisation' which allows the concept of Panopticism to operate. Foucault (1979) suggests that conformative behaviours occur to avoid disciplinary power. This disciplinary power is used to create what coaches term 'productive bodies' but as Denison (2007) highlighted, these bodies are simply docile and have an automaton identity. Denison and Mills (2014) argued that although a body can be made productive in achievement terms, they can simultaneously become docile as they may lose the capability to think for themselves.

Such docility instilled in the athlete arguably creates a culture of self-surveillance (Johns & Johns, 2000). Johns and Johns (2000) note the importance of body shape and size in certain aesthetic centred sports. Coaches often reinforce this importance through their discourse thus promoting self-surveillance of, in this case, excessive dieting. In one case highlighted by Johns and Johns (2000) it was noted that it was not merely the discourse but also the actions of the coach which promoted self-surveying behaviour:

“One coach would weigh us 4 times a day was ridiculous. We had to weigh before each practice and that made us really self-conscious. And then she would say ‘You’re fat, why do you weigh more than you weighed this morning? What did you eat this afternoon that made you weigh more?’” (p.228)

This shows how the coach’s actions impact upon athletes’ behaviours. The coach’s actions instil behaviours in order to avoid disciplinary power. In the above case highlighted by Johns and Johns (2000) the coach’s behaviours and discourse impact upon the athletes’ behaviours by promoting conformity in order to avoid exposure to further disciplinary power. Denison (2007) suggested that this disciplinary power controls the life of its subjects as seen in the above example as these athletes go on to self-survey their diet. This further questions whether athletes can be truly empowered, or whether this notion of self-surveillance for fear of disciplinary power controls behaviours, further reinforcing Jones’ (2004) notion of the ‘illusion of empowerment’.

As previously highlighted, part of empowerment is the dissemination of power from the coach. It is notable that this power can be retracted. This seemingly unidirectional power exchange begins to question the extent to which athletes are truly empowered (Jones et al, 2004). It is this possibility of retraction of power which causes athletes to comply with the ‘norms’ of the context (Jones & Standage, 2006). This was termed the ‘illusion of empowerment’ whereby an athlete still enacts the coach’s desired behaviours (Jones et al, 2004). Ozarelli (2003) suggests that institutional norms are embedded within individuals, it is these norms which are replicated. Ozarelli (2003) goes on to suggest that deviance from these institutional norms are viewed as ineffective and are disciplined accordingly. Jones and Standage (2006) suggest that current coaching culture remains authoritarian. Lee et al (2013) suggest that effective coaches can induce athletes into following an unwritten framework which transforms the coach’s vision into reality. This leads to the creation of docile bodies as exemplified by Denison (2007). A culture whereby empowerment is

accepted by the athlete is required for true empowerment to be successful. However, it can be questioned whether coaches wish for true empowerment to occur or whether they wish athletes to be subject to the 'normalising gaze'. This may be influenced by coaches being subject to result pressure (Jones & Standage, 2006), as they are ultimately responsible for the success of the athletes and therefore do not wish to give total responsibility to the athlete as this will make themselves redundant (Jones, 2006).

Discourse

In order to analyse the influence that discourse has on the above components, the key concepts must be fully understood. Cassidy, Jones and Potrac (2009) state that discourse is the language used to describe and explain. This can include framing activities. This 'framing' of activities can be done overtly through prescriptive means, or covertly through use of gestures, descriptors and metaphors, either way it is the process of painting a picture in the recipients mind (Sabo & Jensen, 1994). This suggests that language is a means of transmitting one's ideology, as through an individual's discourse prioritisation of ideals occur. This agrees with Lee et al's (2013) suggestion that coach discourse aims to transfer a vision into practice.

To exemplify the notion that discourse reflects ideology, Kirk (1992) suggests that a modern day discourse states that the only socially celebrated somatotype is that of a mesomorph and anything else is deviant. In coaching this is also true. Cassidy et al (2009) suggest that coach discourse reflects that of his/her private agenda. Thus, whichever coaching method is used, their discourse will reflect what they wish to occur within that training session. This highlights how discourse can instil behaviours within athletes, this in turn emphasises how discourse can empower and control athletes simultaneously (Cassidy et al, 2009). This may be partially achieved through the roots and wings metaphor. The coach gives the athletes structure in respect of what he/she wishes to occur (roots) but also issue the athlete with freedoms to express their own agency (wings) (Ogilvie, 2013). The roots and wings metaphor emphasises how coaches can both empower and control the behaviours of the athlete simultaneously (Ogilvie, 2013). A further note must be made that not all discourse is limiting; it can also be enabling, as coach discourse can allow for the opportunity for sense making, through processes such as questioning (Kirk, 1992).

Coaching discourse is influenced by coach education and is based largely within the realm of scientific functionalism resulting in a bioscientific discourse, where the body is viewed as an automaton to be acted upon (Buttryn & Masucci, 2003). This bioscientific discourse promotes the coach as being the bearer of 'factual' knowledge whilst the athlete is viewed as being 'in need' of this knowledge (Cassidy et al, 2009).

Bioscientific discourse produces a view that conflict between the ideals of coach and athlete is dysfunctional. This is contradictory to the widely accepted notion that coaching is a contested and complex phenomenon (Jones, 2000 cited in Cushion, Armour & Jones, 2003). This bioscientific discourse is in line with the widely utilised prescriptive approach to coaching whereby the coach is viewed as the sole knowledge-bearer (Kidman, 2001).

Coach's discourse plays a major role in the behaviours of athletes as highlighted by Johns and Johns (2000). Coaches dictate what is 'normal' through their discourse and what is deviant (Halas & Hansen, 2001). Johns and Johns (2000) state that this is due to the coach's hierarchical position, especially in sports reliant upon a certain aesthetic. Coach discourse reflects this aesthetic focus and promotes excess dieting as normative behaviour (Johns & Johns, 2000). This is a clear example of how coach discourse can instil behaviours into athletes.

This instilling of behaviours through prescriptive means is juxtaposed to the key principles of empowerment (Kidman, 2001). Denison (2007) suggests that his discourse (although he previously believed it to promote equal debate) created a docile body as the athlete merely stated what he thought Denison wished to hear. This reinforces the notion that coaches must be aware of their own discourse in order to understand its impacts upon the athlete (Johns & Johns, 2000). This shows how discourse can instil behaviours and strengthens Halas and Hansen's (2001) view that coaches are viewed as the 'agents of normalisation'. Discourse transmits such ideology, and this ideology is replicated for fear of disciplinary action (Johns & Johns, 2000). It is this fear of disciplinary power which allows the notion of Panopticism to function; it is clear how discourse can reinforce this fear of disciplinary power and promote self-surveillance.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

Gratton and Jones (2004) state that there are three central approaches to the nature of knowledge acquisition: positivism, reductionism and interpretivism. These differ in theories of knowledge acquisition which, in turn, impact upon the data collection process and the subsequent data analysis procedure (Phillips & Barbules, 2000).

Positivism is based upon scientific approach to research, measuring facts and figures and is generally based within the quantitative realm of research. Most early research within sport was based within positivism, although recently other approaches have become increasingly commonplace (Ibid, 2004). Ibid (2004) noted that positivism plays little attention to intangible concepts such as emotional factors influencing athletes. Sparkes and Smith (2014) state that reductionism is the process of analysing, and describing a complex phenomenon by breaking it down to its individual explanatory components. It is arguable that in social investigations, populations are too unpredictable to describe by observations of individuals. Reductionism can be based upon both tangible and intangible phenomena.

It is these intangible factors upon which interpretivism is based. Sources of data in an interpretivist approach stem from the subjects themselves. Interpretivists are concerned with appreciating the interactions and behaviours in the social world which are reproduced on a continual basis (Blaikie, 2000). Inherently within interpretivism is the notion of interpreting the data. This means that outcomes were influenced by the interpretation of the researcher (Sparkes & Smith, 2014). As the aim of the study is based upon how Foucault's (1979) notion of Panopticism influences athletes' behaviours, this study sits within the interpretivist approach. The following chapter will outline the rationale for the chosen method of data collection and analysis.

Rationale

The study in question sits in the realm of the interpretivism, as the source of the raw data stems from participants themselves. It was decided not to use an ethnographic study as

Sparkes and Smith (2014) highlighted that, circumstantially, it can be difficult to fully appreciate the subconscious impact that an external person or phenomenon is having when contained within that culture. In this study, the researcher felt that they could not fully appreciate the impacts that a coach has upon the athlete's behaviour when empowered, as they would themselves be immersed within that culture. The researcher felt they needed to adopt an *etic* position, whereby they look from outside the culture inwardly (Sparkes & Smith, 2014).

Interviews are commonly utilised in interpretivism, especially when the required data is concerned with explaining phenomena. It is recognised that interviews can be insightful in terms of both content and manner in which it is conveyed (Gratton & Jones, 2010). Furthermore, interviews can result in unexpected data emerging which can reveal personal insights conveying information that can alter the expected study direction. Sparkes, Partington and Brown (2007) conducted an interview study whereby they were primarily considering the creation of 'Jock Culture' in a sporting institution. However, it emerged from interviewing the alumni that Jock Culture was institutionalised, as a minority had been immersed in the Jock Culture of the army but found it to be vastly contrasting to that of the sporting institution (Sparkes et al, 2007).

The omission of interviews from this study was due to the nature of the study itself in spite of the advantages highlighted above. The study is based around the notion of Panopticism and, explicitly, how coaches influence athletes' behaviour. This limits the reliability of interviews as the data stemming from the participant may be influenced by the coach or, arguably, the answers may be influenced by the interviewer. The notion of the 'normalizing gaze' may be deeply embedded within the athlete and may impact upon their discourse when discussing the coaching context. This is highlighted in Denison (2007) whereby 'Brian' answered his coach's question with a similar answer to a parallel scenario which the coach had previously prescribed. This emphasises how coaches can subconsciously impact upon athlete discourse. It was decided, therefore, that conducting interviews which could be hindered by the phenomenon in question could be inherently detrimental to the resulting data.

It must be noted that qualitative research is dominated by interviews as Kellehear (1993) states: "A simple and persistent belief that knowledge about people is available simply by asking. (p.1)" Kellehear (1993) argues that to think interviews are the most effective data collection method in all interpretivist studies would be naïve. Unobtrusive methods are those measures which have minimal impact on the social environment and which are

being experienced or witnessed in their organic state (Gratton & Jones 2010). Therefore, data collected was that of behaviours in their true state rather than in their reported state (Smith, 2010). Though behaviours may be organic, without researcher interaction, it may be difficult to truly appreciate the nature of interactions. An example of unobtrusive research methods is that of non-participant observation.

O'Reilly (2012) sums up non-participant observation as follows: 'Participating enables the strange to become familiar, observing enables the familiar to become strange' (P.112). Observation allows contextual understanding of behaviours and exchanges. Sparkes and Smith (2014) highlight how observation can allow for the unquestioned to become questioned; phenomena taken for granted are investigated. Wacquant's (2004) participant observation of a boxing culture in Chicago exemplifies how elements of life that were taken for granted are questioned through observation. Wacquant's (2004) work was based in a boxing gym situated in gangland Chicago. Whilst the streets were treacherous due to the gangland warfare, the boxing gym was viewed by gang members, often of opposing gangs, as a safe haven. Wacquant (2004) observed the transformation from the 'hard man' image to the athlete in pursuit of sporting achievement. Furthermore, he explains the social interactions within the gym that enabled this. This example highlights the benefit of observations to both witness and explain the underlying cause of what has been observed.

Looking at the above discussion regarding a select few research methods, it was decided that observation would be the chosen research method: specifically, 'complete observer' observation. Observations as a 'complete observer' is otherwise known as non-participant observation. The researcher embodies the metaphor, 'fly on the wall' (Sparkes & Smith, 2014), meaning the observer is neither interacting nor involved within the observed environment. The researcher in this study has an *etic* position, as they do not participate within the culture (Sparkes & Smith, 2014). Furthermore, it was decided that for discourse to be analysed unobtrusive recording would take place in the form of a tie-clip microphone, allowing for discourse analysis to occur (Gratton & Jones, 2010).

Discourse analysis, in this case, will be situated in line with Foucauldian discourse analysis (FDA). FDA is concerned with the creation of power relations through discourse (Sparkes & Smith, 2014). Power in FDA is relational but it is this use of power which interests us and can indicate underlying social processes, including those with which this study is concerned (Ibid, 2014).

Procedures

Smith (2010) suggests that in order to undertake observational research four steps must be adhered to. He states that there must be an appreciation of the basic concepts of theories but the researchers remain in a position whereby the theoretical frameworks can emerge from the data, akin to grounded theory (Martin & Turner, 1986). Secondly, decide on an appropriate sample. Thirdly, determine a clear method of data recording which is both ethically approved and appropriate. Finally, a pilot study should be undertaken to provide a platform for any difficulties in data collection to emerge without influencing the information used for the study.

Theoretical Frameworks

In terms of the theoretical frameworks under investigation, the study is concerned with Panopticism, discourse and their impact and interactions when participants are empowered. Of these variables only discourse can be recorded tangibly. What is contained within discourse can indicate the extent to which participants are empowered. Furthermore, it can indicate the extent to which coaches dictate what is deemed 'normal' and reinforce what is deviant (Potrac & Jones, 2011). Two of these variables, Panopticism and empowerment, are intangible. However they may, theoretically, sit on continuums indicating the extent to which they are evident. It is argued that observation may lead to subjective viewpoints of the interactions of these phenomena, as the observer's previous experiences may influence data interpretation (Gratton & Jones, 2010).

Sample

Participants for this study were based within Barchester University Football Academy or Hockey Club. The hockey club participates in one of the top leagues in the British University and College Sports system. The Football Academy is run by the university for children in the community, the age range of which was 14-15. The sampling method used within this study was a purposive sample; this is a non-representative subsection of the larger population. This sample is based upon meeting certain characteristics (Wilmot, 2005).

Recording

One of the issues with recording data through observation is the observer effect as first highlighted by Henry Landsberger (1958). There is an irony about the observer effect playing a part in a study which is based around Foucault's (1979) notion of Panopticism,

but cannot go unmentioned. It is the role of the researcher to record without causing discomfort to the participant which may impact upon their behaviours (Sparkes & Smith, 2014). Observations were recorded through note taking and further transcription. Smith (2010) suggests that these observations should be as objective as possible. Furthermore, discourse was recorded through unobtrusive recording through a tie-clip microphone allowing for discourse analysis.

Pilot Study

It is important that, when observing, the researcher knows how to detect the variables in action (Gratton & Jones, 2010). In current sports coaching theory it is commonplace to promote the notion of theory to practice. This is based around the notion that many understand the theory of different coaching concepts but fail to have the capability to apply theory (Jones, 2006). It is a similar notion in research: a researcher may understand the theories but when understanding them in a practical setting, may not be able to pick up on them (Sparkes & Smith, 2014). This is why a pilot study is required, testing both the capability of the researcher and the strength of the methods chosen to research these concepts (Smith, 2010).

Data Analysis

Data must be analysed to be meaningful. This study was analysed through inductive data analysis (Martin & Turner, 1986), though Thomas (2003) states inductive content analysis is subject to prior knowledge. This approach to content analysis allows for themes to emerge from the data but also for theory to be applied to the data (Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007). Hierarchical content analysis allows researchers to make comparisons and contrasts within the data (Sparkes & Smith, 2014). Firstly, the data must be coded; in qualitative research this means it is categorised (Gratton & Jones, 2010). These codes must emerge from the data themselves and not be prescribed. For coding to occur effectively the data must be read and coded carefully. The codes should be analysed to discover the links and explanations of the codes. Furthermore, the text must illustrate cases justifying the selected coding system. Moreover, it should include any contradictory information (Gratton & Jones, 2010). This final illustration stage must be devoid of personal opinion or using data to confirm personal opinion (Sparkes & Smith, 2014).

Issues of Trustworthiness.

The main issue with non-participant observations is that of the observer effect, whereby participant behaviours alter due to the presence of the researcher (Gratton & Jones, 2010). This was minimised by issuing participants with information sheets and consent forms informing them of the nature of the study. This will assist in minimising the impact of the observer. To increase trustworthiness the researcher will transcribe their observations and then present these to the coach(es) in question for confirmation that these are indeed a true representation of what occurred during the observed sessions. A concern for research validity is that of transferability as Shenton (2004) suggests that observations cannot be generalised, being unique to the contexts in which they occur.

.Issues and Ethical Considerations

Jones (2006) suggests that anonymity within text can be difficult and the use of pseudonyms does not always ensure anonymity. Each individual was assured that their identity and identifiable characteristics have been excluded from the study although Morse (2007, cited in Sparkes & Smith, 2014) states that researchers should not promise absolute confidentiality as total anonymity cannot be achieved. Jones (2006) suggests that in some cases stating certain characteristics in text, may harm an individual's reputation and may incite legal action in extreme cases. To further reduce the risk concerning anonymity any files containing personal information were securely stored with access limited to the researcher. Furthermore, any sensitive topics which could be detrimental for any reason to the participant was eliminated and at any point participants can ask for certain information to be excluded. A further ethical issue would be the presence of the observer (Landsberger, 1958). It is the role of the observer to ease any discomfort as such uneasiness may cause an alteration in behaviours.

CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Keeping up appearances

It's 8:30 on a Monday evening, or as Bryan calls it 'the graveyard shift', the pitch has frozen before training has even begun, consequently I'm not sure whether I would rather be playing or observing them. Bryan sets up a drill whilst the other coaches take part of the warm up near the halfway line. He then calls the players in. Most of them jog except the one or two who walk. Bryan positions himself at the centre of the group and tells them that the aim is to improve different methods of entering the striking circle.

Bryan said that when at the baseline they could score how they wished, as long as they were responsive to their environment. He sets up obstructions to act as defenders on the edge of the striking circle in the form of tyres and rebound boards. Bryan and the other coaches had positioned themselves around the striking circle, whilst the stations away from the striking circle had no coach directly observing although Bryan regularly turned round to instruct them when to start. The drill started at the halfway line and progressed towards the striking circle, where the athletes could choose to go round the obstruction and shoot or pass to a waiting teammate. There were at least two players at each station not involved in the drill at any one time. These players often complained they were cold as they weren't doing anything, although it is normal for players who wore jumpers or tracksuit bottoms to be frowned upon, as it made them look 'too much like a coach'. There was a definite dress code: shorts and t shirt. Anything else was socially deviant. I don't know

how they managed, I was struggling to write down any observations as my hands were as frozen as the ground itself.

While the drill was going on the athletes at both the halfway and wide stations chatted amongst themselves, topics of conversation varied from girls to housemates. Meanwhile they never made eye contact, watched the drill and kept their body language engaged so that it appeared they were consistently ready to play. They kept up the façade that they were engaged in what was going on.

Similarly, in Jackson's session in the Barchester University football academy. Jackson split the group into three and asked them all to discuss what they want to improve on. The drill was a small sided game which focused on passing. Instantly Jackson moved into one of the groups to 'listen' whilst his assistant coach did the same. This left one group unsupervised. This group chose to discuss school life and what the other group were doing at the other end of the field. Then they see Jackson has finished talking to his group. One player suggests they carry on talking as they were but over emphasise their body language so they can look like they're doing what Jackson asked. As I knew what they were up to, they looked ridiculous, and I couldn't decide whether their façade was working or whether it was too obvious with excessive pointing in seemingly random directions.

The above example highlights how athletes acknowledge the coach as the holder of discipline, and embodying the Panopticon. The athletes adjust their behaviour so that it appears they are engaged with the task that has been set out as they know that the Panopticon (the coach) could be observing. This adjustment of behaviour exemplifies surveillance causing a normalisation of behaviour, or in this case the appearance that these normalised behaviours are occurring (Adams, 2009). Interestingly, Jackson's group openly discuss the notion of 'keeping up appearances' showing an acknowledgement by the group that normative behaviours should ensue, as such self-policing occurs. Foucault (1991) suggested that Panopticism promotes the self-policing of behaviour in order to avoid disciplinary action. This self-policing is a result of the coach being viewed as the

'agent of normalisation' (Halas & Hansen, 2001). This means that the coach controls the social norms meaning they control what is accepted. This 'normalisation' allows Panopticism to operate. In the above example we can see that the social norm would be to look engaged in the task. The athletes in Jackson's session must be aware of the 'normal' at some level as they openly discuss simulating engagement, thus adhering to the social norm of ostensibly being engaged with the task. This shows that the coach is the holder of disciplinary power as, if they were not fearful of discipline, they would not engage in the façade (Foucault, 1979).

Worst (2010) states that individuals who are doing wrong do not wish to be caught and as such adjust their behaviour to conform to the norms of the culture. Ibid (2010) states that these norms are inherent within the culture but are often implemented by a hierarchical figure - the coach in this case. The above example highlights how the athletes are doing wrong as they are not carrying out the task they have been empowered to do but also how they are showing acceptance of Bryan and Jackson's hierarchical position through self-policing. Their choice to conform to what is expected is due to fear of discipline (Foucault, 1979). This fear of discipline is instilled throughout coach's discourse, as all coaches who were observed spoke of how they would exert discipline. Arguably, the coach has embedded institutional norms which are replicated within the athletes (Ozarelli, 2003). This norm would be to obey the coach, which they acknowledge but notably the one freedom they possess lies in their discourse, of which they take advantage.

Bryan and Jackson both empower their athletes, however the notion that they hold the disciplinary power is continually reinforced. Athletes are empowered to work autonomously. Though their overt behaviours remain seemingly engaged with the task, their discourse does not remain involved. It is noted that when the coaches are in close proximity the athletes' discourse is seemingly normalised, thereby strengthening Jones and Standage's (2006) argument that coaches act as the 'normalising gaze'.

In the above extract these athletes have been empowered to carry out a task. However, it must be questioned whether they are truly empowered if their behaviours are still constrained by the coach. Jones et al (2004) highlights that this is the 'illusion of empowerment', whereby athletes, though empowered, still exhibit the desired behaviours as they have been outlined by the hierarchical structure existing within that institution (Kirk, 1992). In the shown example the hierarchical structure would be that of the coach being superior to the athlete. The athletes alter their behaviour so that they are seemingly conforming to this hierarchical structure in line with Kirk (1992), but their one permitted

freedom is within their discourse of which they take advantage. This is one of the limits of empowerment highlighted by Kidman (2001).

Coaches feel their athletes may take advantage of their new found power. This fear is exemplified here as, although they embody the institutional norm of seemingly looking engaged, their discourse does not concern the exercise. The discourse often revolved around sexual encounters, socials, lectures, and teachers. This shows that whilst athletes are empowered they take advantage, though arguably the athletes could have lost focus. However, it may not be that they are taking advantage but that they are unaccustomed to being educated in such a manner. Jackson's group contained athletes aged 14-15. These individuals remain within compulsory education. Schooling within the United Kingdom remains based within the authoritarian style of teaching (Houser & Frymier, 2009). As these adolescents are contained within an educational culture whereby they are dominated by their teachers, they expect to be subjugated by their coaches (Houser & Frymier, 2009). This may result in confusion when empowered. As Steve Hansen stated, there must be a culture in which athletes feel comfortable enough to be empowered (Kidman, 2001). These athletes have not yet been inducted into such a culture and feel confused about how they act when introduced to such a philosophy.

It can be seen here that whilst empowered athletes exhibit the behaviours their coaches wish, they even go to the extent of discussing the façade they display. This is possibly the clearest sign of Panopticism throughout this study. As, although the players have the freedom to share a discourse regarding what they wish, their behaviours are observed and disciplined where appropriate (Foucault, 1979). This notion is embodied by the athletes who seemingly remain engaged but when the athletes talk amongst themselves in that context they are anything but.

Instilling Normal through Discourse

Jackson is an experienced coach, and holds a UEFA B licence. As we walk onto the pitch Jackson tells me that he wishes to empower athletes more in his coaching. Consequently he likes to set them tasks through questioning, and challenging them to set their own goals. He says that he needs them to be able to think for themselves when they are playing.

At first I thought Jackson was achieving true empowerment by asking them to do these tasks but upon reading through the transcripts I

realised he was not doing so. Before each question was a prolonged speech about how and why certain elements were important. The players, although listening, looked bored and obviously just wanted to carry on playing. A few of them were playing with footballs at their feet. Jackson then asked them questions and set them tasks such as to come up with two improvements. Jackson then split them into groups to come up with answers themselves. He made sure that the groups were a few metres apart so that they did not hear each other's ideas. When I read the transcripts of the dialogue before the questions I realised that the answers the athletes gave came from this speech. As shown by the following example:

Jackson: Use the space more, make the pitch what bigger or smaller?

Player: Bigger (The players asks, although seemingly hesitant).

Jackson: So if we make the pitch bigger is it harder or easier for them? ...What else can we do? Losing your marker? Yeah, so, at the moment what people naturally do, where's the goal?...So the two ones you wanna improve on, what are they? (Though, these are questions, there is no upward inflection, they are said as statements)

Player: Getting away from the defender (Sounding sure of himself)

Jackson: No that was the one I gave you. (He says firmly)

Player: Using the space. (Hesitantly)

Jackson: So utilising the space, what else? (He says sharply)

Player: Making the pitch bigger.

The athletes had repeated what Jackson had said to them. It's unknown whether they did this consciously to keep him happy so they could get back to playing football, or whether Jackson had managed to sub-consciously instil this in them. I don't know whether Jackson is even

sure himself of what he is doing, or whether it has been instilled in him to give lots of technical and tactical information in his coach education.

Example Two

A drill had just finished and Isaac said to the girls they could go and get a drink. As they had been running a lot so most of them seemed grateful for that opportunity. Isaac pulled one of the players aside and asked her about her grip on her stick. He told her that it was an observation and reassured her that she did not have to change anything if it worked for her but her hands were too close together, meaning that she was not generating as much power as she could. Isaac then started the next drill. After this drill had finished the girls were collecting the equipment, Isaac asked the same girl, rather sarcastically, how her grip was. She snapped at him saying she hated it, she couldn't get used to it and that it didn't work for her. Isaac retorted defensively that he didn't say she had to change it. She said that she felt she had to try it otherwise he would judge her, and made reference to a lecturer who also uses that tactic in order to achieve change.

Similarly, at the end of the 'graveyard shift' Bryan is talking to the team in a circle. He says that they can leave if they wish, to which the relief is obvious in some, as the ground is freezing rapidly and some of them have spoken throughout how they cannot wait to get home. However, Bryan says that pitch time is invaluable and those who leave would miss out especially as their short corners were poor in the last game. As the observer at the time, I must confess I was a little disappointed as I too was freezing and ready to go home, but not one player left. They split into four groups, most of them stayed and practiced short corners until Bryan had had enough and called time on the session.

Discourse is the language used to describe and explain, furthermore it can be used to frame activities (Cassidy et al, 2009). The traditional view of discourse is that it is unproblematic, the things of which individuals speak act as labels (Todd, 1986). However

framing, as Kapellidi (2008) states, is a symbolic representation of what is desired within that socio-cultural domain. All of the coaches within the study frame ideology in a way which is in keeping with Kapellidi's (2008) three aspects of framing: information value, salience and connectivity. Looking at the above example of Jackson this framework can be followed. The information is valuable to the player in aiding them to achieve their goal, which is to ultimately be successful in the exercise. Furthermore, the information is salient due to its source, as Jackson has high cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1990) due to his previous accomplishment and his education. The connection is inherent within the information that is being framed as it can help performers achieve their goal.

Though it is debatable how information is framed, it is unknown whether athletes are conscious of how the activity is being shaped for them. It is widely accepted that through framing coaches are able to transmit their ideology to athletes and are able to translate beliefs into practice (Lee et al, 2013). Interestingly, in Isaac's case, the athlete acknowledges that his discourse is embodying the notion that Lee et al (2013) suggests whereby the coach translates ideology into practice. Furthermore, the athlete states through Isaac's attempts to frame a change in behaviour of what is 'normal' means that she embodies his ideology to avoid discipline. This exemplifies the working of Foucault's (1979) Panopticon and how it functions through discourse. The athlete is aware of Isaac's hierarchical position and his capability to discipline. She adjusts her behaviour to conform to what he represents as 'normal' in line with Johns and John's (2000) notion that athletes self-surveys to achieve the prescribed norm.

Although trying to empower the athletes, all the coaches contained within this study simultaneously frame what is 'normal'. This creates Potrac and Jones (2011) notion of the 'normalizing gaze' whereby as an individual in a superior hierarchical position, suggests a behaviour which is adhered to by those lower in the hierarchical structure for fear of repercussions if it is not. In the above example this is shown in the discussion between Jackson and his players, whereby Jackson framed the behaviours that he wished to occur. The athletes adhered to these and embodied these in their practice, further strengthening Lee et al's (2013) notion that framing of the activity occurs in order to translate the coaches ideology into practice.

Kidman (2001) noted that coaching is in a period of transition between prescriptive towards the more democratic approach such as shared leadership. This transition was evident in the data collected, despite the nature of the participants being those coaches who used empowerment. Inherent in the discourse of the coach was evidence of a flux

between the prescriptive and the democratic approach to coaching. This strengthens the notion that there is an imbalance which edges towards control and conformity rather than the creation of self-sufficient athletes (Denison & Mills, 2014). This is shown through Jackson's discourse, whereby preceding his questioning of the athletes, he spoke about technical and tactical suggestions that could be made. This shows how, although empowering the athletes to create with their own goals, they are actually 'framed' for them by the coach. There are several reasons this may have occurred: coaches traditionally base their coaching upon their own previous experiences (Cassidy et al, 2009). Jackson's previous coach may have been prescriptive which would be replicated by Jackson in his practice, though the flux may have been caused by coach education (Jones, 2001). Jackson openly admits that his will to empower has stemmed from his coach education. However, there is seemingly a conflict between the prescriptive approach and the empowerment approach in Jackson's discourse. This flux represents itself in his discourse in the form of seemingly prescribing options but furthermore empowering them to decide.

The extent to which the athletes have been empowered is debatable. Considering Kidman's (2001) definition of empowerment as a coaching style which allows the athlete to be the constructor of knowledge and also for the athlete to take responsibility for their choices, it further questions the extent to which empowerment was achieved. Looking again at the example of Jackson, it is arguable that he did not allow them to be the constructors of knowledge but that the knowledge was constructed for them, antithetical to Kidman's (2001) definition. However, Jackson did allow the athlete's responsibility for their choices, but the choice was limited to accepting or rejecting the knowledge which had been framed for them. Contrasting to the notion by Theodore (1985) that empowerment is "owning the capacity to act, rather than be acted on" (p.161), instead in this instance it can be seen that athletes own the capacity to act through their choices but also that they are being acted upon by Jackson.

Athletes in all cases have the capability to reject the knowledge or suggestions the coaches impart. Although athletes have the ability to make their own choices they choose not to. This is not to say that athletes are powerless. Markula and Pringle (2006) state athletes always have a degree of power to alter the coach's behaviour. Foucault (1979) suggested that the human body is a site to be subjugated. It is this subjugation which allows for Panopticism to operate. Although athletes seemingly have choices, they are controlled by the way the coach has framed their experience. This is the 'illusion of empowerment' (Jones, 2004). This framing, combined with the hierarchical position and,

occupation of a position which allows the coach to be viewed as a disciplinary figure, causes the 'normalising gaze' to occur (Halas & Hansen, 2001). As such, the athletes are fearful to deviate from what has been framed for them and consequently be subjected to disciplinary power. The athlete's behaviour is akin to that of the individuals portrayed in Orwell's (1950) *1984* whereby they fear that anything deviant from the 'norms' will be disciplined by those higher in the social hierarchy. Arguably this has made the athletes docile (Denison 2007).

Denison (2007) believed he was promoting equal debate within his discourse, however upon reflection he realised he had created docile bodies. Arguably, this has occurred here. Isaac and Bryan have both openly given athletes the option to reject their advice but ultimately all of the athletes do not think for themselves. Adding to this concept of the creation of docile bodies is the use of concurrent feedback by all coaches observed. Concurrent feedback creates docility as it removes the athletes' need to think for themselves (Chollet, Thouvarecq, Leroy & Baudry, 2006).

Contesting Panopticism and Creating Docile Bodies

Bryan tries to give some responsibility to his athletes for their own learning. Though the activities are heavily framed through Bryan's discourse, he gives them power to seemingly take control. For example, during the warm up, he calls individuals out and gives them 'jobs'. These jobs are given a time frame and include things such as getting everyone practicing different types of pass. When athletes are given these jobs they carry them out with high intensity and are praised accordingly. Interestingly, in the case of Bryan, is his relationship with the captain. Oliver, the captain, chooses not to join in the warm up and carries on playing football with another coach. Oliver consistently attempts to undermine Bryan. For example, when Bryan wants the group to focus on performance issues Oliver chooses to carry on discussing his social life. It appears Oliver believes he has an inherent amount of power from his status as captain, however Bryan is of the belief that a captain should be integrated within the team not above it. Bryan

thereafter consistently attempts to publicly stigmatise the behaviours that Oliver displays. For example, when explaining another drill to the players Bryan tells them that Oliver's team can attack the end with the café behind it as 'You always attack the café for a little pasty. Fat p***k'. Oliver does not seem happy with this suggestion but from then on seemingly conforms to Bryan.

Foucault (1979) states that the Panopticon is to cause a homogenous effect due to its power and altering of behaviours due to its hierarchical organisation. In the above example it can be seen that Oliver is overtly contesting this notion. This shows that Bryan's 'normalising gaze' (Halas & Hansen, 2001) has not reached Oliver. He does not conform as Bryan wishes and puts himself on a pedestal above the rest of the team. As Bryan is attempting to empower the athletes and is disseminating power away from himself, this contestation will be looked at through the Bourdieu's (1990) lens of capital.

Bryan has high cultural, physical and symbolic capital, meaning that he has influence over the athletes due to his education, physical capability and hierarchical position respectively (Bourdieu, 1990). Oliver, however, is contesting this capital by trying to exert his own social and symbolic capital upon the group, meaning he has forms of influence due to his social standing and his position as team captain (Ibid, 1990). This leads to a contest between the two. Bryan tries at every opportunity to exert his capital over Oliver and vice versa. However, the athletes are subject to Bryan's 'normalising gaze' and as such conform to his wishes. This is due to, as Foucault (1979) put it, the hierarchical organisation, whereby Bryan is higher in the hierarchy and therefore has more capacity to discipline. This is shown when Bryan chooses to discipline Oliver for the way he behaves through publicly humiliating him and reducing his social capital (Bourdieu, 1990). This disciplinary action against someone of higher hierarchical position than just a regular athlete reinforces the hierarchy to both the athletes and Oliver (Nakao & Machery, 2012). As such, Oliver ceases to be an issue from there on. This shows how transient Bourdieu's (1990) capital is and how this notion of power and discipline interlink.

This reinforcement of hierarchy strengthens the notion that Panopticism does not use explicit verbal or physical punishment, but may require demonstrations of punishment for 'fear' to set in (Denison, 2007). Though Oliver was the recipient of the discipline, the

behaviour which led to the castigation will be avoided by the other athletes (Foucault, 1991).

When looking at the first part of the example above, Bryan uses empowerment to instil his own ideology (Lee et al, 2013). Though this is a clear example of the 'illusion of empowerment' (Jones, 2004), the athletes carry out their 'jobs' with high intensity, which would seemingly indicate high levels of intrinsic motivation (Kidman, 2001). The reasoning for this high intensity can be questioned. An unproblematic view of empowerment would state that it is as the athlete feels increased ownership and investment in the task (Kidman & Lombard, 2001). However, when looking through the Panoptic lens, it could be argued that this high intensity is a product of fear of discipline (Foucault, 1979) which results in conforming behaviour (Jones et al, 2011). The behaviours which are to be conformed to are inherent within the coach's discourse (Sabo & Jensen, 1994). Often when the coaches ask questions they have framed the answers themselves and as such these responses form the basis of normalised behaviour.

Foucault (1979) suggests that the body came to be viewed as an object and target of power in the classical age. Ibid (1979) uses the metaphor of an eighteenth century platoon of soldiers marching in step to emphasise how normative behaviours can be achieved so to avoid disciplinary power. Though, contrastingly to this study, there was no empowerment. When the soldiers were instructed by their superiors, the soldiers had every aspect of their professional lives controlled when in training. These soldiers had become docile, and it was this docility that was called upon when their superiors put them in life threatening situations. Their capacity to do as they were told without questioning was largely due to the fact that those who questioned a superior in an eighteenth century army would face worse consequences than if they complied (Foucault, 1979). The same could be said of the athletes within this study.

As previously discussed, Bryan gives individuals 'jobs', which may seem empowering. However, questions still remain as to why they carry them out with such high intensity. A further argument may be that of a docile body, as seen in Foucault's (1979) metaphor of the platoon of soldiers, whereby the athletes often undertake activities without questioning. This may be due to how it is framed within the coach's discourse (Sabo & Jensen, 1994). Exemplified when Bryan offers the choice of leaving or not he simultaneously frames it so that those who do leave will be stigmatised. Furthermore, when he gives them choices, the athletes regularly ask him where they should be or what they should do, showing reluctance to think for themselves. These are productive bodies (Denison & Mills, 2014).

These bodies are useful in terms of performance, but choose not to think for themselves, rendering them docile (Denison, 2007).

Docile bodies during empowerment, or the 'illusion' of, may be viewed as useful for the coach following Lee et al's (2013) notion that discourse is a tool translating ideology into practice. The creation of docile bodies as shown in this study and perceived empowerment is antithetical to Kidman's (2001) notion that empowerment creates self-sufficient athletes. Argued it pushes athletes the other direction, as they become more reliant upon the coaches, losing the capacity to think for themselves (Denison, 2007). There is further debate as to whether this is done by coaches to achieve productive bodies, as suggested by Denison and Mills (2014), or whether it is to minimise feelings of redundancy as a coach (Jones, 2006).

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

This study set out to investigate of how Panopticism influences the utilisation of empowerment as a coaching method. Moreover, how it impacts upon the actions of the athlete during empowerment. It was discovered that through discourse coaches operated the Panopticon. The coaches contained within this study all gave the impression that they were empowering the athletes though, through discourse analysis, it was found that they were in fact framing the activity for the athletes in line with Kapellidi's (2008) model of framing. This framing is akin to Lee et al's (2013) notion that discourse is used by coaches to translate their ideology into practice, often giving the 'illusion of empowerment' (Jones, 2004). Similarly, it was found that coaches are viewed as the 'normalising gaze', as highlighted by the case of Isaac, whereby he merely suggested an improvement but she altered her behaviour based on the fact that the coach conveyed it. This athlete stated that she did this because she feared disciplining if she did not conform, which shows how fear of discipline is caused by hierarchical structure (Foucault, 1979). The coach has the capacity to discipline as he is in a superior position in the institutional hierarchy (Foucault, 1979). This view was contested by some individuals in the study, notably Oliver, though Bryan reinforced his hierarchical superiority in terms of discipline, showing that hierarchical structure helps operate the normalising gaze (Foucault, 1979), as the rest of the group and Oliver do not display the behaviours which led to Oliver being disciplined.

Furthermore, it was noted that athletes kept up the appearance of being engaged when in fact they were otherwise involved in social conversation. This shows how fear of discipline can cause an alteration of behaviours as, if the fear was absent, this façade would cease (Foucault, 1979).

It was evident that coaches, through framing, promote the creation of docile bodies. The coaches are viewed in all cases as the prescribers of the norm which are adopted. These norms are inherent within coach discourse (Kapellidi, 2008) and athletes adopt these

norms so they do not have to think for themselves (Foucault, 1979). This is clearest when Bryan empowers the athletes who ask numerous questions about the exercise, showing they do not wish to think for themselves and reject empowerment. Similarly, the coaches promote this docility as they consistently provide concurrent feedback during the drill (Chollet et al, 2006).

Strengths and Limitations

This study provides insight into the interaction between discourse, empowerment and Panopticism. The analysis of this discourse would not have been possible without the research methods utilised. Unobtrusive recordings of the coach's in-action discourse allowed for organic discourse analysis and the extent to which athletes are really empowered and also the extent to which activities or choices are framed for them. A further strength would be that observing the organic state in which the interactions occurred allows appreciation of how the coach and athletes behave in response to that interaction.

Though, as with all studies, there are limitations. The issue of knowing whether athletes are acting consciously or sub-consciously is a limitation. If interviews had been utilised as a research method it could have provided an insight into the athlete's view of empowerment, docility and even whether it is the fear of discipline which causes this conformist behaviour. This could only be achieved by overtly questioning the athletes, though this would increase the observer effect (Landsberger, 1958) and potentially further alter their behaviour.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings highlighted that Panopticism meant that athletes displayed normative behaviours in order to avoid disciplinary action. Inherent within the coach's discourse are the norms framed for the athletes to adhere to. Denison (2007) stated that his athletes did not become thinking athletes but instead adopted his discourse, though he believed he promoted equal debate. Furthermore, Denison (2007) set out training plans for his athletes to adhere to when he, the coach, was not present. This begs the question of what happened when the coach was absent. The coach received an indication of how the

training had gone due to electronic representations through a stopwatch reading but not of the quality of that training (Ibid, 2007).

Dobson and Fisher (2010) stated that there are three stages of Panopticism. This study has dealt solely with stage one. The second stage is concerned with electronic Panopticism, which is the concept of being monitored by electronic devices without a secondary operator being present (Ibid, 2010), akin to Orwell's (1950) "Big Brother" concept. The area for future research which this study lends itself to is investigating whether empowerment and electronic Panopticism operate in a similar fashion when both coach and subsequent discourse are not available. It is plausible to assume that behaviours would remain subject to the normalising gaze but discourse would not be present to frame the manner in which that interaction would occur. Moreover, the notion of docility could be eradicated as they would have to be pro-active in their learning. This could be done through observations and also interviewing the athletes upon their perceptions of the phenomena, which could allow for comparisons between stages one and two of Panopticism.

Reference List

Adams, P. (2009) *Geographies of Media and Communications*. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.

Bennie, A. and O'Connor, D. (2010) Coaching philosophies: perceptions from professional cricket, rugby league and rugby union players and coaches in Australia, *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 5 (2), 309 - 320.

Blaikie, N. (2000) *Designing Social Research*, Cambridge: Polity.

Butler, J. (2005) *Teaching Games for Understanding: Theory, research and practice*. Leeds: Human Kinetics

Buttryn, T. and Masucci, M. (2003) It's Not About The Book: A Cyborg Counter narrative of Lance Armstrong. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 27 (2), 124-144.

Cassidy, T, Jones, R and Potrac, P. (2009) *Understanding sports coaching: the social, cultural and pedagogical foundations of coaching practice* (2nd Edition). Oxon: Routledge.

Chollet, D. Thouvarecq, R. Leroy, D. and Baudry, L. (2006) Auditory concurrent feedback benefits on the circle performed in gymnastics, *Journal of sports sciences*, 24 (2), 149-156.

- Cushion, C. Armour, K. and Jones, R. (2003) Coach education and continual professional development: Experience and learning to coach. *Quest*, 55, 215-230.
- Cushion, C. (2007) Modelling the Complexity of the Coaching Process. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 2 (4), 395-399.
- Denham, D. (2000) Modernism and Post-Modernism in professional Rugby League in England/ Modernisme et post modernisme dans le rugby a treize professionnel en Angleterre. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 17 (3), 275-294.
- Denison, J. (2007) Coaching knowledge's: Understanding the dynamics of performance sport. London: AC Black.
- Denison, J. and Mills, J. (2014) Planning for distance running: Coaching with Foucault. *Sports Coaching Review*, 3 (1), 1-16.
- Denison, J and Scott-Thomas, D. (2011) Michel Foucault: Power and Discourse. In Jones, R. Potrac, P. Cushion, C. and Tore Ranglan, L. (2011) *The Sociology of Sports Coaching*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Dobson, J, and Fisher, P. (2007) The Panopticon's Changing Geography. *Geographical Review*, 97 (3), 307-323.
- Elo, S. and Kynga, H. (2008) The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107–115
- Foucault, M. (1979) *Discipline & Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Foucault, M. (1991) *Discipline and Punish: The birth of the prison*. London: Penguin.
- Glaser, B. (1992) *Basics of grounded theory analysis*. Mill Valley, CA: Sociology Press.
- Gratton, C. and Jones, S. (2004) *Research Methods for Sport Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Guttman, A. (2002) The Development of Modern Sports. In Coakley, J and Dunning, E. (2002) *Handbook of Sports Studies*. London: Sage.
- Halas, J. and Hanson, L. (2001) Pathologizing Billy: Enabling and Constraining the body of the condemned. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 18, 115-126.

Hammersley, M, and Atkinson, P. (2007) *Ethnography: principles in practice*. Routledge, New York.

Houser, M, and Frymier, A. (2009). The role of student characteristics and teacher behaviours in students' learner empowerment. *Communication Education*, 58 (1), 35-53.

Hyde, D, and Ward, V. (2015) *The Smart Televisions That May Be Recording Your Conversations*, The Daily Telegraph, 10 Feb, p.5.

Johns, D. 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 (2), 219-239

Jones, R. Armour, K. and Potrac, P. (2004) *Sports coaching Cultures: Practice to theory*. London:Routledge.

Jones, R. and Standage, M. (2006) First among equals: shared leadership in the coaching context. In Jones, R (2006) *The Sports Coach as Educator: Reconceptualising sports coaching*. London: Routledge.

Jones, R. (2006) *Sports Coach as Educator: Reconceptualising Sports coaching*. London: Routledge.

Jones, R. Potrac, P. Cushion, C. and Tore Ronglan, L. (2011) *The Sociology of Sports Coaching*. Oxon: Routledge.

Jones, R. Edwards, C. and Irineu, A. (In Press) Understanding coaching as a complex social system: Epistemic and methodological considerations.

Kapellidi, C. (2008) Framing and Perspectivizing in Discourse. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 40 (3), 577-580.

Kellehear, A. (1993) *The Unobtrusive Researcher*. St Leonards, New South Wales: Allen & Unwin.

Kidman, L. (2001) *Developing Decision Makers: An empowerment approach to coaching*. New Zealand: Innovative Print Communication Ltd.

Kidman, L. and Lombard, B. (2010) *Athlete-centered Coaching: Developing decision makers*. Auckland: IPC Print Resources.

- Kirk, D. (1992) Physical Education, Discourse, and Ideology: Bringing the Hidden Curriculum Into View. *Quest*, 45, 35-56.
- Kunter, M. and Baumert, J. (2006) Constructivist Approaches In The Secondary School Mathematics Classroom and Their Effects on Students' Learning, Interest and Sense of Challenge: A Re-Analysis of the German TIMSS Data. In Howie, S and Plomp, T. (2006) *Contexts of Learning Mathematics and Science*. London: Routledge.
- Landsberger, H. (1958) *Hawthorne Revisited* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University.
- Lee, Y. So-Hee Kim, and Kang, J. (2013) Coach Leadership effect on Elite Handball Players' Psychological Empowerment and Organizational Citizenship Behaviour. *International Journal of Sport Science and Coaching*, 8 (2), 327-342.
- Lyle, J, and Cushion, C. (2010) *Sports Coaching: Professionalism and Practice*. Edinburgh: Elsevier.
- Markula, P. and Pringle, R. (2006) Foucault, Sport and Exercise: Power, Knowledge and Transforming the Self. New York: Routledge.
- Martin, P. and Turner, B. (1986) Grounded Theory and Organizational Research. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 22 (2), 141-153.
- Merrill, G. (2011) Ontology, Ontologies, and Science. *Topoi*, 30 (1), 71-83.
- Nakao, H. & Machery, E. (2012), The evolution of punishment. *Biology & Philosophy*, 27, 833-850.
- Ogilvie, K. (2013) *Roots and Wings: a history of outdoor education and outdoor learning in the UK*. London: Russell House Publications.
- O'Reilly, K. (2012) *Ethnographic Methods* (2nd ed). London: Routledge.
- Orwell, G. [1949]. 1984. New York: Signet Classic.
- Ozarelli, N. (2003) Effects of Transformational Leadership on Empowerment and Team Effectiveness. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal*, 24 (6), 335-344.
- Phillips, D. and Burbules, N. (2000). *Postpositivism and educational research*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield. University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign.

Potrac, P. and Jones, R. (2011). Power in coaching. In R. Jones, P. Potrac, C. Cushion, and Ronglan, L. (Eds.), *The sociology of sports coaching* (pp. 135-150). London: Routledge.

Roberts, D. (2013) An investigation into the notion of shared leadership within a team sport. Cardiff School of Sport.

Shenton, A. (2004) Strategies for ensuring trustworthiness in qualitative research projects. *Education for Information*, 22, 63-75.

Smith, M. (2010) *Research Methods in Sport*. Exeter: Learning Matters Ltd.

Smith, W. (2014) Fundamental movement skills and fundamental games skills are complementary pairs and should be taught in complementary ways at all stages of skill development. *Sport, Education and Society*, 19 (1), 1-12.

Sparkes, A. Partington, E. and Brown, D. (2007) Bodies as bearers of value: the transmission of jock culture via the 'Twelve Commandments'. *Sport, Education and Society*, 3 (12), 297-316.

Sparkes, A. and Smith, B. (2014). *Qualitative Research Methods In Sport, Exercise and Health*. London: Routledge.

Thomas, D. (2003) A general inductive approach for qualitative data analysis. University of Auckland Press: Auckland.

Todd, J. (1986) Framing the Second Discourse. *Comparative Literature*, 38(4), 307-318.

Theodore, T. (1985) Reporting Bureaucratic Performance: A Social Learning Approach to Development Action. In Garcia Zamor, J.-C. (1985) *Puplic Participation in Development Planning and Management: Cases From Africa and Asia*. Boulder; Colorado: Westview Press.

Wacquant, L. (2004) *Body and Soul: Notebooks of an apprentice boxer*. New York : Oxford University Press.

Wilmot, A. (2005) Designing sampling strategies for qualitative social research with particular to the Office for National Statistics' Qualitative Respondent Register. *Survey Methodology Bulletin Office for National Statisics*, 56, 1-14.

Worst, R. (2010) *What is self policing?*, BNP Media: Troy.

